

Minutes

Ordinary Council Wednesday, 13th October, 2021

Attendance

Cllr Ms Sanders (Mayor)	Cllr Mrs Hones
Cllr Reed (Deputy Mayor)	Cllr Hossack
Cllr Aspinell	Cllr Jakobsson
Cllr Barber	Cllr Kendall
Cllr Barrett	Cllr Laplain
Cllr Dr Barrett	Cllr Lewis
Cllr Bridge	Cllr McLaren
Cllr J Cloke	Cllr Mynott
Cllr S Cloke	Cllr Naylor
Cllr Cuthbert	Cllr Parker
Cllr Mrs Davies	Cllr Poppy
Cllr Mrs Fulcher	Cllr Mrs Pound
Cllr Fryd	Cllr Tanner
Cllr Gelderbloem	Cllr Tierney
Cllr Haigh	Cllr Wagland
Cllr Heard	Cllr White
Cllr Hirst	Cllr Wiles

Apologies

Cllr Nolan	Cllr Russell
Cllr Mrs Pearson	

Officers Present

Amanda Julian	- Corporate Director (Law & Governance) and Monitoring Officer	-
Claire Mayhew	- Corporate Manager (Democratic Services)	
Jonathan Stephenson	- Chief Executive	
Jacqueline Van Mellaerts	- Corporate Director (Finance & Resources) and S151 Officer	
Tracey Lilley	- Corporate Director (Housing & Community Safety)	
Greg Campbell	- Corporate Director (Environment & Communities)	
Phil Drane	- Corporate Director (Planning & Economy)	

LIVE BROADCAST

[Live broadcast to start at 7pm and available for repeat viewing.](#)

154. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs Mrs Pearson, Russell and Nolan.

155. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made at this stage.

156. Mayors Announcements

The Mayor and group leaders paid tribute the former councillor and Past Mayor of Brentwood, Ken Wright who recently passed away. Ken was a councillor for Herongate & Ingrave Ward between 1995-2006 and Mayor of Brentwood from 2005-2006. Our deepest condolences, have been sent to Ken's family on their sudden loss.

Members observed a minute's silence.

The Mayor informed the Council:-

"It's hard to believe I am not far from 6 months into my Mayoral year and have been so happy to attend a varied mix of engagements during this time. So far, I have attended 42 engagements.

I was fortunate to hold a great Charity Quiz Night in September raising over £1000 for my chosen charities and thank those of you who attended and supported the event. I am looking forward to hosting my Charity Curry Night in November and look forward to welcoming some of you then.

It was great to attend the Family Fun Days over the summer months and glad that these could return for 2021. It was so great to see so many families attending and enjoying all the entertainment. A big well done to the events team for bringing this back.

I also hosted my Civic Service at Brentwood Cathedral early August which was such a great service surrounded by fellow Chain Gang Mayors and Chairman, family, friends, and Members. It was so lovely to be joined by the impressive choir on the evening. I look forward to having my Christmas Carol service back at Brentwood Cathedral in December.

In early September, I was delighted to present Civic Awards to the long-awaited recipients from 2019 and 2020 as well as bestowing the Honorary title of Freeman of the Borough to Dennis Rensch. It was a very special evening

to be part of and celebrate the great and the good in the community. We are pleased to be opening up Civic Awards nominations for 2021 in the coming weeks should you wish to make any nominations.

I am looking forward to the Remembrance Day Parade which is taking place on Sunday 14th November leaving from the Town Hall. This will be a great honour for me as Mayor to take part in such a prestigious Civic event alongside the Royal British Legion. I hope to see many of you there in the parade.

I look forward to attending more events in and around the Borough in the coming months”.

157. Minutes of the previous Ordinary Council meeting held on 28th July 2021

The minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 28th July 2021 were **APPROVED** as true record, subject to the inclusion of the written questions and responses submitted by Cllr S Cloke and Cllr Dr Barrett to state the following:

One written question has been received from Cllr Dr Barrett, as follows:

“Has the council had any engagement with highways England about the proposed community woodland at Hole Farm Warley - what are the plans for Brentwood Borough Council involvement and input”?

Cllr Hossack responded as Leader of the Council.

