

Minutes

Ordinary Council
Wednesday, 27th June, 2018

Attendance

Cllr Mrs Murphy (Mayor)	Cllr Mrs McKinlay
Cllr Parker (Deputy Mayor)	Cllr Mrs Middlehurst
Cllr Aspinell	Cllr Morrissey
Cllr Barrell	Cllr Mynott
Cllr Barrett	Cllr Naylor
Cllr Bridge	Cllr Nolan
Cllr Chilvers	Cllr Poppy
Cllr Clarke	Cllr Mrs Pound
Cllr Cloke	Cllr Reed
Cllr Mrs Davies	Cllr Ms Rowlands
Cllr Mrs Fulcher	Cllr Russell
Cllr Haigh	Cllr Ms Sanders
Cllr Hirst	Cllr Mrs Slade
Cllr Mrs Hones	Cllr Tierney
Cllr Keeble	Cllr Trump
Cllr Kerslake	Cllr Tumbridge
Cllr McCheyne	Cllr Wiles

Apologies

Cllr Hossack	Cllr McLaren
Cllr Kendall	

Officers Present

Phoebe Barnes	-	Principal Accountant
David Carter	-	Environmental Health Manager
Philip Drane	-	Planning Policy Team Leader
Chris Leslie	-	Commercial Manager
Claire Mayhew	-	Corporate and Democratic Services Manager
Philip Ruck	-	Chief Executive
Jean Sharp	-	Governance and Member Support Officer
Lorne Spicer	-	Business Development and PR Manager
Steve Summers	-	Chief Operating Officer
Daniel Toohey	-	Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer
Jacqueline Van Mellaerts	-	Chief Financial Officer

41. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs Hossack, Kendall and McLaren.

42. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Barrett advised that he would need to declare an interest in relation to a motion later in the meeting.

43. Mayors Announcements

The Mayor had undertaken a large number of engagements since Annual Council and advised Members of some of the highlights.

44. Minutes of the previous meeting

The Minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 6 March 2018 were approved as a true record.

45. Minutes of Extraordinary Council 21.3.18

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 21 March 2018 were approved as a true record.

46. Minutes of Annual Council

The Minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 16 May 2018 were approved as a true record.

47. Public Questions

Eight Public Questions had been received and were put and responded to at the meeting, as follows:

Mrs Gearon-Simm:

‘Brentwood Borough Council has outsourced the work of its Legal Department to Barking and Dagenham Council.

Both the work of the Housing Department and Licensing has been outsourced to Basildon Council.

In addition to this the work of Brentwood Borough Council’s Planning Department has been outsourced to Thurrock Council.

1. *How much is this costing the council taxpayers of Brentwood?*
2. *Is this arrangement going to be permanent?’*

Cllr Mrs Mckinlay responded as follows:

"It is useful to clarify some misunderstandings, and so I advise as follows: the Council has its own in-house team for Legal services, but we do sometimes receive assistance from Barking and Dagenham legal services – this should not be misconstrued as them doing all of the work in lieu of our Legal services. We have an in-house team for Housing services, but we have recently put in place an agreement with Basildon Council in regard to the Council's Repairs and Maintenance function. In Planning, Environmental Health and Licensing we have a managed services agreement in place with Thurrock Council but again we still retain the in-house employees to deliver the service. There is no additional cost to these arrangements and it's actually of benefit to the Council as it gives us additional capacity and skills at a time when many of these areas suffer from sector shortages. In Planning for example there is a national dilemma around how not just local authorities but interestingly private companies can recruit the necessary people with the right skills. So, to be able to pull on that wider pool of experience, skills, knowledge and capacity is obviously of benefit to the Borough.

In terms of whether these arrangements are permanent, I can answer 'yes' as there are no plans to stop that or change this. However, we do constantly review the arrangements in place to see if a better one is suitable."

