

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday 9 April, 2019

* Councillor Mike Parsons (Mayor)

* Councillor Richard Billington (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Nigel Kears |
| * Councillor Philip Brooker | * Councillor Sheila Kirkland |
| * Councillor Adrian Chandler | * Councillor Nigel Manning |
| * Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| Councillor Nils Christiansen | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor Marsha Moseley |
| * Councillor Geoff Davis | * Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith |
| * Councillor Graham Ellwood | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor David Elms | Councillor Dennis Paul |
| * Councillor Matt Furniss | * Councillor Tony Phillips |
| Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Mike Piper |
| Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor David Quelch |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Jo Randall |
| Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr | * Councillor David Reeve |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Iseult Roche |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Christian Holliday | * Councillor Matthew Sarti |
| * Councillor Liz Hooper | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Mike Hurdle | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Michael Illman | * Councillor James Walsh |
| * Councillor Gordon Jackson | Councillor Jenny Wicks |
| * Councillor Jennifer Jordan | Councillor David Wright |

*Present

Honorary Alderman T Patrick was also in attendance

The Council stood in silent tribute to the memory of Honorary Alderman Bernard Parke, who had passed away on 26 February 2019.

CO90 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Councillors Nils Christiansen, Andrew Gomm, Angela Goodwin, Dennis Paul, Jenny Wicks, and David Wright, from Honorary Freeman Jen Powell, and from Honorary Aldermen Mrs C F Cobley, Mrs S Creedy, Mrs C F P Griffin, J Marks, and L Strudwick.

CO91 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO92 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 26 February 2019. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO93 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

With his mayoral year drawing to an end, the Mayor thanked everyone who had supported him so far, in particular with fund raising events. To date, over £43,000 had been raised for the

Mayor's charitable causes, and it was hoped to increase this significantly at the Mayor's final event – Gatsby at the Mandolay – on Saturday 4 May 2019.

Councillors were asked to contact the Civic Secretary as soon as possible if they wished to reserve a table.

CO94 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Leader of the Council.

CO95 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr John Rigg addressed the Council in support of the motion referred to in agenda item 11. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner responded to the representations.

CO96 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (1) Councillor Caroline Reeves asked the Lead Councillor for Licensing, Environmental Health, and Community Safety, Councillor Graham Ellwood, the following question:

“There has been a series of derogatory comments and misinformation on social media about the replacement stray dog service now that Treetops has closed. Please could the Lead Councillor for Licensing, Environmental Health, and Community Safety explain exactly what the new provision is and how it works, as well as a clear explanation of the charges?”

Also there is new legislation to cover the licensing of dog kennels, catteries and the breeding of dogs. Given the unfortunate stories we hear around bad practice and breeding farms, it would be beneficial to know what steps are taken to stop this. Please could the Lead Councillor give an explanation of how this new system functions?”

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

“Thank you for your question regarding the recent social media interest in the Council's stray dog service. I would like to explain the new service to reassure the public that animal welfare is at the forefront of the new service.

Following an open procurement process the Council has recently appointed a new contractor for the collection and kennelling of stray dogs. The new contract was extended to include the collection of stray dogs 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, rather than just evenings and weekends. This not only provides an improved service to residents but allows the Council's Dog Warden to focus on the recent introduction of more robust animal welfare regulations covering licensed animal establishments such as catteries and kennels during the working week.

The new contractor takes and logs all calls from Guildford residents about lost and found dogs 24 hours a day 7 days a week. When an owner is identified, the dog is delivered back to them instead of the owner having to travel to the kennels on the next occasion that the kennels are open. The service is operated in fully licensed and insured boarding kennels, which have recently achieved the highest star rating possible (5 stars) under the new animal welfare licensing regulations. The kennels are used mainly for commercial dog boarding and the stray block, located in a separate area, is to the same high standard as the rest of the kennels. The vans used to transport the dogs have secure fixed cages, as well as water and air conditioning for hot weather. The vans also have mobile telephones and breakdown cover in case of emergency. We have robust contract monitoring procedures in place that include inspections of the kennels to ensure that the dogs are well looked after.

The kennels will provide the Council with details of where unclaimed dogs are placed after the statutory 7 day holding period. As previously, all unclaimed dogs will be sent to established rescue organisations or centres if the kennels are unable to find them homes themselves. We do not put down healthy dogs (unless the dog is one of the four banned breeds named under the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 and then we have a legal duty to euthanise by a Vet). In accordance with their licence requirement, the kennels are registered with a veterinary practice and any sick or injured dog will be taken straight to them. The kennels will also contact the Council in serious cases and where euthanasia is advised by the vet, or undertaken in an emergency.

