

attended Crawley Museum for the launch of the latest exhibition of science fiction costumes, as well as attending St Andrew's Church in Furnace Green with veterans from the AFVBC for a concert by the Band of the Welsh Guards.

Cabinet Members Councillors Y Khan and Noyce provided the Full Council with further context to their Cabinet Member announcements, as contained within the Supplementary Agenda (Order Paper).

4. Public Question Time

Questioner's name	Name of Councillor responding
<p>Bob Burgess, Three Bridges</p> <p><i>Some years ago a decision was made that the late Alderman Alan Quine should be honoured by having a suitable epitaph – be it a road name or housing block or similar – named after him. Since that time other people have been honoured – the late Geraint Thomas had a housing development named after him relatively quickly after he had passed away, and the late Raj Sharma also had a property named after him. I believe that this property was built on the site where former Councillor and Mayor Howard Bloom used to live, but sadly there has been no recognition or honouring of him. I understand Alan Quine served with great distinction in the RAF. Is this how we treat our veterans by promising them something and forgetting all about it? Why has it taken so long to honour Alan Quine, and when are we likely to see a resolution?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>I can assure Mr Burgess that nobody has forgotten the late Alderman Quine. What has happened is that Alan Quine represented Pound Hill North, and we tend to try to dedicate buildings or roads to our late councillors within the ward they represented. The opportunities for these don't come along every day. In terms of Alan's dedication of a road - it is in a phase of the Forge Wood development that is yet to go ahead. It is going to go ahead quite soon – sadly it has been held up by water neutrality to a certain extent – but Alan has been by no means forgotten and I can assure Mr Burgess of that. We have taken opportunities to dedicate buildings to the late Geraint Thomas and Raj Sharma, and it was absolutely right we did so because they were prominent buildings within the wards they represented. I don't want anyone to think that we have forgotten anyone and we will do something for everyone, as appropriate, when we can.</i></p>
<p>Supplementary question:</p> <p><i>Geraint Thomas was not a Ward Councillor representing the town centre, where the development in his name is placed. The town centre and Northgate are separate, so can I query the accuracy of what Councillor Jones said?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>There have been a few boundary changes in the wards recently. I'm afraid I don't agree with this. It's an appropriate location to dedicate something to the late Geraint Thomas.</i></p>

5. Recommendation 1: 2024-2025 Budget and Council Tax

The Leader of the Council presented report [FIN/642](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance, which set out details of the Budget and level of Council Tax for the year 2024/25, and report [FIN/650](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance, which set out an update to the original report. The update comprised an amendment to recommendation 1a, which was proposed as a result of the recent announcement of additional Government funding.

It was noted that the report detailed each of the Revenue, Capital and Housing Revenue Accounts that combine together to formulate 'The Budget'. In proposing the level of Council Tax for the Financial Year 2024/25, each of those accounts identified had been considered. The combined proposal ensured that the Council had a balanced Budget.

The General Fund budget for 2024/25 forecast a take from balances of £1.2m. It was emphasised that the main additional pressures were an additional £1m for temporary accommodation and £630k for the Town Hall and District Heat Network. Those increases had been balanced by a favourable increase in the level of business rates. The General Fund budget assumed a Council Tax increase below the referendum level of 2.99% or £6.76, which would result in a £232.10 charge for a band D property. The budget also assumed that fees and charges were to be increased by 7% where feasible. It was noted that the report had been previously considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 29 January and the Cabinet on 31 January 2024. Councillor Jones moved the recommendations which were seconded and supported by Councillor Nawaz.

The Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Crow, presented [Amendment 2 to Recommendation 1](#) as shown in the Supplementary Agenda (Order Paper), and in doing so confirmed that it was the intention to take two individual votes on the two recommendations within the amendment. The current financial situation was acknowledged however there were concerns regarding the temporary accommodation budget, level of fees and charges and the need to review the capital programme to identify projects that could potentially be delayed by one year in order to generate additional revenue funding of between £100,000 to £250,000, as well as enabling the deferral of any need to borrow to sustain the capital programme. The amendment was seconded by Councillor Lanzer.

