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36/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

37/16 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 28 September 2016 and of the Special meetings of the Council held on 19 October and 17 November 2016, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and signed as correct records.

38/16 MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor began by acknowledging that it had not been long since the Council had last met, as there had been two Special Council meetings held in the intervening period. Since the September Council meeting, the Mayor had attended almost 80 events. In early October, the Mayor had attended the annual memorial on the date that Flight Sergeant Charles Sydney R.A.F. was shot down in his Spitfire over Walton. The Service was organised by the friends of Flight Sergeant Sydney, and volunteers, Mr. Miller and Mr. Flexman, tended the memorial throughout the year. The Mayor thanked Councillor Mrs.
Elmer, who had invited her to attend the very moving service and the Mayor had felt honoured to be invited to lay a wreath.

The Mayor and Consort had been pleased to attend a Bantu Arts and African Cultural event held at Riverhouse in October. There had been a lot of music and drumming and the whole event had been a night to remember.

In October the Mayor and Consort had also attended a thanksgiving service in respect of the signing of the Royal Charter formally establishing the University of Surrey. It had been astounding to note the University’s achievements over the last 50 years.

Mid-October saw the Elmbridge Long Service Awards, which recognised the contribution and achievements of so many Elmbridge volunteers. Long Service meant 5-years or more, and it was acknowledged that many of the volunteers had served the Borough for far longer. A citation had been read out for every volunteer and they had been presented with a framed certificate. The event had been a great success and the Mayor extended her thanks to officers from the Community Support Services Team for their hard work in organising the Awards evening.

Early November saw the Sports Personality Awards at Danes Hill School and the Mayor had been pleased to join the Sports Council Chairman, Councillor Barry Cheyne, the Deputy Mayor, Rachael I. Lake and Councillors Mrs. Janet Turner, Mrs. Mary Marshall and David Archer, together with a number of sponsors and members of the Community, to present a variety of awards. It was wonderful to note and celebrate the sporting achievements of so many in the Borough and particularly gratifying to see the young talent across the Borough. The notable attendees included Ms. Giselle Ansley, for her gold medal achievement in hockey and Ms. Rebecca Simon, for her achievements in kayaking.

There had been a number of Remembrance Services across the Borough, with one of the most poignant being at Claremont Fan School. The Mayor had laid a wreath at All Saints on the morning of Remembrance Sunday and at St. James Church in Weybridge in the afternoon. The Mayor also took the opportunity to thank all those Members who laid wreaths at various services around the Borough.

There had been numerous gift fairs, Christmas fairs in churches, village halls, and schools and even a Christmas show. There have been some 100th Birthday celebrations and one birthday celebration that she would never forget was for a lady celebrating her 102nd Birthday, who had been asked to recite a poem and which she had done entirely from memory.

She had also been invited to switch on numerous Christmas lights, notably in Walton, where there were in excess of 3,000 people packed in to The Heart. Cobham and Esher was also very busy events. She had also been pleased to turn on the lights in Thames Ditton. Congratulations were extended to all the various committees and business guilds who had organised these events.
It has been a very busy few weeks and thanks were extended to the Deputy Mayor for her continued support. Thanks were also extended to the Mayor’s Secretary, Mrs. Gill, who provided invaluable support.

The Mayor took the opportunity to outline forthcoming events and engagements, including helping with the Christmas mail 19 December. On 16 December there would be a night of a fundraising with a concert in support of the Mayor’s Charities, entitled ‘Ring Out The Bells’. There would be some very talented singers from Surrey Arts, singing music from around the world, and would be led by professional musician, Mr. Rufus Frowde. The Mayor mentioned, with pride, that her daughter, a soprano singer, had been successful in obtaining the female lead role in an opera at the Bologna Opera House in May of next year and was looking forward to performing. Other forthcoming engagements included the Valentines Ball, which would be held on 18 February 2017 at Oatlands Park Hotel.

39/16 LEADER’S QUESTION TIME

1. Question asked by TG. Oliver to the Leader of the Council, S.J. Selleck

‘Does the Leader of the Liberal Democrat / Residents coalition agree with me that we have a truly excellent set of officers at Elmbridge who are genuinely focussed on delivering the highest quality service to our residents?’