Our charges remain unchanged under the new arrangements. As before, owners have to pay one fee which comprises two parts: the government and council prescribed fee. The total fee is £108.50 for the first day or part thereof and it increases incrementally each day to a maximum of £271.00 on the 7th day (£108.50, £131.00, £153.00, £180.00, £207.00, £234.50, and £271.00).

The new animal welfare licensing legislation has introduced higher welfare standards and more types of animal activities are required to be licensed. The new regulations introduce a national system of premises ratings, similar to the food hygiene rating scheme which will allow members of the public to make a decision on which businesses to use based on the standards achieved. The Council is also actively searching for businesses that require licensing under the new legislation to ensure they are licensed appropriately.”

Councillor Graham Ellwood
Lead Councillor for Licensing, Environmental Health and Community Safety

- (2) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Lead Councillor for Community Health, Wellbeing, and Project Aspire, Councillor Iseult Roche the question set out below. The Lead Councillor's comments in response to each element of the question is set out in italicised text below:

“With the Executive deciding that the option to build a new Spectrum be progressed at a cost of up to £220 million, may I ask the Lead Councillor:

- (i) whether the Executive has considered what would be the financial effect on Guildford residents and council taxpayers towards the cost of building and operating such a large and expensive new project?

‘As stated in the report that was considered by the Executive on 19 March, the next phase of the feasibility process will look at the overall business case for the new venue. The cost of building a venue of comparable size to the existing one would be broadly the same, and probably slightly less, than refurbishing the existing building with significantly less disruption. As part of the business case, a funding plan will be required to be developed (as per recommendation 2 of the report)’.

- (ii) Surely the charges for usage and/or level of council tax will have to increase in order to help pay towards the costs of building and running such a facility once built?

‘As detailed in the 19 March report, Guildford Spectrum has historically run with an operating surplus contributing revenue income back into council funds. The impact of the cost of building the facility will depend to an extent as to how it is funded, the possible options for funding was set out in section 11 of the 19 March report and include planning gain (e.g. S106, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)), grant funding (e.g. Sport England), commercial partnership arrangements and borrowing).

The provision of leisure facilities is about building on Spectrum's fantastic success, we want to get the community more active and punitive pricing would not assist in achieving this goal as set out in the Council's Sport Development Strategy and the Health and Well Being Strategy. We want lots of people to be able to enjoy excellent facilities at a reasonable price again and again bringing exciting events, health benefits, employment and regional visitors to our town.'

- (iii) What are the current charges for services provided at the existing Spectrum?

'There is a vast range of charges for the different facilities for customers at Spectrum. The commercial prices are market led so if the charges are too high customers will use alternative facilities or spend their money in a different way. This would be unlikely to change in a new facility. The community prices are signed off by councillors each year as part of the budget process and this is unlikely to change.'

- (iv) What charges are projected for services provided in a new Spectrum?

'Please see the answer to (iii) above'.

- (v) What increase in council tax may be required to help fund this project?

'As stated earlier, a funding plan will be required as part of the business plan process. As I'm sure you are aware, there are government restrictions on how much council tax can be increased in a year without having a referendum. For a borough council this threshold is currently 3% and this increase has to meet all the pressures on council budgets.'

- (vi) Will there be an entry charge for a new Spectrum?"

'It is unlikely there would be any change to the current arrangements, with no general admission charge to visit the building unless you wished to gain access to a specific facility or event. We want to encourage as many people as possible to visit and enjoy both the leisure facilities and the catering facilities in the venue'

- (3) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

"With the Executive attempting to rush through the Local Plan before the local elections, it is clear that the scale and location of proposed housing development will bring more traffic into Guildford town, the villages, and across the borough, so I ask the Leader of the Council:

- (i) what steps are the Council taking to relieve the traffic congestion, pollution and environmental damage that will inevitably be caused?
- (ii) surely highways and other infrastructure improvements required to cope with new housing must come first?"

The Leader of the Council's response was as follows:

"Prior to addressing the detail of Cllr McShee's question, it is important to state up front that the Local Plan Inspector, in finding the Plan sound, has endorsed the approach taken by Council across the 11 main issues he identifies upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. This includes stating that, subject to his modifications, the Plan's overall spatial strategy is sound in every respect.

In response to part (i) of Councillor McShee's question, the Council has set out its approach to planning for future patterns of movement in the draft Local Plan, the Topic Paper: Transport and in the extensive evidence base covering the issues of traffic congestion, air and noise pollution. These issues were then discussed extensively during the examination hearings.