Mr Martin Skinner

1. Local Development Plan ("LDP"): Priests Lane Sites 044 and 178

I note that the current Regulation 18 LDP Consultation has removed the inclusion of "open space and/or sports facilities for public use" as part of the proposed site when compared to the previous Regulation 18 Consultation in 2016 and the document presented to Council at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 15 November 2017. This change appears to have been made on the basis of one letter from the owners of one of the sites in response to the 2016 Regulation 18 Consultation (response 15091) asking for the "open space and/or sports facilities for public use" to be deleted from the proposal stating that the land makes no contribution to either public open space or sports provision. First, the playing fields did used to be hired by non-school local sports organisations. Secondly, the 2005 Open Space Audit Report concluded that there was insufficient open space areas for the public in West Shenfield and that if land became available the opportunity to provide open space should be taken by the Council in this area. The land is also adjacent to two schools. Since that point there has been no change in the provision of open space in West Shenfield. The 2016 Open Space Audit merely provides a stocktake of open space and does not draw any detailed conclusions unlike the more detailed work in 2005. In addition, Sport England made written objections to the development of these sites as representations to the 2016 Regulation 18 LDP Consultation stating that the development of these sites would contravene Government policy. Please can Councillor

McKinlay explain why the inclusion of "open space and/or sports facilities for public use" has been removed from this proposed site in the current Regulation 18 LDP Consultation?

Cllr Mrs McKinlay responded as follows:

"The assumption that development of a site currently designated as protected open space should provide some replacement open space has not changed. What was clear in the Council's Draft Local Plan regulation 18 consultation (January 2016) is that the level of open space and/or sports recreation space had not been set and that further work was required to inform the type and amount. This needs to be informed by updated sports and open space evidence, of which a study is nearing completion to inform proposals in the Plan. We are making sure that we consider the evidence to inform what comes forward on each site, but the intention is to retain a suitable element of open space as part of proposed redevelopment as well as land for school expansion."

2. LDP: Prioritisation of planning applications once LDP has been submitted

The Council rightly prioritises the development of brownfield sites before greenfield and greenbelt land. However it is possible, even likely, that planning applications will be submitted for the greenfield and greenbelt sites first because they are most easily and profitably developed. Given that the housing projections may be overstated, it is possible that brownfield sites may be left undeveloped while the Community loses greenfield and greenbelt land. What steps will the Council take to not only identify brownfield sites for priority development, but to ensure that these sites are actually developed before eating into precious resources of greenbelt and greenfield land?

Cllr Mrs McKinlay responded as follows:

"This is a useful point and relevant for future development rates. The Local Plan will set out a trajectory for when sites are expected to come forward. The trajectory is informed by encouraging brownfield first but also the full context of how quickly sites will come forward, considering site background and constraints etc.

The reality is that the amount of available brownfield land in the borough is limited, and there are no significant identified brownfield redevelopment sites that would yield high housing numbers (other than land at the Warley Depot and Ford HQ – which is half owned by the Council with decisions about depot relocation to be had and the other half dependent on Ford's longer-term relocation plans, and so will naturally will not be capable of being delivered early in the Plan period). For this reason, it is not likely that large brownfield sites will remain undeveloped – Brentwood is a viable place when it comes to land values and most brownfield sites identified are small in size. We would expect a steady rate of delivery in urban areas as has been consistently achieved in the past. The necessity to deliver new homes in what is now Green Belt will supplement this strategy and help meet local needs.

Ultimately the Council will be judged on the rate at which new homes are being delivered, and over the life of the Plan we expect a good mix between brownfield and greenfield locations.”

Ms Pearson

1. Local Development Plan ("LDP"): The LDP includes an uplift on proposed new housing by a substantial 36% over the projected housing needs to meet affordability targets. This is presumably to suppress house prices by creating over supply. The Council recognised that the basis of these calculations is flawed because it ignores the earnings of the Borough residents working in London, whose spending power will always exceed those working in the Borough and so will always produce too high an uplift. This pressure to overbuild in the Borough is detrimental to the current residents and the Council should be taking steps to ensure the Borough's problem is recognised at Central Government. Other than sending in the response to the Government's consultation paper last year, what further steps has the Council taken to resolve this issue that is one of the most fundamental problems with the draft LDP now out for consultation?

2. The LDP states that the uplift calculated for housing affordability is 30%, a very high number in view of the Borough's restrictions. The Council has stated that the long-term population projections are unstable, they are based on historic data that are unlikely to factor in reduced migration post Brexit. It is likely that this 30% target is already over and above housing needs and yet the LDP uses a 36% uplift on housing needs to provide a buffer. How does the Council justify increasing the housing projections by a contingency of 6% when not only are the affordability calculations dubious but the population growth forecasts over 20 years are particularly unstable because of Brexit?