A single debate occurred on both the recommendation and the proposed amendment. Councillors Lanzer, Irvine, Belben, C Mullins, Burgess, S Mullins, Ali, Lamb, Lunnon, Nawaz and Jones (using his right to reply) all spoke during debate.

The Full Council was reminded that in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, all Councils at their annual budget meetings are required to adopt the practice of recorded votes - that is, recording in the minutes of the meeting how each member present voted on any decision relating to the Annual Budget and Council Tax. This applies not only to substantive budget motions to agree the Budget and setting Council Taxes, including precepts, but also on any amendments proposed.

Following the conclusion of the debate, the Mayor invited the Head of Governance, People and Performance to commence the voting process on the 2024/2025 Budget and Council Tax for both the amendments and substantive recommendations.

Amendment 2 – Proposed Recommendation H

For the recommendation: Councillors Ali, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burke, Crow, Hellier, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Morris, Mwagale, Pendlington, and Piggott. (15)

Against the recommendation: Councillors Ashraf, Ayling, Charatan, Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Noyce, Pritchard, Raja, Rana, and Russell. (19)

Abstentions: None (0)

The Mayor declared that the proposed amendment had fallen with 15 votes in favour and 19 votes against with 0 abstentions.

Amendment 2 – Proposed Recommendation I

For the Recommendation: Councillors Ali, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burke, Crow, Hellier, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Morris, Mwagale, Pendlington, and Piggott. (15)

Against the Recommendation: Councillors Ashraf, Ayling, Charatan, Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Noyce, Pritchard, Raja, Rana, and Russell. (19)

Abstentions: None (0)

The Mayor declared that the proposed amendment had fallen with 15 votes in favour and 19 votes against with 0 abstentions.

Substantive Recommendation

For the recommendation: Councillors Ashraf, Ayling, Charatan, Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lunnon, C Mullins, S Mullins, Nawaz, Noyce, Pritchard, Raja, Rana, and Russell. (19)

Against the recommendation: None (0)

Abstentions: Councillors Ali, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burke, Crow, Hellier, Jaggard, Lanzer, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Morris, Mwagale, Pendlington, and Piggott. (15)

The Mayor declared that the recommendation was carried with 19 votes in favour and 0 votes against with 15 abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves the following items regarding the 2024/25 Budget:

- a) approves the proposed 2024/25 General Fund Budget which includes using £1,065,439 of general fund reserve as set out in 4.2 of report [FIN/650](#),

- b) approves the proposed 2024/25 Housing Revenue Account Budget as set out in Appendix 5 of report [FIN/642](#) which includes the savings and growth items as set out in Section 9 of report [FIN/642](#),
- c) approves the 2024/25 and future years Capital Programme and funding as set out in Section 10 of the report [FIN/642](#),
- d) agrees the transfers between reserves as outlined in Section 11 of report [FIN/642](#).
- e) agrees that the Council's share of Council Tax for 2024/25 be increased by 2.99% an increase of £6.76 from £225.34 to £232.10 for a Band D property as set out in paragraph 5.11 of report [FIN/642](#),
- f) approves the Pay Policy Statement for 2024/2025 as outlined in paragraph 12.4 and Appendix 8 of the report [FIN/642](#) noting that the pay award has yet to be agreed,
- g) approves the Capital Strategy as outlined in paragraph 10.1 and Appendix 9 of the report [FIN/642](#).

6. Recommendation 2: Treasury Management Strategy 2024-2025

The Full Council considered report [FIN/644](#) of the Head of Corporate Finance. The Leader of the Council presented the report which set out the Treasury Management Strategy for 2024/2025 and included the Council's Investment Strategy. The Council was required to approve a Treasury Management Strategy before the start of the financial year in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management and the Council's financial regulations.