The planning inspector has recently published his report on the draft Local Plan. He finds that the plan is sound, subject to agreed main modifications, and is compliant with the legal requirements.

Specifically, the planning inspector's report addresses as issue 8 the question of 'Whether the Plan deals adequately with the transport impacts of its development strategy'. I would refer Councillor McShee to paragraphs 125 to 142 of the report.

In opening this section, the inspector identifies that:

'The Plan incorporates the programme of transport schemes contained in the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017. This covers all modes of surface transport. The Plan's spatial strategy has been assessed in Surrey County Council's Strategic Highway Assessment Report (2016) and the Council's Addendum (2017). The conclusion of these studies was that the amount and distribution of development proposed in the Proposed Submission Local Plan together with the key highway schemes would not have a severe impact on the local and strategic highway network.' (125).

The inspector presents his findings with respect to the Council's approach to improvements to the A3 and junctions, local roads including the schemes for traffic management and/ or environmental improvements in the villages, other transport proposals including the new rail stations, the Sustainable Movement Corridor and the new park and ride.

He concludes as follows:

'The Plan deals adequately with the transport impacts of the development strategy, and takes a positive approach towards encouraging people to shift transport mode away from private vehicles. Subject to the main modifications described above, the transport strategy is sound.' (142).

In response the part (ii) of his question, I would refer Councillor McShee to Policy ID1 Infrastructure and Delivery, as modified, of the draft Local Plan.

This includes various elements including that:

'(1) Infrastructure necessary to support new development will be provided and available when first needed to serve the development's occupants and users and/or to mitigate its otherwise adverse material impacts. To achieve this, the delivery of development may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure.' and

'(4) The imposition of Grampian conditions shall be considered as a means to secure the provision of infrastructure when it is needed. If the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured in line with this policy, planning permission will be refused.'

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

- (4) Councillor Tony Rooth asked the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor Matt Furniss, the following question:

“In view of the widening of the A281 road at Shalford to 4 lanes and an additional roundabout at Broadford Road being a condition of the planning approval for 1,800 homes at Dunsfold Aerodrome, would the Lead Councillor comment upon the effects these roadworks would have on Shalford Common, the open character of the village and the cricket club, what measures will be taken to cope with the increase in traffic coming into Guildford itself and along the roads towards Peasmarsh and Chilworth and Gomshall and whether these schemes will solve the congestion problems on the A281 and surrounding roads?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“These highway improvements were approved as part of the redevelopment of Dunsfold Park for a new settlement. The proposals were recommended for approval by an independent Inspector following a Public Inquiry held between the 18 July and 3 August 2017. The development was subsequently approved by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 29 March 2018. Guildford Borough Council was not the determining authority for this development; however, the environmental impacts of the scheme, including these works, were considered as part of this process.

During the course of the appeal Guildford Borough Council, with the support of Surrey County Council, were able to secure a contribution of £5 million towards measures to mitigate the transportation impact of the development within Guildford including improved edge of centre or out of town parking provision or other measures to provide road capacity headroom on the southern approaches to Guildford Town Centre This is in addition to the cost of the Shalford Works and the other transport interventions which are to be undertaken at the cost of the developer.”

Councillor Matt Furniss
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

- (5) Councillor Colin Cross asked the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, the following question:

“In view of the Executive’s recent u-turns in putting community assets like Burchatts Farm and Chantry Wood Campsite out for commercial disposal, will they give their binding undertaking to endorse the policy of the Independent Alliance and Residents for Guildford and Villages Groups, to promote all the borough’s cultural, historical and community assets for the benefit of the community, with such sites being protected and managed in a way that maximises their community value, whilst being as financially viable as is reasonably possible?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“I am afraid I cannot agree with Cllr Cross’s assertion that the Executive have made any U-turns. I must make clear that in neither of the cases mentioned was it the intention to dispose of the properties, both would have remained in the Council’s ownership and ultimate control. This Executive not only promotes our local culture and heritage, but spends substantial sums every year supporting these offers, totalling £1.9m.

Whilst I am happy to see that opposition parties share this Executive’s desire to support both culture and heritage, the role of any particular asset is something that needs to be assessed from time to time in the light of the demands on the Council as a whole. I agree that the work we do to support our communities, particularly those who are most vulnerable

must be a priority but such work extends far beyond any particular asset. I am pleased to see that opposition parties also share our desire to support communities”.