Response given by S.J. Selleck

Thank you for your question, the answer obviously is “Yes”.

I believe that across the Chamber, Members are usually appreciative of the work our staff put in. We all acknowledge over the years what a tremendous job they have done, particularly as the workloads have increased dramatically and we have in this chamber often congratulated them on their efforts to maintain the services that we, as Members, would like to deliver to our residents. Generally we are pretty good at giving credit, where credit is due, rather than taking it ourselves.

However, occasionally we get it wrong and, sometimes, mix up our enthusiasm to do more for our residents with a message may come across as being critical of our officers. We should resist such public criticism and acknowledge that we are all on the same side, looking for the same objectives.

We all know that our officers help us to achieve our high levels of satisfaction and we cherish the partnership, with the Chief Executive, Management Board and all the staff that continue to deliver our services to our residents.

Supplementary Question by T.G. Oliver

I endorse what the Leader has said in terms of his public praise for the officers and can I ask him therefore please to consider the quote, and I reluctantly read this, in a public publication, which happens to be the ‘Focus, Liberal Democrats’, which has been
distributed, when interviewed and asked about the work of Council officers, they responded by saying that ‘I’m afraid things aren’t all rosy on that side either and we need to tackle such issues. It’s partly because the Council is simply understaffed due to austerity. But it’s also because the attitude of, for instance, planning enforcement is somewhat relaxed. We need to re-boot some of the officers and make sure their work is of the highest standard and serves resident interests optimally.’ Does the Leader agree with that?

Response given by S.J. Selleck

As I didn’t write that, nor did I speak to the person that did write that, it difficult to comment. Certainly it’s something that, as I said before, the over-enthusiasm of a particular Councillor, who got carried away as we all do sometimes, in trying to register, possibly, frustrations and we all have frustrations that things don’t progress. As I said before, it’s something that I would criticise generally, that we do not need to make a public statement about our officers in any shape or form, other than to give more credit, so I do take on board and apologise on behalf of the Administration if he feels that there has been a disservice to the management and staff. There was no intention of that, I’m sure, from the relevant Councillor involved.

2. Question asked by I. Donaldson to the Leader of the Council, S.J. Selleck

‘One year ago, the quarterly performance monitoring report against the 2015/16 basket of performance indicators, showed in the second quarter, 28 (76%) Council Plan objectives were on target and of the 9 ‘Flagship’ activities, 7 (78%) were on target.

Today under the new leadership, the Cabinet report (page 70 of the agenda) shows that the second quarter performance monitoring report in respect of the 2016/17 basket of performance indicators, Council Plan objectives and Flagship activities states in the second quarter, 20 (88%) Council Plan objectives were on target. Of the 9 Flagship activities, 4 (44%) were on target.

Can the Leader explain why there are 8 fewer Council Plan objectives since last year, and why there is a reduction of 34% in performance since last year with only 4 of the 9 Flagship activities for 2016/17 being on target?’

Response given by S.J. Selleck

Thank you for your question.

Having chaired the Performance and Finance Panel for a number of years I am aware of the monitoring reports and how effective they are in keeping Members up to date on the performance of the Council. The quarterly reports are historic and therefore one has to possibly look forward to what is actually happening.

As for the reasons why there were 28 Council Objectives last year and only 20 this year, that was of course a decision made by the previous Administration back in February when the Council Plan was approved. I think it’s worth noting the updates on the outstanding
These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the COUNCIL, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

“amber” or “red” monitoring reports:

- Put in place a new CCTV monitoring arrangements by March 2017

This action was behind for the second quarter. There was an awful lot of work done by Councillor Cheyne and fellow Members and that is on the agenda this evening for a decision. Once that goes through, then it will be up to target.

- Agree a Devolution Deal that secures more Council control over services that residents value by March 2017

This is outside the direct control of the Council. This has been driven by the Government and the Government has changed as we all know. It is not clear whether devolution, in its current form, will go ahead anyway.