The council is already undertaking work to reduce its carbon footprint and influence that of others in the borough, including businesses and residents. As such, the Council is presently recruiting a Climate & Sustainability Officer who will work towards producing a ‘Green’ strategy. This strategy will include recommendations to reduce our carbon footprint, offset our carbon production and increase sustainability within the borough. Therefore, rather than make declarations at this stage, the Council is focused on delivering projects in the short term and seeking to develop a longer term strategy. This strategy will set out clear targets and the methods this authority will follow in order to deliver against local, national and worldwide climate objectives.

In addition, Brentwood as a member of Scope are already working with all other Essex councils, including County and share initiatives and expertise to reduce its carbon footprint and thus contribute to reducing global warming to less than 1.5°C %.

Following changes to our procurement rules, we already ensure products and services consider the environmental impact of their provision as part of the overall scoring when considering tenders. The Council will continue to develop other strategies, policies and action plans that encourage carbon reduction and carbon offset schemes. As well as sitting on already mentioned

we already sit on SCOPE, we are part of the Essex Councils Environmental Group and work with the Forestry Commission and Thames Chase to reduce our impact on the environment and reduce the amount of carbon in the borough through woodland planting.

The Council will continue to work towards zero carbon output as part of the forthcoming strategy later this year.

Two written question has been received from Cllr S Cloke as follows:

Question 1

“Residents of Brentwood that use communal waste facilities. e.g. those living in blocks of flats, do not all have access to locally positioned glass recycling bins. The expectation of Brentwood Council is that these residents, who are more likely not to have access to cars to transport bulk waste, must take their glass to a Recycling Centre or a supermarket or simply send it to landfill in black sacks. This results in wasted opportunities for recycling of glass as well as contamination of other recycling bins when residents dispose of their glass in bags or bins that are not designed for this type of recycling. When will the council provide glass recycling facilities equally to all residents by supplying communal glass recycling bins to all of those who live in accommodation with communal waste collection?”

Cllr Hossack responded as Leader of the Council.

The Council provides glass recycling bins to residential communal areas that request the service. This is however, directed by available space and the ability of managing agents and residents to comply with non-contamination of the glass recycling container.

Question 2

“Since the rollout of the new recycling scheme in Brentwood around a year ago the council has transformed its residential recycling scheme from a cost to an income. This has been achieved by limiting the collected items, re-educating residents on what can be collected and, most importantly, by providing a real time feedback loop to residents who put contaminated recycling out for collection as their bags are not collected. Unfortunately, there is still a large minority of Brentwood residents who do not have equal access to the recycling scheme, which is any resident using communal bins. These residents continue to fill orange sacks, which I understand are generally sent to landfill due to contamination. Many residents are unaware their orange sacks are being sent to landfill and many do not understand fully what should and should not be included in the recycling as they do not have the same real time feedback loop that individual recycling bag users have. The council has offered to trial communal recycling bins in these areas on request but this option is not being properly publicised and such trials will fail without the associated education of residents. When will the council proactively provide

communal recycling bins along with proper education and feedback on the appropriate contents for these to all relevant residents across the borough?"

Cllr Hossack responded as Leader of the Council.

When the roll out of the communal recycling bins takes place, each resident receives an informative letter detailing how to participate and listing the acceptable items.

Regards the comment about limiting collected items, there are only two elements of the waste stream adversely affected and that is 'food and drink cartons' and shredded paper. Plastic carrier bags, for example, were listed as unacceptable for inclusion in the orange sack.

158. Public Questions

There were none.

159. Memorials or Petitions

Cllr Pound presented a petition on behalf of the residents of Oliver Road. The Petition relating to their concerns about traffic calming along their road.

The Mayor suggested that Cllr Wagland, presents this issue to the Local Highways Panel for consideration, this the Chair.

160. 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 provided for Members' information at each Ordinary Council meeting.

Any Member might ask a Chair a written or oral question on

- (a) Any matter included in the Chair's written report; or
- (b) Any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the Council's area and which falls within the area of responsibility of the Chair's committee.

Two written questions were submitted from Cllr Mynott.

What actions, if any, did the Council take, either

1. *After 19.12.17 and in the eighteen months before 26.6.19, in response to its consultants, Lichfields, advising it to consider an Article 4 Direction 'to stop the conversion of offices to residential uses through permitted development'?*

2. *(Other than behind the scenes discussion) since June 2019, once my (slightly amended) motion of 26.6.19 had been passed unanimously, and the*

Council had therefore 'resolve[d] to consult on the introduction of an Article 4 restriction on office conversion in an area to be confirmed?