The item had been previously considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Cabinet on 29 January and 31 January 2024 respectively. Councillor Jones moved the recommendation which was seconded and supported by Councillor Nawaz.

RESOLVED

That Full Council approves:

- a) the Treasury Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement contained within Section 5.4 of report [FIN/644](#)
- b) the Treasury Management Strategy contained within Section 6 of report [FIN/644](#)
- c) the Investment Strategy contained within Section 7 of report [FIN/644](#).

7. Recommendation 3: Review of Crawley Borough Council's Statement of Licensing Policy for 2024-2029

The Full Council considered report [HCS/073](#) of the Head of Community Services. The Cabinet Member for Public Protection presented the item and in doing so noted that the Council was obliged to provide a Licensing Policy, under the Licensing Act 2003,

for liquor, late night refreshment and regulated entertainment. The legislation required the policy to be updated every 5 years.

The item had previously been considered by the Licensing Committee as well as the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Cabinet respectively. Councillor Jones moved the recommendation which was seconded and supported by Councillor Yasmin Khan.

Councillor Burgess also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council approves and adopts the proposed revised Statement of Licensing Policy 2024 -2029, as detailed in Appendix B to report [HCS/073](#), made under the Licensing Act 2003 with a view to implementation on 1st March 2024.

8. Recommendation 4: PSPO - Council-Owned Multi-Storey Car Parks

The Full Council considered report [HCS/072](#) of the Head of Community Services. The Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change presented the report, which sought to introduce a new Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to restrict anti-social and criminal behaviour within council-owned multi-storey car parks in Crawley following public consultation on the matter.

The item had previously been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and the Cabinet on 29 January and 31 January 2024 respectively. Councillor Jones moved the recommendation which was seconded and supported by Councillor Noyce.

Councillors Lanzer and Burgess also spoke on this item.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council makes a PSPO in the form set out in Appendix A to report [HCS/072](#) with the restricted area being Orchard Street multi-storey car park (Pegler Way, Crawley, West Sussex, RH11 7AE), Town Hall multi-storey car park (Exchange Road, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1UZ), and Kingsgate multi-storey car park (Queensway, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1EN) which should come into force on 26 February 2024 for a period of three years.

9. Recommendation 5: Notice of Precept 2024-2025 - Council Tax Resolution

Councillor Jones presented [Recommendation 5](#), which set out the Notice of Precept 2024/25 from the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex and West Sussex County Council, which combined with the previously agreed Crawley Borough Council precept to formulate the Council Tax Resolution for 2024/25.

The recommendation was moved by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Nawaz.

Councillor Crow also spoke on this item.

Following approval of the Council's budget in recommendation 1 in report [FIN/642](#) and the amendment to recommendation 1a in report [FIN/650](#) and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the names of the councillors voting for and against recommendation 5 were recorded as set out below:-

For the recommendation: Councillors Ali, Ashraf, Ayling, Belben, Bounds, Burgess, Burke, Charatan, Crow, Hart, Hellier, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Jones, K Khan, Y Khan, Lamb, Lanzer, Lunnon, McCarthy, Millar-Smith, Morris, C Mullins, S Mullins, Mwangale, Nawaz, Noyce, Pendlington, Piggott, Pritchard, Raja, Rana, and Russell.
(34)

Against the recommendation: None. (0)

Abstentions the recommendation: None. (0)

The Mayor declared the recommendation was carried with 34 votes in favour and 0 votes against, with 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

That the Full Council, following the receipt of the notice of precept from the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex and West Sussex County Council and the approval of the Council's budget approves the following:

1. That it be noted that on 31 January 2024 the Leader of the Council under delegated powers calculated the Council Tax Base 2024/25 for the whole Council area as **36,637.0** [Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
2. That the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2024/25 is calculated at £8,503,448.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2024/25 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

(a)	£130,916,257	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
(b)	£122,412,809	being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
(c)	£8,503,448	being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).