- Secure at least 40 additional affordable homes and bring at least 40 empty properties back into use by March 2017

This is the most disappointing thing for us. We are committed to ensuring that we deliver affordable housing however again, this is out of our control. Two of the major developments due to come onstream this year, unfortunately will not be. However, as you will be aware, as an Administration, we are working feverishly behind the scenes to put through as many options as possible to increase the affordable housing in the Borough. Not least, again in this agenda, we will have secured 38 units which will be delivered in the next couple of years.

- Work in partnership with The Landscape Group to effectively implement the new contract to maintain and improve the Council’s green spaces by March 2017

We all know the problems experienced last year. We have addressed that, and as you will know, at the Cabinet meeting we agreed to move the contract back to Burley’s for the verge cutting.

- Complete the contamination works and start construction of the Waterside Drive Sports Hub by October 2016

We all know the issues surrounding Waterside Drive and its delivery. Again, the contamination works have finished and the construction started, and I know many Members have been around the site to look at it, so one anticipates that this should be back on target for the third quarter.

3. Question asked by J. Browne to the Leader of the Council, S.J. Selleck

‘Will the Leader join me in welcoming Philip Hammond’s announcement in the Autumn Statement that £1.4 billion is to be made available for 40,000 new affordable housing starts? Secondly, given that Elmbridge is an area of high housing need, does he envisage this Council making a bid for financial support from the new Housing Infrastructure Fund in due course?’
Response given by S.J. Selleck

Delivering Affordable Housing is a key priority for this Administration so ‘Yes’, the Chancellor’s commitment to provide additional funding to boost affordable housing delivery is most welcome. The Council will be working closely with our housing association partners to look at the options to deliver more affordable units. In terms of Mr. Hammond, I have already spoken to the officers and once the details are known, then we will know how to approach the Government to get access to this infrastructure fund. As an aside, I have a meeting with two MPs, Mr. Dominic Raab and Mr. Philip Hammond, in the next few weeks and this will be high on our agenda.

Supplementary Question by J. Browne

I’m delighted to hear the Leader’s response. He will be as aware as I, that the mood music emanating from the Government in respect of affordable housing, has historically been quite mixed, in that on the one hand they encourage the building of affordable housing, but that on the other hand, they have been giving at least tacit encouragement to developers to challenge affordable housing requirements as part of their developments. Would the Leader agree with me that the most recent change of time is to be welcomed?

Response given by S.J. Selleck

Yes, I would, and it’s something I will raise with our MPs as it’s quite crucial, in fact for the whole of the south-east, that we do have a working relationship with the Government and that they do understand the issues facing even some of the wealthiest Boroughs like Elmbridge.

4. Question asked by T.G. Oliver, to the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, A. Davis

‘As the Portfolio Holder is probably aware when car parking charges were introduced under a Resident Administration they introduced a two-tier system of charging. As he now intends to create a three-tier system could he tell us if he intends to extend this to other areas?

The November Cabinet paper gave the estimated lost income for Ashley Road Thames Ditton, Walton Road Molessey, and New Berry Lane Hersham car parks. Now that Cabinet has additionally added Southbank car park in Long Ditton, it would be helpful if we could be told the total cost of these concessions when Councils are struggling and every penny is important.’

Response given by A. Davis

In 2004, it was first muted to extend the charging from the community car parks to the other car parks and we ended up with three-tiers or categories of car parks, and over the years some car parks have been recategorized and a number of car parks have changed their shape. For instance, in my own town of Weybridge, we have three town car parks and each one is quite different in its makeup. We have two that allow all day parking, two that have season tickets and one that has restricted car parking, so although they are ostensibly the same they have various categorisations, and that applies across the
Borough. Following recent consultation, as of tomorrow, weather permitting, we are introducing contactless car parking machines which will spread to certain car parks, so we have in a sense another category of car park in the mix. Hopefully, after due consideration, a report will be brought forward next year, which, following approval by the full Council, will have pay on exit car parks, and that technology allows us to have another category of car parks, which would suit, perhaps, Weybridge Churchfields, Hollyhedge in Cobham and the Civic Centre car park in Esher. So we have a variety of car parks already. Looking back to that 2004, if you think at that time that if you had said ‘Amazon’ to someone, they would have thought of a large river in Brazil and Twitter hadn’t been invented. In those 13 years, a lot has happened and the nature and stresses of working and transport has changed remarkably in that time, so if we cast our minds forward another 13 years to 2030, who knows, we might have driverless cars, we might commute on electric bicycles, the nature will change. I think we have to take each year as it comes to meet the needs of our communities and our overriding need is that car parks will play their part in making sure that we have safe, healthy, vibrant communities.