Cllr Hossack responded as Leader of the Council.

Cllr Mynott knows that the priority of this Council has been to adopt a new Local Development Plan, for which there has been significant action taken and progress made over the past few years.

The Economic Futures evidence from Lichfields informs LDP policy. This evidence should be read in context. The work looks at provision of employment land and the LDP needs to consider a wide range of evidence in addition to that. The planning inspectors have been very clear on this point through the LDP examination – that one piece of evidence does not necessarily override another; they need to be understood in context and combination. The one issue that does seem to have overriding importance is the delivery of new homes.

The corporate strategy objective to grow our economy is being achieved in multiple ways, it is not just about retaining offices. We need a healthy mix of uses with efficient use of land – exactly what the LDP will be in place to achieve. The Economic Futures evidence advises that existing employment land and buildings be modernised through the better use of space, effectively increasing the number of jobs per square metre compared with historic land uses. This will be achieved through LDP policy, but change has also been accelerated through the pandemic and the way people work. We also need to respond to market needs, and right now there is massive demand for new homes. In comparison there is significantly less demand for commercial space, such as offices and retail.

Housing delivery in recent years has been significantly underpinned by residential conversion through permitted development rights. Evidence of this delivery has helped the LDP examination progress. Without it, it is likely that we would have to identify further land to deliver new homes, including Green Belt.

I say this because it highlights the fact that the answer is not simply to slap article 4 directions across the borough. Government policy to allow residential conversion through permitted development rights has benefits and disbenefits. The issue is nuanced with various implications. I personally have discussed this with the MP and representatives of the Brentwood Business Partnership, where it was clear that businesses have very different views about the policy – some think it's good for business, some don't. We will be holding a town centre conference to discuss this type of issue, because it is the opinion of businesses that really matters.

Our borough is changing. What we need to ensure is that it changes in a way that increases economic opportunities. That cannot be through protecting the old way of doing things. Let's be clear about what an article 4 direction is – you can't put a blanket direction on the whole borough, we have several

defined employment areas through planning policy and many individual buildings outside of these designations. Preparing an article 4 direction is not a simple job and justifying the reason for such a direction is even more difficult.

I will be responding to a motion on this issue from Cllr Mynott later. That will provide assurance that an options paper will be brought to PRED Committee. Such a paper must be considered against the Secretary of State's announcement to update National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 53 on this issue. This requires article 4 directions to be used in a targeted way, limited to necessary situations that avoid wholly unacceptable adverse impacts. In all cases, robust evidence is needed that applies to the smallest geographical area possible.

That's the substance of the reply, I have to say, if I look at your original motion that we all agreed I have to ask this. The amendment was initially I think, you talked about general areas you suggested in the pre-amended motion including Brentwood North, Brentwood West, Brentwood South, and Warley wards as potential areas. The change was we would look at a restriction of office conversion area to be confirmed I don't know what that area idea is or indeed is it a building, so I think if we're going to pursue this Phil, and I know you're passionate about it and I have no problem with it but we do need to look at these mechanisms to get the balance right between residential and business. But we do need to home in on specifically what you've got in mind because if it's a town centre radial approach, is it a blanket process, one thing made the comment in relation to that if you would have said to me, lets use a past example, Fords at Warley, then that's specific and we could've looked at that. But I do have to say this if we had looked at that back in the day where would we be with the Ford motor company headquarters now. It would be sitting empty, and it certainly wouldn't be nearing the end of completion that its going to create hundreds of units for accommodation which is what we need to think this through. I think the response is comprehensive, I have to say imagine if we had put Article 4 on Ford, I'm not suggesting we are I'm trying to use this as a hypothetical example.

Cllr Aspinell, If you'd have been successful, we'd be in a very difficult position right now because we've missed our new homes bonus and the building would still remain empty because nobody would be setting up saying wow look at all this office space let me move my employees into it. So, if you'd haven't done it where the things are shifting, we would be in a god-awful situation, and it probably would've cost us 200 grand and no homes bonus. So, we have to think about it clearly. I would like some clarity from yourselves, whether its Phil or yourselves exactly what you are considering where it says on the motion in the area to be confirmed they should not confirm that as yet.