(d)	£232.10	being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
(e)	£0	being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
(f)	£232.10	being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

4. That it be noted that the County Council have proposed precepts and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Sussex have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2024/25 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

COUNCIL TAX SCHEDULE 2024/25

	CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL	WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL	POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SUSSEX	TOTAL
BAND A	154.73	1,143.30	£168.61	1,466.64
BAND B	180.51	1,333.85	£196.71	1,711.07
BAND C	206.30	1,524.40	£224.81	1,955.51
BAND D	232.10	1,714.95	£252.91	2,199.96
BAND E	283.68	2,096.05	£309.11	2,688.84
BAND F	335.25	2,477.15	£365.31	3,177.71

BAND G	386.83	2,858.25	£421.52	3,666.60
BAND H	464.20	3,429.90	£505.82	4,399.92

6. That it be determined in accordance with Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992 that the Council 's basic amount of Council Tax for 2024/25 is NOT excessive in accordance with principles approved by the Secretary of State under Section 52ZC of the Act.

10. Notice of Motion - Declaring a Housing Emergency

The Full Council considered the [Notice of Motion](#) – Motion on Declaring a Housing Emergency – as set out on page 101 of the agenda.

The Motion was moved and presented by Councillor Jones, who in doing so gave further explanation of the reasoning behind the motion. It was seconded and supported by Councillor Irvine.

Councillor Crow moved and presented [Amendment 3](#) to the Motion of Motion (as shown in the Supplementary Agenda). The amendment was seconded by Councillor McCarthy.

Councillors Lunnon, Burgess, C Mullins, Lanzer, Nawaz, Piggott, Y Khan, Belben, Charatan and S Mullins also spoke on the item.

11. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business of the meeting had not been completed within the scheduled two hours and 30 minutes, a vote on continuation in line with Council Procedure Rule 8.3 was held. The Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting.

Having put it to the vote, the Council agreed that the meeting be continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

12. Notice of Motion - Declaring a Housing Emergency (continued)

Following the agreement of the Full Council to continue the meeting, the Mayor restarted the discussion on Notice of Motion 1 – Declaring a Housing Emergency.

Councillors Irvine, Jaggard, Pritchard, and Jones then spoke on the item.

The Mayor called for a vote on the proposed amendment in respect of Notice of Motion 1 – Declaring a Housing Emergency, which fell by 15 votes in favour, 19 against and 0 abstentions.

The Mayor then called for a vote on the substantive Motion of Motion (Notice of Motion 1 – Declaring a Housing Emergency), which was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED

This Council recognises the growing pressures on Local Authorities relating to housing, and that Crawley is one of the worst affected areas in the country with a number of factors driving increasingly unsustainable revenue costs relating to temporary accommodation for the Council. These factors include:

- The unaffordability of home ownership for an increasing number of people
- A shrinking private rented sector with soaring rents (8% increase in the last year) that also makes this option for housing unaffordable for a growing number of people
- the shortage of council and other social housing to meet demand
- Water Neutrality planning restrictions imposed by Natural England slowing down new development

As of 6 February 2024, this has resulted in:

- 2796 applications made for the 243 housing units made available in the last 8 months, so over 11 applicants per property resulting in over 260 bids for every property
- 485 households, or 1224 people, living in temporary accommodation
- One pound in every three of the Council's net revenue budget being spent on temporary accommodation

The Council also recognises the likelihood of a worsening situation given the presence of four Asylum Contingency hotels in the borough and the decision of the Home Office to disperse those seeking asylum directly into communities without a managed process or proper support in place.