Mrs McKinlay responded as follows:

“Work on the Local Plan is primarily focused on arriving at a point where the Council can adopt a ‘Sound’ Plan following examination in public. The starting point is meeting local housing needs, based on evidence, and with enough flexibility to do so if things change such as certain sites not coming forward as expected or changes in the market etc. Meeting needs is the minimum, the Council are expected to deliver this and “boost the supply of housing” further, as required by national policy.

The Council has responded to the Government’s consultation on the merits of a housing needs methodology that requires further increases of units to reduce house prices. We await conclusions through the introduction of a revised National Planning Policy Framework, expected soon. In the meantime, we are putting together a strategy that provides the maximum flexibility to arrive at a Sound Plan that can be adopted, with a strategy aimed at retaining our local character, but recognising that growth is needed. The Regulation 19 Plan that will be published later this year will provide greater clarity on this point.”

David Gooderson

1. Councillor Aspinall made a request at the last Ordinary Council meeting for a conflicts of interests register as they relate to the Local Development Plan, but the Council legal team said there to is no need to collect this information from a legal perspective as the LDP is a consultation. Recently Westminster Council have been in the press with regard to poor practice where unrecorded benefits were provided by parties with an interest in Council and community business, such as developers. There is significant public concern that the inclusion of certain sites within the LDP will give a potential financial benefit to the owners of those sites. To allay growing public disquiet and to give transparency, please can the Councillors provide information to the public where they, or related parties, may have an interest, either as an owner, contractor or developer, in the sites or may have been provided with hospitality by interested parties, when the regulation 19 plan is presented for consultation?

Cllr Mrs McKinlay responded as follows:

“Clearly the LDP is an extensive process. When it comes down to the individual sites the sensitivities are not lost on any of us, and I think transparency and openness is absolutely essential in all of this. I would just say that there is already a record of interests which all Members have to keep updated and that covers any land that is owned and indeed any directorship of companies and that is available on line for public viewing, that is outside of the whole LDP process and covers the entire workings of the Council and everything that we individually come across in terms of our everyday lives.

That record is there already, however I do think that that when it does come to the Full Council meeting to finalise the Regulation 19 process later this year that we look at a way to be even more transparent and make that statement again, so I’ll say tonight that I’ll be looking to have discussions with the group leaders around how best we do that. It’s in everybody’s interest that even if they don’t like sites, and I do understand that, to have a plan that meets the number of homes required will mean that we are not going to be keeping everybody happy, that’s inevitable. However, it is important that everybody understands that we’ve followed due process and that there is confidence in the process, system, and those making the decisions. I will come back on the detail of that in due course”.

Question 2. I would like to ask each of the Councillors for my ward, Councillors Morrissey, Wiles and Barrett, at least two of who do not live in the ward, if they have made visits to Priests Lane and its junction with Middleton Hall Lane in the morning and evening school and work rush hours to experience what the current traffic situation is like. By this I mean a physical presence rather than just in a car adding to the traffic flow. Traffic congestion has been highlighted by many residents who have lodged comments about the current LDP. If they have not perhaps they would like to

do soon say 3 occasions (which I believe is the standard applied for traffic surveys) to gain first hand experience of the traffic. I would add that they should do so in the next few days before Brentwood Council break up for the summer holidays, although of course all of the A level students at the schools near the Town Centre have now left after their exams so the number of vehicle movements will have dropped already. I would hope that each councillor would report back to me once they have attended the area with their comments.

Cllr Barrett responded as follows:

“As this is a very specific question I will answer it with as many specifics as possible. Whilst I have never completed a session where the exclusive purpose was to view traffic on the specific junction mentioned, I can confirm from my electronic diary in 2018 that I have on more than three occasions - the most recent being two evenings in the week commencing the 16th April - observed the traffic on Priests Lane at peak periods. I have also read with interest the information sent to me by local residents of Priests Lane which provides more information than these three anecdotal experiences.