Councillor Nigel Manning
Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management

CO97 REVIEW OF PROBITY IN PLANNING – LOCAL CODE OF PRACTICE

The Council noted that The Probity in Planning - Local Code of Practice document set out in Part 5 of the Council’s Constitution had not been reviewed for some time and had been included as a part of the ongoing review of the Constitution. The document provided guidance for councillors and officers on their role and conduct in the planning process. The guidance included how councillors and officers should manage contact with applicants, developers and objectors or supporters. The purpose of the guidance provided in the document was to ensure that decisions made in the planning process were not biased and were taken openly and transparently, and based on material planning considerations only.

During the review, officers had undertaken a comparison process between the existing document and other councils’ local codes published more recently. The Planning Development Manager, the Principal Planning Solicitor and the Monitoring Officer had reviewed the document. During the course of this process, it was suggested that the updated Probity in Planning - Local Code of Practice could be amalgamated with other relevant information in respect of the determination of planning applications, including how the Planning Committee operated in that regard, and published as a ‘Probity in Planning Councillors’ Handbook’, which would be very useful for all councillors, particularly those newly elected following the Borough Council Elections on 2 May 2019.

A copy of the draft Handbook was attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council.

The report had been considered by both the Planning Committee (on 27 March 2019) and Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (on 28 March 2019). Both committees’ comments in support of the Handbook had been included in the report.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, the Council

RESOLVED: That the ‘Probity in Planning Councillors’ Handbook’, attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted.

Reason:

To provide up to date and fit for purpose Probity in Planning guidance to councillors and officers, together with other relevant information on the planning process at the Council in a helpful handbook for councillors.

CO98 APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED INDEPENDENT MEMBERS OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE (MAY 2019 - MAY 2023)

The Council noted that Article 10 of the Constitution provided that the composition of the Council’s Corporate Governance and Standards Committee included three non-voting, co-opted persons who were not councillors or officers of the Council (independent members), whose term of office would be for a four-year period, with serving independent members being eligible for re-appointment.

Following a recruitment process, two applications had been received, one from the current independent member Mrs Maria Angel MBE seeking re-appointment, and the other from Mr Murray Litvak.

On the basis that Mrs Angel had served very ably and impartially as an independent member on the Committee (and its predecessor committee) since 2013, officers had no hesitation in commending to the Council her re-appointment as an independent member for a further four-year term.

Mr Litvak was interviewed on 6 March 2019 by a panel comprising the Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (Councillor Richard Billington), the Chief Finance Officer (Claire Morris) and the Deputy Monitoring Officer (Sarah White).

Following the interview, the panel indicated that Mr Litvak was an extremely able and high calibre candidate with a good knowledge of standards and governance issues. Mr Litvak was currently Chairman of the Spelthorne Members Code of Conduct Committee and also the statutory Independent Person at Runnymede Borough Council. The panel had therefore recommended that Mr Litvak be appointed as an independent member of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee.

Before the Council determined this matter, Councillor Michael Illman disclosed that he was a member of the same rowing club, and on the same committee at that club, as Mr Murray Litvak, who was a candidate for appointment as independent member of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee. Mr Litvak had also coached Councillor Illman. Councillor Illman therefore withdrew from the meeting before any decision was taken.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, the Council

RESOLVED: That Murray Litvak be appointed, and Maria Angel MBE be re-appointed as independent members of the Council's Corporate Governance and Standards Committee with effect from May 2019, for a four-year term of office.

Reason:

To comply with Article 10 of the Council's Constitution.

CO99 APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS UNDER SECTION 28 LOCALISM ACT 2011 (MAY 2019 - MAY 2023)

Under Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011 ("the Act") the Council was required to appoint at least one independent person whose views may be sought regarding any allegations of misconduct against a councillor and the arrangements under which any such allegations can be investigated and determined.

There were currently three Independent Persons who had been appointed by the Council in 2015 and their term of office would end in May 2019.

Although the role of Independent Person was voluntary, the Council was required to advertise the vacancy in such manner as the authority considered likely to bring it to the attention of the public.

As with previous appointments, the Council had entered into a joint arrangement with a number of other councils in Surrey to recruit and appoint Independent Persons.

The Council considered a report setting out details of the 2019 recruitment process, and the seven candidates who had been recommended for formal appointment as Independent Persons by this Council (and the participating councils) for the four year period from May 2019 to May 2023. The report had also been considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, at its meeting on 28 March 2019. The Committee had commended the appointment of seven candidates as this Council's Independent Persons.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, the Council

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed as the Council's Independent Persons for a four-year term of office expiring in May 2023:

- Vivienne Cameron
- Bill Donnelly
- Paul Eaves
- Liz Lawrence
- Roger Pett
- Bernard Quoroll
- John Smith

Reason:

To enable the Council to comply with its obligations under Section 28 (7) of the Localism Act 2011.