This is despite the range of Council efforts to tackle structural pressures including, but not limited to:

- One of the best records in the country developing social housing, delivering over 1600 affordable units over the past 10 years, and continuing to bring new sites forward
- Buying additional properties such as the recent acquisition of 6-9 Ifield Road
- Retrofitting thousands of our social housing stock with water saving devices to allow us to build more homes
- Pursuing long leasing opportunities for temporary accommodation to increase supply and reduce costs
- Bidding for funding streams from multiple sources to support new affordable housing and temporary accommodation delivery
- Using over £500k of funding over the past two years to support people to stay in their accommodation and prevent them from becoming homeless

Whilst the Council's teams will continue to do everything in its powers to meet the needs of our residents and meet our statutory obligations, the system was not created to deal with these numbers. The driving forces are not in the Council's control and the Council under the current funding arrangements does not have the resources to solve the problem alone.

The Council therefore resolves to:

1. declare a Housing Emergency for the Borough of Crawley
2. request the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Housing to write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities calling for additional resources to help local housing authorities and councils worst affected such as Crawley, including unfreezing the Local Housing Allowance for councils currently set at 2011 levels.
3. work with the sector and with Government to develop long term solutions to fix the national housing crisis.

13. Councillors' Question Time

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
<p>Councillor Piggott to the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing (supplementary question to written question):</p> <p><i>Thank you for your response to my written question. I understand the limitations in terms of the commercial discussions and the public comments, so thank you for those. It's extremely helpful to have this overview of the current situation regarding Goffs House which is why I asked the question as there have been many residents concerned as to what is going to happen with this property. Proactive and clear communication, as appropriate and within the limitations indicated, are important and I am pleased we're now able to share this with residents whom we represent. May I recommend that with this, as with all significant locations within the town, that clear and proactive communication with residents is maintained moving forward?</i></p>	<p>Councillor C Mullins (Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>In one sense I was very pleased to have Goffs Park House come back under my portfolio. The house has lots of potential in many ways - some park use, some business use. We have not made any final decisions on the house yet. I have responded to a few email queries explaining that the house itself has problems and is dilapidated. We have not managed as yet to settle the payments due from the Ministry of Justice who handed the house back to us. I wouldn't want to get into commercial discussions or ideas at the moment, but it is an ongoing situation. We are keen to see the success of the house in the longer term, that is our ambition, but it's not going to be cheap due to the state of the house. So if you're talking to constituents about this, please tell them to be patient as it will take time and we cannot rush. We need to look at our financial resources - even if we reach an acceptable agreement with the Ministry of Justice in the near future, that won't really solve the problem of the conversion needs inside - but we would like to try and get some sources of income for the house as well. It will take time and that's why it has not been put in to the Goffs Park business plan but have kept it separate as we want the plan to move ahead separately. At some point the Council's working group will be looking at the house.</i></p>

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
<p>Councillor Lanzer to the Cabinet Member for Housing (supplementary question to written question):</p> <p><i>Thank you for your answer to my written question. Part of your answer refers to a private ('part B') agenda item from the Full council meeting on 17th July 2019, which means that this information is inaccessible to the public and the media. The decision was to use Housing Revenue Account funding to top-up sick pay arrangements for housing sub-contractors. If you remain proud of a decision to use tenants' money to support the terms and conditions of private housing sub-contractors, why was the answer to my question still put in private 'part B', and why was the decision ever put in private 'part B' and made inaccessible to the public?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Irvine (Cabinet Member for Housing)</p> <p><i>It is not my decision as to whether the matter was put in private 'part B' - that is a decision for the paid service. However I would say that, in terms of the original decision, I think it was the right thing to do. We don't want people working on behalf of the Council having to come to work when they're sick because they can't afford to go off sick. I can't say whether I will still be Cabinet Member for Housing when the contracts are re-negotiated, but when that does happen I would hope that the terms of the contract could be re-negotiated to include better sick pay. However if that happens that could increase the cost of the contract, so the cost of providing it in another way might end up exactly the same. I have not received any detrimental reports about the use of the sick pay scheme since it has come into action. In the last four years we have managed to repay the overpaid rents to Council tenants from a mistake which arose from the previous administration, we have started to shift temporary tenancies back into secure tenancies, and we are providing extra staff to conduct rolling surveys of our stock. So all in all I don't think there is anything we can't be proud of.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Crow to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection</p> <p><i>I have received an invite, as all borough councillors have, to the community safety event you are holding in early March. What do you hope to get out of the event and what do you think it can achieve that is not going to be achieved through public consultation (for example, the Safer West Sussex Partnership ran a consultation on community safety in the autumn of 2023)?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Y Khan (Cabinet Member for Public Protection)</p> <p><i>I am really hoping that people do come forward, take advantage of this event, and raise their concerns. People do not always turn up to these things but we have had enquiries about it and I am hoping that people will come and raise their concerns. Sussex Police will also be in attendance. We are trying to get some young people involved so they can come and see the impact of things like drug taking and the effect that has on people. I am hoping that it will be a really positive event and that we can change some lives. I have been speaking with some hard to reach communities - I think I have gained their trust, so they are willing to come forward to ask some questions and we want to see how we can help them.</i></p>