Cllr Mynott, asked one supplementary question. Why the Leader of the Council sees fit to complete the avoid answering the questions that I have submitted well in advance before this meeting and are perfectly clear. I take the Leader of the Council back to the introduction of the questions, what actions if any did the council take, past tense, Cllr Hossack has mentioned a

couple of things what might happen in the future, that is not covered by the past tense, if the answer of which actions did the council take, under the 2 headings in my question is no it didn't take any action at all, could Cllr Hossack be good enough to give that true answer?

Cllr Hossack replied by saying that a true answer was given, it was almost the first words I uttered and they'll be minuted hopefully and were outside of this, which is yes, we have taken action and we've taken that action with the scope of the LDP that's why I went on to iterate to you beyond that point is that we need to look at this in the round all of that work involved with Litchfield's that whole piece about Article 4 directions needs to be considered in the context of LDP work. You can't do that separately I gave you that answer frankly and truthfully at the very beginning. You will need to refer to the minutes to see that I said it if not look on the video tape.

Two written questions were submitted by Cllr Naylor.

1. *Brentwood and Essex Conservatives who attended their recent National Party conference in Manchester, will have noticed the Tram running beside the conference centre.*

In recent months, local press has reported on the possibility of a Tram network connecting Towns in South Essex. Cllr Chris Hossack, the Leader of Brentwood Council, and chair of ASELA, said in one report that Trams are a "Could be". These reports have been scant on detail, with one report including Brentwood in a proposal, and another, only going as far as Wickford and not beyond to Brentwood.

I would very much welcome a tram network connecting Brentwood with neighbouring towns such as Basildon (earmarked as the home for a new technical university by ASELA) and Thurrock. An even better network would link in to the proposed KenEx project, connecting Brentwood with direct public transport not only across the rest of Essex, but also onward to Kent.

If ASELA is to mean anything to the people of Brentwood, it must bring tangible benefits to Brentwood too. Better connectivity for Brentwood to neighbouring towns to the South, linking in with current West to East routes, would finally provide full interconnectivity.

Can the Leader of this Council, and as chair of ASELA, give assurance that Brentwood will be included and not left out of a Rapid Transit network as per the ASELA Growth and Recovery Prospectus, give any further details to local residents and members of this Council, to any plans of this nature, appreciative that it is indeed early on, but surely more informed than what has been reported on in the press?

2. *Given the failure of SERT (South Essex Rapid Transit) in early part of the last decade, and previous Essex wide partnerships; have Brentwood and other Essex Conservative leaders engaged in serious attempts with their colleagues in national government, to this time, provide the support and requisite funding*

to move concrete proposals in to actual reality, and provide Brentwood and Essex with investment that has been missing for decades?

Cllr Hossack responded as Leader of the Council.

Infrastructure transport is absolutely what ASELA is trying to deliver and your last comment is the reason it has been prioritised because there has been recognised under investment in south Essex for decades. We see pressure all over the place and so it has been identified that there are various methods of achieving mobility and transport improvements across south Essex, one of them could be a rapid transit system, which could include trams, although personally I'd rather see us getting on with the investment that's badly needed in the A127 and the widening of it. All of this transport infrastructure likely comes to figures in the tens of billions of pounds to deliver such things, which again we now have a Department for Levelling Up as of a month or two ago, and following the general election the Government has made it plain about their desire to see levelling up, particularly towards the north, but that's doesn't mean that we take our foot off the gas. So in answer to your question, I received a phone call from the BBC about trams as there is reference to this in the growth prospectus that you mentioned, but I can't give you concrete proposal for trams across south Essex because there aren't any concrete proposals. Our five key programs in our proposal at the moment include the university, for which it is key that we gain infrastructure improvements to get access to that university if it's to be located in Basildon, another key programme we are working on at the moment is Freeport. The full fibre network is another form of connectivity. Our housing growth programme is key and also looking at green connectivity with cycleways that are safe. Trams could be a part of the solution, I'm not going to stand here and rule it out. Everyone should benefit from the ASELA programs. I won't be able to give you a specific tram plan because there isn't one.

Cllr Laplain asked that the questions put by Members and the responses to those questions are included in the minutes. This was agreed by the Mayor, Cllr Sanders.

Cllr Tanner, put a question to the Leader of the Council, Cllr Hossack

In this year's budget we allocated a proposed 2% pay award for Staff?

Cllr Hossack, Leader of the Council responded.