In terms of the second part of your question, the foregone revenue is around £15,400, with the extra car park that was added, Southbank, being £600 in the period concerned. This is a pilot and at the end it will be reviewed to see how effective it has been in reaching the goals that we set. I should add that last Saturday we offered free car parking and I would like to think that that has been very effective across the Borough and that forewent £5,000 of estimated revenue for the day so we invest in our car parks to allow our communities to thrive.

Supplementary Question by T.G. Oliver

We’ll have a debate later this evening on whether it is equitable to have free car parking at selected car parks across the whole of the Borough. My supplementary question, is that in the Cabinet papers, there’s an estimated cost of the introduction of limited free parking for the 3 Saturdays of £15,000 and there will be an additional cost for the fourth one. My question is does that include the impact on season tickets, on the basis that the season ticket holder currently pays for a six day parking permit and therefore is there an additional cost in that there will be a reduction in the season ticket to reflect the fact that they will have free parking on a Saturday anyway?

Response given by A. Davis

I will find out the answer for you and will let you know as soon as possible.

Supplementary Question by R. Green

It’s often repeated by my Conservative friends and in fact it still appears on their website that the Residents Group introduced car parking charges. That is not the case. Car parking charges were introduced in this Borough when Councillor Milne was Chairman of the Highways Committee and were introduced at station car parks and Weybridge town centre car parks at the request of Weybridge Chamber of Trade who were losing trade because the car parks were constantly full up. Would Councillor Tim Oliver agree with me that this is a true fact?
Comment by T.G. Oliver

This is Leader’s questions, not questions to the Leader of the Opposition, but I would also ask Councillor Green, if in his Manifesto for Hersham Village Society, he says that if the RA Group gain control after the election they will put right many of the wrongs that the Conservatives put in place and one of those is to reduce the charge in station car parks to encourage their use and stop charging for town and village car parks on a Saturday. Is that the case?

Supplementary Question by S.J. Foale

I’m grateful that Councillor Davis raised the free parking on a Saturday. I wonder whether you gathered any statistics for that Saturday because one of our concerns about free parking is that the car park will predominantly be used by the shop keepers and their workers and therefore this will prevent people using it. Can you say whether that actually happened on this occasion, particularly in the Weybridge car parks and if not, could you gather the evidence over the next few Saturdays please and report back because that would help us to make a decision.

Response given by A. Davis

That’s an interesting question and who is using the car parks? has been brought up by many Members. We had one debate where it was quite clear that we had local workers using the car park. This statistic is very important and any decision we make should be based on good statistics and I will be looking at those figures very closely indeed. I should say that in some instances it is hard to say whether a car is parked by an employee or shopper, but we will be reviewing and looking at this.

Supplementary Question by G.P. Dearlove

When Councillor Davis answered the question earlier, he referred to three car parks in Weybridge. In fact there are four car parks. He mentioned a car park had restricted parking. That car park has only about 15 spaces, so it is a bit unfair to make that a comparison.

Response given by A. Davis

It depends on what you call Weybridge. The reason why Monument Green car park was restricted was because it had very few numbers. That’s the point. Each car park is different and has different attributes. Having a ‘one size fits all’ strategy is probably not appropriate.