14. Vote to Extend the Meeting (Guillotine)

As the business of the meeting had not been completed within the scheduled two hours and 30 minutes, a vote on continuation in line with Council Procedure Rule 8.3 was held. The Mayor required the Full Council to consider if it wished to continue with the meeting.

Having put it to the vote, the Council agreed that the meeting be continued for an additional period not exceeding 30 minutes.

15. Councillors' Question Time (continued)

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
<p>Councillor Charatan to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>I understand there is something happening with the Ask building - is there any information about that?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>The property has been on the market for some time, since Ask went into administration during lockdown. I am pleased to be able to share that we have received a very recent offer from a restaurant operator which is being considered by officers at the moment. Hopefully we will have a new tenant very soon and the building will be back in use, which we would all like to see.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Pendlington to the Cabinet Member for Public Protection</p> <p><i>Please could we have a brief update on how the Car Cruising Public Spaces Protection Order is going?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Y Khan (Cabinet Member for Public Protection)</p> <p><i>So far there have been no complaints and there have also been no fines issued, but I can look into it further. If you are referencing Pound Hill and Gatwick I am aware of those.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Russell to the Cabinet Member for Housing/Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>On Saturday 2nd March we have a community consultation about the possibility of some small-scale housing development on Bristol Close. Knowing that there is a strong desire from residents for their voices to be heard, would one or both of you be able to attend that public consultation alongside myself so residents feel they are being listened to?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Irvine (Cabinet Member for Housing)</p> <p><i>I would be happy to attend if it would help. However I would assure anybody who attends that whether I or Councillor Jones are there or not, their voices will be heard through the consultation process. Nothing has been decided yet as it is only the consultation phase so I would urge people if they are concerned one way or the other about the scheme to please let the Council know by taking part. This will enable us to consider all points of view and better decide what to do in the future.</i></p>