Yes, we factored this into budget. We wanted to see what happened National through the NGC and the Unions. The 2% pay award is in reserves, and he asked that the Section 151 Officer and the CEO make arrangements for staff to be receive this in their November pay, backdated to April 2021 to all pay grades.

Cllr Kendall, put a question was to the Chair of Community & Health Committee.

Page 33, a couple of weeks ago I visited the Brentwood Centre Gym, I have noticed there has been no charging facilities. Can you confirm this will charge?

Cllr Poppy, Chair of Community & Health Committee responded.

Cllr Poppy informed Cllr Kendall, that there are still non charging facilities. The Centre was handed over SLM on 1st October 2021. It will be changing soon however as of now remains the same.

Cllr Barrett, put a question to the Chair of Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee (PRED)

At the last meeting of Council, answered a Public Question on Mobile Masts. Cllr Barrett requested an update to Members about the Mobile Phone Masts contracts. Cllr Barrett asked for an off-line response to be circulate to Members

Cllr Hossack, Chair of Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee (PRED) responded.

Cllr Hossack asked the Corporate Director (Planning & Economy), Mr Drane to circulate an update to all Members.

Cllr Barrett, put a question to the Chair of Community & Health Committee.

We now have a third party provider for the Brentwood Centre. But in the announcement it was stated that contract was for 2 years ahead of a tender process. When will the tender process at starts? Within that tender process, will there be some kind of self-management programme or Local Authority lead option?

Cllr Poppy, Chair of Community & Health Committee responded.

I could not answer the second part of your question. SLM has just been taken on. We had started meeting as a working group where discussions have been made around the development of the site. Procurement process not likely to start for at least two years.

Cllr Mynott, put a question to the Chair of Planning & Licensing Committee.

In relation to the comment on paragraph 3 on page 37, identified process and resources to maintain performance.

Given that we have be informed by Officers in the past that lack of resources has affected the work on Article 4 and the Local Development Plan.

Would there be a possibility of future resource so that both projects can work in parallel?

Cllr Cloke, Chair of Planning & Licensing Committee responded.

Cllr Mynott, you will note that that Planning Applications have increased. There are plans in place to further resource the team.

Cllr Cloke referred to Mr Drane. Mr Drane confirmed that staff resources are being reviewed as part of the “Gearing up for Growth Project”, for which an update will be presented at the All Member Briefing shortly. A report will be presented to PRED Committee in future.

Cllr Naylor, put a question to the Chair of Audit & Scrutiny Committee.

Cllr Naylor question relating to Risk Management, especially risk 10 referring Income rejections for the Council. This risk means we are digging more and more into the Council Reserves. Residents will see more spending together with the services cutbacks that have already been made and the results can be seen around Brentwood.

Will the conservatives deal with this group and appropriateness of the inclusion of this in budgets.

Cllr Hossack spoken on behalf of the Chair of Audit & Scrutiny, Cllr Nolan.

We are going through a budget setting process at present. We can see pressures throughout the origination especially relating to resource. Human Resource counts to 62% of the costs for this authority. We will be to review commercial income and shared services for the organisation.

Risk Assessments are factored in the budget process. We take time to view all the risks, some are great then other. But there is transparency with the proposals.

Cllr Naylor, put a question to the Chair of Community & Health Committee

Do the Conservatives of Brentwood Borough Council believe that their colleagues in National Government including the Prime Minister such restore some form of democratic and social accountability and resign from their roles in what was described and the worst public health failure by a joint committee, where we were viewed fair to poor. Billions spent of money spend test and trace that didn't work.

The Mayor did not accept the question put.

Cllr Lewis, put a question to the Chair of Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee (PRED)

5 months ago it was at 3% it is now at 4% and is likely to creasing to 6% next Spring and to continue for the next 2-3 years. Are you comfortable with a balanced budget and the HRA?

In relation to Cllr Tanner question previously relating to Staff Pay. If there is a 6% increase by next Spring will you be comfortable with morale and the quality of the work force with offering them 1-2% pay raise, when then are actually losing 4%.

Cllr Hossack, Chair of Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee (PRED) responded.

I tend not to comment on forecasts, as they change from one moment to the next, it's down the individuals if they are comfortable. I'm comfortable we will present a balanced budget in March and are working hard with Officers to deliver this.

In answer to your question and I will confirm again. Yes, a balanced budget will be delivered in March.

Cllr Haigh, put a question to the Chair of Community & Health Committee.