Supplementary Question by A.H. Kopitko

I wonder if Councillor Davis is aware that the advertising for the free car parking for last Saturday and free business day was very poor. Councillor Kelly and myself happened to be in the Drewitts Court car park and it was obvious from talking to people that they were not aware it was free car parking. It appears that advertising has not been put out properly and I would like reassurance that this is going to happen now and that we will
make it more widely known. There was a small sticker which was put over the slot on the payment machine and people hadn’t seen that because they had put money in, and we should have advertised it properly, and can you reassure me that there will be better notification for the other three days?

Response given by A. Davis

My understanding is that the Borough Council’s part in the Small Business Saturdays initiative is that we make the Borough’s car parks free and we make sure that people know when they go to park, that it is free. However, the advertising in the locality is up to the local business group and I understand that some business groups were far more active than others. In some places they had advertisements in all their shops, in others it was a bit weak. I would encourage all business groups across the Borough to make sure they communicate this as far as possible. Insofar as social media is concerned, this was quite prevalent. I know a lot of people got ‘tweets’ and Facebook ‘pushes’ quite a lot. This was very much under the auspices of the local groups and some were more active than others. If I could go back to the business groups to say this is what you need to do, then I would do, and following the decision tonight, I would encourage them to publicise this as much as possible. You want to make sure people know about it before they decide to shop on that day.

Supplementary Question by A. Kelly

With respect to what Councillor Davis has just said, its effectively passing the buck to say it is up to the local business groups to do the advertising. I was not particularly aware that that was the policy when we were in Administration. I do remember questions, I do remember statements from our Portfolio Holder pledging to do more, because we raised this previously. I don’t think it’s acceptable to pass it to the local business groups. What this Council did do was issue a press release at 2.20 p.m., the day before. That’s far too late to go in any newspapers. There were no ‘tweets’ from this Council until the day before. With respect, it only appears to have kicked-in when Councillor Mrs. Christine Elmer and myself e-mailed the officers because there was confusion on a local internet forum. There was not enough done by this Council.

Response given by A. Davis

I will look into the timings on that and thank you for raising that question.

Comment by Tricia W. Bland

I would just like to point out that in Thames Ditton, two weeks before, I actually went around and put posters in all the shops, and it was a very successful initiative in Thames Ditton.

40/16 URGENCY DECISIONS

Members noted that there had been no executive or non-executive decisions taken as a matter of urgency since the last meeting of the Council.
41/16 2017/18 COUNCIL TAX BASE

In moving the report, the Portfolio Holder for Resources extended thanks to the Finance Team for their work in drawing together the report so quickly.

RESOLVED that the Council Tax Bases (showing Band ‘D’ equivalent dwellings for tax setting purposes) for the Elmbridge area in respect of the year 2017/18 be approved as follows:

For the whole Borough 63,415 dwellings
For the area of the Borough covered by Claygate Parish Council 3,433 dwellings

42/16 REPORTS OF CABINET / COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEE ETC.

RESOLVED that, subject to any amendments noted below, the reports of the Cabinet and the following Committees and Sub-Committees at the meetings held on the dates shown, be received and the recommendations contained therein be approved:

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 22 September 2016
APPOINTMENTS SUB-COMMITTEE 26 September 2016
PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 October 2016
CABINET 12 October 2016

Minute No. 31/16 – Joint Waste Collection Contract: Tender Evaluation and Award

G.P. Dearlove commented that he wished to give notice to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment that Members would continue to work to ensure that the matter progressed to a satisfactory conclusion.

INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION MAKING – RESOURCES 20 October 2016
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 20 October 2016
INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION MAKING – PLANNING SERVICES 2 November 2016
LICENSING COMMITTEE 14 November 2016
CABINET 16 November 2016

Minute No. 43/16 – Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Task Group: Heathrow Expansion

T. Popham, seconded by Mrs. M. Marshall, proposed that Recommendation (D) be amended to read:

‘(D) Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) on behalf of its residents cannot support the expansion of Heathrow airport. It has yet to be convinced that the Environmental impact of noise and air pollution has been addressed. The necessary infrastructure improvements across a much broader area have not been considered and provided for. We regret the loss of 750 homes. We, EBC, call upon the Government to support dispersal of the flight paths within the 3km corridors; and to appoint an independent regulator responsible for Air Quality and Noise.’