Previously towards the end of the previous Regulation 18 Consultation I performed a similar morning observation following the considerable levels of interest in the sites numbered 044 and 178 in the draft Local Development Plan, both from interested residents and the Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association. I share many of the concerns raised in the previous consultation responses on these sites and await the published responses to the latest Regulation 18 consultation.

I would be very happy to discuss this further with Mr Gooderson or any other resident of my Ward or anyone interested in the LDP - and am happy to justify any decision or vote - I actively seek to understand all evidence before making a decision especially on a matter of this importance.”

Cllr Morrissey responded as follows:

“Like Cllr Barrett, I have on various occasions observed the Priests Lane traffic at different times of day but I have not completed anything similar to a survey nor do I monitor my own movements around the ward in this fashion. I do not believe this would class as evidence for any decision or vote but I would carefully consider anything submitted on sites 044 and 178. We have a responsibility to consider all of the evidence within the LDP policies, appropriate development levels and the sites. Personal experience is important but hard evidence more so, which is why I welcome the submissions made and the reports I have individually received from residents, businesses and groups. I also question the merit of any traffic survey done with such a light touch despite what the legislation may say.

Further to the statement by Cllr Barrett I would like to make clear that I recognise the combined concerns on Priests Lane of congestion and speeding traffic dependent on the time of day. Both are issues that are

worthy of consideration. I believe considerable investment in road infrastructure is necessary for any development to be considered viable which given the location I've yet to see clear evidence that this is a possibility. I welcome residents sending me their thoughts, concerns and proposals".

Cllr Wiles' arrival at the meeting had been delayed and therefore he was unable to respond to the questioner.

However, Cllr Mrs McKinlay responded as follows:

"The whole LDP process has to be based on evidence and it's not simply enough to say we know the road is busy already. I use the road regularly – I live in Shenfield and am up and down that road every day and I've sat in traffic just like, I'm sure, a number of us have but when it comes to a process involving the LDP it's going to have to be based on the evidence. Both studies are taking place now and it's on the back of those studies and the evidence that we'll not only be questioning it and going through it with a fine-tooth comb but ultimately making the decision".

48. Memorials or Petitions

No Memorials or Petitions were received.

49. Committee Chairs Reports and Members Questions

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a brief written report by each committee Chair covering their area of responsibility was included in the agenda.

Any Member was entitled to ask a Chair a written or oral question on

(a) Any matter included in a Chair's written report

(b) Any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affected the Council's area and which fell within the area of responsibility of the Chair's committee.

No written questions had been received before the prescribed deadline and the Chairs responded to oral questions put to them by Members.

50. Outside organisations - Appointment of Council Representatives

Members were reminded that, following a change to the Council's Constitution on 25 January 2017 Councillors were now appointed to a number of outside organisations at the Ordinary Council meeting following Annual Council. Many of the outside organisations supported and advanced the broad objectives of the Authority. Representations came about either through the Authority initiating the appointment, or an organisation requesting a representative being nominated or a Charity Commission rule that a Council representative be appointed.

The list of nominations for representatives on outside organisations was presented at the Ordinary Council meeting each year for Members' approval.

Cllr Mrs McKinlay **MOVED** and Cllr Kerslake **SECONDED** the recommendation in the report and advised that two nominations had been made for representative roles showing as 'vacant' on Appendix A. These were: Brentwood Theatre Trust – Cllr Bridge and Hartswood Golf Club – Cllr Mrs Hones.

Cllr Aspinell **MOVED** and Cllr Mynott **SECONDED** an **AMENDMENT** nominating Cllr Naylor instead of Cllr Mrs Hones as representative for Brentwood/Montbazon town Twinning Association.

Cllr Mrs McKinlay did not accept the **AMENDMENT**. A vote was taken on a show of hands and the **AMENDMENT** was **LOST**.

Returning to the **SUBSTANTIVE MOTION**, a vote was taken on a show of hands and it was

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY

That the list of outside bodies and nominated representatives/point of contact for 2018/19 shown in Appendix A be approved with the addition of vacancies for Brentwood Theatre Trust and Hartswood Golf Club being filled by Cllrs Bridge and Mrs Hones respectively.

(Cllr Haigh reported that he had taken advice from the Monitoring Officer in regard to his being on the list of solicitors for the Citizens Advice Bureau and now being appointed as the Council's representative for the CAB there could on occasion be a conflict of interests for which he would remain alert).