CO100 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 28 MARCH 2019

Prior to the formal consideration of this matter, the Mayor drew the Council's attention to the note circulated by the Managing Director to all councillors on 5 April 2019 specifically in respect of paragraph (1) of the proposed resolution in the motion.

A copy of the note had been appended to the Order Paper circulated to all councillors before the meeting.

The Council's lead barrister on the Local Plan, Mr James Findlay QC was present to offer any further advice to councillors in order to deal with this matter appropriately.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Tony Rooth proposed, and Councillor Colin Cross seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

"This Council notes that an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council has been called on Thursday 25 April 2019 for the purpose of considering whether the Local Plan should be formally adopted following receipt of the Inspector's final report.

The Council

RESOLVES:

- (1) That consideration of whether the Council should adopt the Local Plan be deferred to a suitable and reasonable date after the Borough Council elections on 2 May 2019.
- (2) That, should the Council decide not to defer consideration of the adoption of the Local Plan, the proposed Extraordinary Council meeting currently arranged for 25 April 2019 be held at a venue with a much larger capacity than the Council Chamber in order to accommodate the large number of Guildford residents interested in the Local Plan who may wish to attend the meeting.
- (3) That, irrespective of the date and venue, public participation at the Extraordinary Meeting be extended by thirty minutes to one hour to allow the public to address the Meeting before the Council makes a decision on the possible adoption of the Local Plan."

Councillor Rooth requested a recorded vote be taken in respect of paragraphs (1) and (2) of the motion, which was supported by four other councillors.

Following the debate on the motion, paragraph (1) was put to a recorded vote and was lost with 14 councillors voting in favour, 25 councillors voting against, and two abstentions as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Colin Cross
Councillor David Goodwin
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Mike Hurdle
Councillor Julia McShane
Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Susan Parker
Councillor Tony Phillips
Councillor David Reeve
Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor Tony Rooth
Councillor Matt Sarti
Councillor Pauline Searle

AGAINST:

Councillor David Bilbe
Councillor Richard Billington
Councillor Philip Brooker
Councillor Adrian Chandler
Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
Councillor Geoff Davis
Councillor Graham Ellwood
Councillor David Elms
Councillor Matt Furniss
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Christian Holliday
Councillor Michael Illman
Councillor Gordon Jackson
Councillor Jennifer Jordan
Councillor Nigel Kearse
Councillor Sheila Kirkland
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Marsha Moseley
Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith
Councillor Mike Piper
Councillor David Quelch
Councillor Jo Randall
Councillor Iseult Roche
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor James Walsh

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Liz Hooper
Councillor Mike Parsons

Paragraph (2) was put to a recorded vote and was lost with 6 councillors voting in favour, 32 councillors voting against, and three abstentions as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Colin Cross
Councillor Mike Hurdle
Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Susan Parker
Councillor Tony Phillips
Councillor Tony Rooth

AGAINST:

Councillor David Bilbe
Councillor Richard Billington
Councillor Philip Brooker
Councillor Adrian Chandler
Councillor Geoff Davis
Councillor Graham Ellwood
Councillor David Elms
Councillor Matt Furniss
Councillor David Goodwin
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Christian Holliday
Councillor Michael Illman
Councillor Gordon Jackson
Councillor Jennifer Jordan
Councillor Nigel Kearse
Councillor Sheila Kirkland
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Julia McShane
Councillor Marsha Moseley
Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith
Councillor Mike Piper
Councillor David Quelch
Councillor Jo Randall
Councillor David Reeve
Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor Iseult Roche
Councillor Matt Sarti
Councillor Pauline Searle
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor James Walsh

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
Councillor Liz Hooper
Councillor Mike Parsons

Paragraph (3) was put to a vote by way of a show of hands and was lost.

CO101 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 19 February and 7 March 2019.

CO102 RETIRING COUNCILLORS - VOTE OF THANKS

The Mayor expressed appreciation of the service to the community and the Council by the following councillors:

- Councillor Tony Phillips (36 years on the Council)
- Councillor Jenny Wicks (24 years)
- Councillor Iseult Roche (8 years)
- Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr. (6 years)
- Councillor Nils Christiansen (4 years)
- Councillor Mike Hurdle (4 years)
- Councillor Michael Illman (4 years)
- Councillor David Reeve (4 years)
- Councillor Matt Sarti (4 years)

who were not seeking re-election on 2 May 2019. Between the nine councillors, they had achieved a combined total of 94 years of service, and had amassed a wealth of knowledge and experience which would be greatly missed by the Council and its residents. The Council joined the Mayor in expressing formally their thanks and appreciation to them and offering their best wishes for the future.

CO103 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 9.17 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date