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
<p>Councillor Burgess to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>I was interested to see that we now have a Tree Strategy. However I was a little concerned at the recent OSC meeting at which the strategy was discussed that there appeared to be some confusion as to what was actually being promoted. You did appear to be a little confused at the meeting in response to the questions - so, will all trees on the Council's land, once removed, be replaced as like for like, one for one, and native species to this country? Would this apply to Council-owned trees only, or also to other trees on Council-owned land? If not would these trees be left instead for natural regeneration?</i></p> <p>Supplementary question:</p> <p><i>I am worried about the trees in Hawth Wood. That is the Council's land and the trees have been decimated - who will replace them? Is that the responsibility of the Forestry Commission or of the Council, or will they be left to regenerate themselves, which will take decades?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>Ordinarily it would be the Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change who would answer questions relating to trees but as I was deputising for the Cabinet Member that evening at the OSC meeting, I'm happy to answer. I think the question was related to potentially non-viable trees, such as those that have sprung up in areas that are not ideal growing territory for those trees. The Council is very committed to maintaining the tree canopy right across the borough but we are constrained in that we only have control over the trees on our land. Inevitably that involves working with private land owners and other land owners including public authorities. I don't feel that there was any attempt to obfuscate what the Council is trying to do - we have never had a proper tree strategy that was formalised and accessible by councillors or members of the public, but we have a great story to tell about the borough's trees. Inevitably there will always be pressure on where trees could be grown - we are very keen to have a community-based facility where members of the community can call for trees in an appropriate area, but we would have to have control over the land in some form. The good news is that there is plenty of Section 106 money to cover the cost of purchasing and planting trees. We would like to hear from the public and want to make Crawley even more green and pleasant.</i></p> <p>Answer to supplementary question:</p> <p><i>Sadly some of the ash trees in Hawth Wood have been struck by ash dieback which is a brutal disease. The council has not taken the loss of these trees lightly and it is heartbreaking to know how many have been lost. However this has been done to try and safeguard the rest of the woodland. It is not going to kill off as many as the arboriculturalist first thought, but it does mean that a lot of trees will be lost. We have a problem in that Hawth Wood is ancient woodland and there are restrictions. Whenever there has been disease and removal of trees in the past, our tree surgeons have been very clear that trees cannot be replanted in the same location for some time. Perhaps we could take this discussion offline as it is quite a technical</i></p>

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
	<p><i>area, and I am sure we can work with yourself and with Cllr Noyce as Cabinet Member if there is anything you have in mind.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Pritchard to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change</p> <p><i>Some improvements have been made to the footpath along the Gatwick stream between The Snooty Fox pub and Hazelwick Avenue - there has been a lot of tidying and smartening up which I believe was not done by the Council. Will you commit to keeping it clean and tidy, and to repairing the fences along that walkway to make it a safe and pleasant place to walk?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Noyce (Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change)</p> <p><i>I will be in communication with the patch team and will be seeing them soon, and will pass on your question and comments with the intention of trying to fulfil that.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Lanzer to the Leader of the Council</p> <p><i>Page six of the Crawley Labour Party's 2023 manifesto states that 'we will not outsource any further local services'. Yet during the current Council year we have seen officer reports and presentations which have contemplated the outsourcing of Council services. I cannot be any more specific as these were in private session. What are your intentions - will you be standing by your manifesto, and if not, why have you got officers working up options for the outsourcing of services? Are you planning to assume a dose of pragmatism and abandon your manifesto, or is your manifesto true?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Jones (Leader of the Council)</p> <p><i>I would have to have a look at exactly what was written in our manifesto. I think the specific commitment was that wherever practicable, and in line with what we were attempting to do, that we would look insourcing services. However we have many existing services which are already outsourced, which I suspect is what Cllr Lanzer is referring to. I can't help but refer back to the elephant in the room, which is that the Council has to live within its means - there are a lot of things I would like to do in this borough but there are issues relating to money. As a result we take decisions on a case-by-case basis.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Ayling to the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing</p> <p><i>The sandpit in Bewbush pocket park has been out of action. Please can you let us know when it will be repaired?</i></p>	<p>Councillor C Mullins (Cabinet Member for Leisure and Wellbeing)</p> <p><i>Unfortunately the sandpit was closed due to structural damage which made it unsafe for children to play in. It can't be reopened until the repairs are complete and it is refilled with sand - I have not got a timescale but I can check that and let you know. The intention is to refurbish it as soon as possible.</i></p>