Arising from further discussion of the matter, and following consideration of the above proposed amendment, it was suggested that Members may wish to simply adjust the Cabinet’s proposed Recommendation (C) to read:

‘(C) Irrespective of the decision by Government as to whether or not to expand Heathrow airport or the position taken by Elmbridge, the Council work in partnership with Heathrow and the community forums to address the economic and environmental impacts of the airport on the Borough and encourage the government to establish an Independent Regulator responsible for air quality and noise. We, Elmbridge Borough Council, call upon the Government to support dispersal of the flight paths within the existing 3km corridors, irrespective of whether the expansion goes ahead or not; and’

T. Popham and Mrs. M. Marshall agreed to withdraw their original amendment and moved & seconded respectively the above amendment to Recommendation (C), as set out in the Cabinet Minutes.

Members voted by way of a show of hands on each of the Recommendations (A) to (D) before them, as amended, and accordingly it was

RESOLVED that

(a) the findings of the Heathrow Expansion Task and Finish Group be noted;
(b) having debated the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Heathrow Expansion Task and Finish Group report, the following statements (C) and (D) below, on the expansion of Heathrow be agreed, based on the evidence gathered;
(c) irrespective of the decision by Government as to whether or not to expand Heathrow airport or the position taken by Elmbridge, the Council work in partnership with Heathrow and the community forums to address the economic and environmental impacts of the airport on the Borough and encourage the
government to establish an Independent Regulator responsible for air quality and noise. We, Elmbridge Borough Council, call upon the Government to support dispersal of the flight paths within the existing 3km corridors, irrespective of whether the expansion goes ahead or not; and

(d) the Council note that the Cabinet cannot support the current proposals for the expansion of Heathrow airport. It has yet to be convinced that the environmental impact of noise and air pollution has been sufficiently addressed; the necessary infrastructure improvements across a much broader area have been considered and provided for; and regrets the loss of 750 homes.

During the debate, a number of Members commented that it would have been helpful if the amendment had been circulated to all Members prior to the commencement of the meeting. In response, the Leader of the Council acknowledged the concerns expressed and requested that the Chief Executive consider the introduction of a procedure governing the submission of amendments in future.

In the interests of clarity, GP Dearlove requested that the final, agreed amendment wording for Recommendation (C) be e-mailed to all Members of the Council.

Minute No. 46/16 – Members’ Allowances: Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

In moving the recommendations of the Cabinet, the Leader indicated that he did so subject to the correction of a typographical error to the figure in Recommendation (A), which should have read £4,942 as the proposed Basic Allowance.

A. Kelly, seconded by J. Browne, moved the following amendment, and in so doing, thanked the officers, particularly Mr. Cooper and Mrs. Hulse for their help in co-ordinating a response to their request for information:

‘It is proposed that recommendations (A) and (B) of the Cabinet’s recommendations in respect of the Members’ Allowances be replaced with the following:

(A) THE PANEL’S RECOMMENDATION TO SET THE BASIC ALLOWANCE AT £4,942 BE REJECTED AND THE BASIC ALLOWANCE BE INCREASED BY 2% IN LINE WITH THE 2016 OFFICER PAY AWARD TO £4,483, WITH FUTURE INDEXATION IN LINE WITH OFFICERS’ PAY AWARD;

(B) IN ACCORDANCE WITH (A) ABOVE, THE PANEL’S RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF LINKING THE SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES TO THE BASIC ALLOWANCE, AS SET OUT IN THE AMENDED APPENDIX B (APPENDED), BE AGREED.

With the other recommendations, namely (C), (D) and (E), to remain unaltered.’
J. Browne requested a recorded vote on the amendment, whereupon there voted:

**In support of the amendment:**


**Against the amendment:**


**Abstained:**

B.J.F. Cheyne, P.R.C. Heaney, Rachael I. Lake, Mrs. T. Shipley and J.A. Vickers. (5)

The Mayor declared the amendment to be **LOST**.