51. Honorary Titles - Honorary Aldermen

Members were reminded that the title of 'Honorary Aldermen' was honorary and was conferred in recognition of eminent past services to the Council under section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Cllr Barrett **MOVED** the recommendation that the Council conferred on former councillors Richard Alan Michael Davies (known as Alan Davies) and David Wesley Tee the title of Honorary Alderman.

Cllr Aspinell **SECONDED** the recommendation in regard to conferring the title on Alan Davies and Cllr Mrs McKinlay **SECONDED** the recommendation in regard to David Tee.

Following tributes being paid to Mr Davies and Mr Tee a vote was taken on a show of hands and it was

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY

That, in pursuance of section 249(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 and in recognition of the Council being of the opinion that eminent services have been rendered to the Council by former Councillors Richard Alan Michael Davies and David Wesley Tee the Council confers on each of them the title of Honorary Alderman.

Reason for Recommendation

The Council wishes to recognise those who merit the highest awards that the Council can bestow on a person or organisation.

(Cllr Mrs Davies had declared an undefined interest and left the Hall, taking no part in the discussion or vote).

52. Association of South Essex Local Authorities 2050 Update

Members were reminded that at the Policy, Projects and Resources Committee held on 19 June it was approved:-

“That the committee recommends to Ordinary Council, that the Statement of Common Ground (SCG), and attached as Appendix A, prepared by ASELA be approved as a guide to the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan”.

The purpose of the report had been to update members of the PPR committee on the status of the work undertaken by Leaders and Chief Executives of South Essex Councils, now known as the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA).

South Essex Councils were defined as Brentwood, Basildon, Thurrock, Southend, Rochford, Castle Point and Essex CC.

Cllr Mrs McKinlay **MOVED** and Cllr Kerslake **SECONDED** the recommendation in the report and following a discussion a vote was taken on a show of hands and it was

RESOLVED

That the Statement of Common Ground (SCG) attached as Appendix A, prepared by ASELA, be approved by Full Council as a guide to the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.

Reasons for Recommendation

To fulfil the obligation of the Duty to Co-operate as required for the Brentwood Local Development Plan to be accepted, and to promote and deliver much needed infrastructure and economic growth, Brentwood must engage with the surrounding authorities.

Each ASELA partner local authority is presenting the SCG to their respective decision-making committees for approval. Individual approval of the document will assist ASELA to continue progress on joint working for Planning Policy documents (both at a local and sub regional level).

53. Notices of Motion

Six Notices of Motion had been submitted in accordance with Rule 3 in Part 4.1 of the Constitution.

Cllr Barrett had submitted the following Notice of Motion which he **MOVED**. Cllr Mrs McKinlay **SECONDED** the Motion subject to an **AMENDMENT** which Cllr Barrett indicated he had previously accepted having discussed the matter with Cllr Mrs McKinlay.

‘Formalising a process for future consideration of Honorary Roles within the Borough of Brentwood

This Council notes:

- 1. The titles of ‘Honorary Alderwomen’ or ‘Honorary Aldermen’ are as the names suggest honorary and are conferred in recognition of eminent past services to the Council.*
- 2. The Council also can recognise distinguished service to the Borough through admission to the honorary title of ‘Honorary Freewoman’ or ‘Honorary Freeman’ of the Borough.*
- 3. These titles hold nor formal authority but are one of the highest honours that the Council can bestow.*
- 4. To be eligible for the honorary title of Honorary Alderwoman or Honorary Alderman, the person nominated must be a former councillor of this Council and not be currently a member of the Council. The must be resident within the Borough.*
- 5. Freeman and freewomen of the Borough are awarded to individuals who provide exceptional service to the Borough and are a resident of it.*
- 6. Unlike for Civic Awards there is no formal process for consideration of these Honorary positions.*

This Council believes:

- 1. It is appropriate to regularly reflect on the service of past members, in an open, non-partisan and fair way.*
- 2. It is further appropriate for a non-partisan method to consider the additional honorary positions and practical that this is done simultaneously.*

Therefore this Council resolves that:

1. ~~A small panel be formed to consider the nominations received for Honorary Roles, similar style of Civic Awards Panel with an appropriate Chair and Vice-Chair appointed crossparty by the Mayor to see through the process. The Panel would put forward recommendations of the honours to be awarded to the Mayor ahead of each Annual Council if individual/s are agreed. Group leaders and the Mayor will consider the nominations received for honorary roles in the style similar to the Civic Awards Panel and require unanimous consent. The Panel will meet each November, put forward recommendations for the honours to be awarded by the Mayor ahead of each Annual Council if the individuals are agreed. Presentation of these honours will be undertaken as one of the last duties of the outgoing Mayor at Annual Council.~~
2. Nominations for consideration should be sought from members by the end of October for each year.
3. Given the requirement for a two thirds majority for assent at Full Council, the Terms of Reference for this panel should include reference to the importance of having near unanimous consent’.

Following a discussion a vote was taken on a show of hands and the **MOTION** was **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Cllr Chilvers had submitted the following Notice of Motion which she **MOVED** and Cllr Cloke **SECONDED**, subject to the addition of a sentence at the end of the motion which **AMENDMENT** Cllr Chilvers **ACCEPTED**.

‘Blue Badge parking spaces are an invaluable lifeline for people with disabilities to enable them to access goods, services and help them to lead an independent life as they should be entitled to.

However, inconsiderate motorists frequently block blue badge parking spaces.

This is unacceptable and cannot be allowed to continue. It is unfair on our mobility challenged residents and therefore we need to empower parking enforcement officers to deal with it.

Therefore, Brentwood Borough Council will itself adopt a more rigorous approach and call upon SEPP and private parking operators (such as NCP, Horizon and Parking Ticket Ltd) to operate a zero tolerance approach to non-blue badge holders parking in blue badge spaces in our borough and to impose and enforce the traffic regulations’.

Following a full discussion Cllr Chilvers accepted a proposal to change the words ‘empower to ‘support’ in the penultimate paragraph and requested that a recorded vote be taken in accordance with Rule 9.5 of the Council’s Procedure Rules.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Cllrs Aspinell, Barrell, Barrett, Bridge, Chilvers, Clarke, Cloke, Mrs Davies, Mrs Fulcher, Haigh, Hirst, Mrs Hones, Keeble, Kerslake, McCheyne, Mrs McKinlay, Mrs Middlehurst, Morrissey, Mrs Murphy, Naylor, Nolan, Mynott, Parker, Poppy, Mrs Pound, Reed, Ms Rowlands, Russell, Ms Sanders, Ms Slade, Mrs Tierney, Trump, Tumbridge and Wiles (34)

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAIN 0

The **MOTION** was **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY** as follows:

‘Blue Badge parking spaces are an invaluable lifeline for people with disabilities to enable them to access goods, services and help them to lead an independent life as they should be entitled to.

However, inconsiderate motorists frequently block blue badge parking spaces.

This is unacceptable and cannot be allowed to continue. It is unfair on our mobility challenged residents and therefore we need to empower support parking enforcement officers to deal with it.

Therefore, Brentwood Borough Council will itself adopt a more rigorous approach and call upon SEPP and private parking operators (such as NCP, Horizon and Parking Ticket Ltd) to operate a zero tolerance approach to non-blue badge holders parking in blue badge spaces in our borough and to impose and enforce the traffic regulations’.

We also call upon our residents and the general public to act more responsibly.’

Cllr Mrs Davies had submitted the following Notice of Motion which she **MOVED** and Cllr Aspinell **SECONDED**:

‘This council resolves to formulate a local planning criteria that better suits Brentwood’s needs, in particular in relation to houses of multiple occupancy. National guidance currently allows house extensions that are subsequently converted to houses of multiple occupancy without adequate parking provision. This results in unacceptable levels of on-street parking, creating congestion that is detrimental to residential areas’.

Following a full discussion, Cllr Mrs Davies accepted a proposal to change the word ‘formulate’ in line 1 of the motion to ‘investigate’.

A vote was taken on a show of hands and the **MOTION** was **CARRIED** as follows:

'This council resolves to ~~formulate~~ investigate a local planning criteria that better suits Brentwood's needs, in particular in relation to houses of multiple occupancy. National guidance currently allows house extensions that are subsequently converted to houses of multiple occupancy without adequate parking provision. This results in unacceptable levels of on-street parking, creating congestion that is detrimental to residential areas'.