Name of Councillor asking question	Name of Councillor responding
<p><i>Councillor Ali to the Mayor</i></p> <p><i>At a previous Full Council meeting I asked about the portrait of King Charles III. Today I walked past the Mayor's Parlour and saw that portrait on display. In most other councils, these portraits are in public view, for example in the council chambers, for residents to see and enjoy. Would you consider displaying the portrait in public view, and if not, why not?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Hart (Mayor)</p> <p><i>The one that is in the Mayor's Parlour, as far as I'm aware, will be staying there. But another portrait has been issued which we are in the process of applying for. That is going to be the standard one that will go into public places. That is in the process of being ordered to be framed to be put up I hope in a public area.</i></p>
<p>Councillor Ashraf to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development</p> <p><i>I understand the Local Plan consultation has concluded. How did it go and have we received any initial response from the inspectors?</i></p>	<p>Councillor Nawaz (Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development)</p> <p><i>Our Local Plan went through an intensive examination led by two Planning Inspectors from the Government. I would like to commend our officers on their professionalism and the brilliant way in which they coped with the hearing sessions and the volume and breadth of questions they had to deal with. We have received an initial letter from the inspectors with some good news. They have confirmed that our local plan is legally compliant. They have asked for some modifications and officers have worked very quickly on those so the Plan is out for consultation already, having begun on 12 February with an end date of 25 March. We are hoping to bring the Local Plan to Cabinet and to Full Council in the summer for consideration and adoption. Water neutrality was the main matter that halted the Plan, but now we are in a position to approve it.</i></p>

16. Receiving the Minutes of the Cabinet, Overview and Scrutiny Commission and Other Committees including Items for Debate

Moved by Councillor K Khan (as the Deputy Mayor):-

RESOLVED

That the following reports be received:

- Planning Committee – 4 December 2023
- Licensing Committee – 12 December 2023
- Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 8 January 2024
- Planning Committee – 9 January 2024
- Cabinet – 10 January 2024

- Licensing Committee – 15 January 2024
- Overview and Scrutiny Commission – 29 January 2024
- Cabinet – 31 January 2024

There were no items for debate.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Full Council concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.50 pm

J Hart (Mayor)

Disclosures of Interest Received

Councillor	Item and Minute	Meeting	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Ali	Planning Application CR/2023/0357/OUT – Former Pay and Display Car Park, Telford Place, Three Bridges (Minute 7)	Planning Committee 4 December 2023	Personal interest – a West Sussex County Councillor
Councillor Ali	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor
Councillor Burgess	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor
Councillor Crow	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor
Councillor Crow	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – the West Sussex County Council Cabinet Member for Community Support, Fire and Rescue (with responsibility for Trading Standards).
Councillor Hart	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – secretary of Ewhurst Sports and Social Club (a licensed premises).
Councillor Nawaz	Statement of Licensing Policy (Minute 5)	Licensing Committee 12 December 2023	Personal Interest – leases a commercial unit from Crawley Borough Council
Councillor Ali	Planning Application CR/2023/0395/FUL – 10 Kithurst Close, Southgate (Minute 4)	Planning Committee 9 January 2024	Personal interest – a West Sussex County Councillor for Southgate & Gossops Green Ward.
Councillor Lanzer	2023-2025 Budget and Council Tax (Minute 5)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 29 January 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC

Councillor Lanzer	Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee (HASC) (Minute 10)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 29 January 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Lanzer	Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee (HASC) (Minute 10)	Overview and Scrutiny Commission 29 January 2024	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Health & Wellbeing
Councillor Crow	2024-2025 Budget and Council Tax (Minute 7)	Cabinet 31 January 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Nawaz	Allocating Monies Collected Through CIL (Minute 13).	Cabinet 31 January 2024	Personal Interest – Councillor for Three Bridges Ward
Councillor Ali	Notice of Precept Recommendation 5 (Minute 9)	Full Council 21 February 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Burgess	Notice of Precept Recommendation 5 (Minute 9)	Full Council 21 February 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
Councillor Crow	Notice of Precept Recommendation 5 (Minute 9)	Full Council 21 February 2024	Personal Interest – Member of WSCC
All Officers attending this meeting of the Full Council	2024/2025 Budget and Council Tax (Minute 5)	Cabinet 31 January 2024	Personal Interest, as Officers of the Council in relation to the Pay Policy Statement