T.G. Oliver requested a recorded vote on the substantive motion, whereupon there voted:

**In support of the substantive motion:**


**Against the substantive motion:**


**Abstained:**

B.J.F. Cheyne, P.R.C. Heaney, M.F. Howard, Rachael I. Lake, Mrs. T. Shipley and J.A. Vickers. (6)

The Mayor declared the substantive motion to be **CARRIED**.

Minute No. 48/16 – Elmbridge Public Car Parks Review

M.J. Freeman, seconded by I. Donaldson, proposed the following amendment:

‘That recommendations (C) and (D) be deleted.’
Following discussion, and clarification from A. Davis, Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, on how he intended to exercise his delegated authority to ensure transparency, M.J. Freeman, as proposer of the amendment and I. Donaldson, as seconder, agreed to adjust their amendment to read:

‘That Recommendation (C) only be deleted.’

R. Green requested a recorded vote, whereupon there voted:

In favour of the amendment:


Against the amendment:


Abstained:

Rachael I. Lake and Mrs. T. Shipley. (2)

The Mayor declared the amendment to be LOST.

Following votes on each of the substantive recommendations, by way of a show of hands, the Mayor declared each of the substantive recommendations to be CARRIED.

Minute No. 50/16 – Local Plan – Strategic Options Consultation

In respect of the ‘Dates for the Local Plan – Strategic Options Consultation Drop-In Events’, as set out in Appendix (C), the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services confirmed that an additional drop-in session would be taking place on Tuesday 10 January 2017 (7.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m.) in the Lecture Hall, 1st Floor, Weybridge Library. Thanks were extended to officers from the Planning Policy Team who had worked hard on preparing the Strategic Options Consultation.

Arising from consideration of the item, A.P. Burley indicated that he would be requesting a drop-in session in Stoke D’Abernon.

PLANNING COMMITTEE 22 November 2016

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY (URGENT MINUTE EXTRACT) 24 November 2016
INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION MAKING – PLANNING SERVICES

The meeting commenced at 7.45 pm and concluded at 10.42 pm

Democratic Services Officer
Ms. M. Hayes Committee and Member Services Manager

Other Officers in attendance
R. Moran Chief Executive
Mrs. S. Selvanathan Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive
R. Lee Strategic Director
Ms. B. Greenstein Head of Democratic Services
A. Harrison Head of Legal Services
Ms. E. Lewis Sports Development Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>CURRENT ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>2017/2018 PROPOSED AMENDMENT</th>
<th>RATIONALE &amp; METHODOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Allowance</td>
<td>£ 4,395 (48)</td>
<td>£ 4,483 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Of The Council</td>
<td>£ 12,240</td>
<td>£ 11,207</td>
<td>2.5 x Basic Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Members</td>
<td>£ 6,120 (9)</td>
<td>£ 5,604 (9)</td>
<td>50% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny</td>
<td>£ 6,120</td>
<td>£ 5,604</td>
<td>50% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny</td>
<td>£ 3,060</td>
<td>£ 2,801</td>
<td>50% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Of Planning Committee</td>
<td>£ 5,100</td>
<td>£ 5,043</td>
<td>45% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Of Planning Committee</td>
<td>£ 1,163</td>
<td>£ 1,261</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen Of Area Planning Sub Committees</td>
<td>£ 4,075 (3)</td>
<td>£ 3,922 (3)</td>
<td>35% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Of Area Planning Sub Committees</td>
<td>£ 930 (3)</td>
<td>£ 980 (3)</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>£ 3,590</td>
<td>£ 2,241</td>
<td>20% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman of Licensing Committee</td>
<td>£ 800</td>
<td>£ 560</td>
<td>25% of Chairman’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Audit and Standards Committee</td>
<td>£ 3,662</td>
<td>£ 3,362</td>
<td>30% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Opposition Group Leader</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£ 2,241</td>
<td>20% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Group with 10% Plus of Total Members</td>
<td>£ 500 (2)</td>
<td>£ 1,121 (1)</td>
<td>10% of Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of Opposition Group with less than 10% of Total Members</td>
<td>£ 125</td>
<td>Allowance withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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