(Cllr Barrell declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council's Code of Conduct by virtue of being a landlord outside the Borough of Brentwood).

Cllr Aspinell had submitted the following Notice of Motion which he **MOVED** and Cllr Mynott **SECONDED**:

'The Council resolves to direct officers to investigate the viability of taking back from the Environment Agency appropriate responsibilities for planning and enforcement of drainage and sewerage requirements'.

Following a full discussion a vote was taken on a show of hands and the **MOTION** was **LOST**.

(Cllr Barrett declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council's Code of Conduct by virtue of being employed by the Environment Agency).

Cllrs Clarke and Tumbridge left the meeting before the next motion was considered.

Cllr Barrett had submitted the following Notice of Motion which he **MOVED** and Cllr Mrs McKinlay **SECONDED**.

Brown Badge Scheme (Elderly Parking Permits) for Brentwood

This Council Notes:

- 1. First introduced in the London Borough of Hillingdon in 2008, the Brown Badge Scheme (Elderly Parking Permits) offers drivers aged over 65 access use of dedicated parking spaces in council owned car parks, in some privately operated car parks and some limited on-street parking.***
- 2. This does not offer free parking, with charges still applying, but instead recognises the needs of the elderly who are not eligible for a blue badge with dedicated spaces in appropriate places. It can be used whether the individual is the driver or a passenger but must be displayed.***
- 3. This scheme has been taken up by other London Boroughs such as Enfield where the age limit is for those aged over 70.***

This Council believes that:

- 1. Given the Borough of Brentwood's high proportion of older residents, such a scheme merits investigation and, if proved feasible, implementation within a reasonable time period.***

Therefore this council resolves:

- 1. That officers investigate the feasibility of such a scheme and make recommendations to the Environment & Enforcement Committee to consider whether such a scheme would be effective and benefit the residents of Brentwood.***
- 2. This recommendation should include any required scope in terms of spaces offered and a framework for positioning of spaces, alongside any costs for the scheme – both for the elderly residents and the Council.***
- 3. Any agreed recommendation from the Environment & Enforcement Committee to be implemented or forwarded to the appropriate Committee for further recommendation, debate and appropriate implementation.***

Following a full discussion a vote was taken on a show of hands and the **MOTION** was **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Cllr Aspinell had submitted the following Notice of Motion but was pleased to advise Members that the barriers referred to were now in place and therefore **WITHDREW** the motion.

‘This Council resolves to insist that Essex County Council replace all damaged railings and footpaths located at the junction of the Ingrave and Ongar A128 Roads with the High Street, known locally as Wilsons Corner. This major junction is a gateway to Brentwood High Street and the continuing failure of Essex County Council to maintain their infrastructure to a level which is not only aesthetically pleasing, but also safe for pedestrians and road users, is essential’.

54. Urgent Business - Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19 Review

The Mayor agreed to accept this item as urgent business following a resolution made at the 19 June PPR Committee.

Members were reminded that, as part of the Council’s Policy Framework, the Council must approve the Treasury Management Strategy. The report before Members presented changes to the Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19, which was agreed at Full Council on 6 March 2018.

The changes were driven by recommendations approved at PPR Committee on 19 June to increase the loan drawdown facility to the Council’s newly established wholly owned company Seven Arches Investments Ltd (SAIL) of up to £30m.

In order to provide the loan drawdown facility to SAIL, the Council would need to increase two prudential indicators included with the Treasury Management Strategy, so that the Council had the power to Borrow additional funds required.

The Council was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to *The CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (2017)*. The Prudential code allows the Council to revise the indicators at any time.

Cllr Mrs McKinlay **MOVED** and Cllr Kerslake **SECONDED** the recommendations in the report and following a full discussion it was

RESOLVED

1. To approve the changes to the Treasury Management Strategy as set out in this report, which includes the revised operational and authorised borrowing limits.

2.To approve a total £30m loan drawdown facility (Including the £10m already approved) to Seven Arches Investments Ltd following recommendations from the Project Board, and that delegated power be given to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Chair of PPR Committee and Group Leaders or their deputies to approve the use of the drawdown facility.

The meeting ended at 10.15pm