It was a shame that the Splashpad at King George's Playing Fields could not open this, Summer Holiday this year.

What were the issues with water connection? Where they foreseeable? Can you offer an assurance that it will be open in Spring 2022?

Cllr Poppy, Chair of Community & Health Committee responded.

Yes, the splashpad will be open in Spring 2022. The connection for the water is now in place. The problem lines way back to when the paddling pool were in place and the connection wasn't there. We have been at the mercy of the water company for the last 6-8 months.

Cllr Aspinell, put a question to the Chair of Environment, Enforcement and Housing Committee.

Have we got a spare capacity in our Surface Car Parking personal do assist SEPP so they can enforce the disgraceful parking on our High Street, Shenfield High Street and throughout the Borough.

We must have been losing thousands of pounds from our surface car parks. on the pavement within the High Street.

Is this possible?

Cllr Honess, on behalf of the Chair of Environment, Enforcement and Housing Committee responded.

She asked that Cllr Cloke (representative from Brentwood Borough Council for SEPP) responded to the question from Cllr Aspinell.

Cllr Cloke confirmed that discussions are taking place with Essex County Council on this matter.

Cllr Wagland put a question to the Mayor as Chair of Ordinary Council.

This happened at the last meeting about the process how this meeting is conducted.

The Leader responded and clarified that the Constitution directed that questions be put to chairs of committees rather than through the Mayor.

161. Notice of Motion

Four Notices of Motion have been submitted in accordance with Rule 3 in Part 4.1 of the Constitution - Council Procedure Rules and are listed in order of the date received.

Three of which were deferred from the Ordinary Council meeting on 28th July 2021.

Motion 1 Received 02/06/2021 @ 15:47

Proposer Cllr Dr T Barrett

Seconder Cllr G Barrett

The Council resolves that all future Brentwood Borough Council backed, or part backed developments, including those through the Brentwood Development Partnership, SAIL and other subsidiary companies will at a minimum meet the guidance on design and amenity standards set out in both Brentwood & Essex design guides.

Cllr Dr Barrett present a revised Motion after discussion with Cllr Wagland, who informed him of some changes to National Planning Policy Framework.

“The Council welcomes the arrival of the Government’s new section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); which allows Local Authorities to prepare local design codes democratically through effective local community consultation based on local defining characteristics; and provides that development proposals that are not well-designed should be refused. The Council is pleased to adopt apply this revision to the NPPF including in relation to its own backed or part-backed developments and will take up the new opportunities given to Local Authorities”.

Cllr Barrett was asked as the original seconder to speak on the Motion. However, he asked that Cllr Wagland my wish to be the seconder, as she assisted with revised motion.

This was accepted by Cllr Wagland.

Officers drew members attention to the word adopt, which could be an issue as in Planning terms the Council is not able to formally adopt national policy, which was reworded by the Mover to instead state apply.

In line with constitution, Cllr Wagland proposed the amendment to the original motion which was accept by Cllr Dr Barrett.

A vote was taken by a show of hands and it was **CARRIED**.

“The Council welcomes the arrival of the Government’s new section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); which allows Local Authorities to prepare local design codes democratically through effective local community consultation based on local defining characteristics; and provides that development proposals that are not well-designed should be refused. The Council is pleased to apply this revision to the NPPF including in relation to its own backed or part-backed developments and will take up the new opportunities given to Local Authorities”.

Motion 2 Received 02/06/2021 @ 15:47

Proposer Cllr Dr T Barrett

Seconder Cllr G Barrett

The Council resolves that all future Brentwood Borough Council backed or part backed developments, including those through the Brentwood Development Partnership, SAIL and other subsidiary companies will be compliant with the 35% affordable housing requirement or provide the market rate sum to purchase the equivalent property/properties in the Borough for use as affordable housing in lieu of this requirement.

Cllr Barrett suggested an amendment to the motion to state, which was accepted by Cllr Dr Barrett, as the Mover.

The Council resolves that all future Brentwood Borough Council backed or part backed developments, including those through the Brentwood Development Partnership, SAIL and other subsidiary companies will be compliant with the 35% affordable housing requirement, **where appropriate for development size** or provide the market rate sum to purchase the equivalent property/properties in the Borough for use as affordable housing in lieu of this requirement.

Cllr Hossack suggested that the word “will” should be amended to “seek” be compliant with the 35% affordable housing requirement. This was not accepted by the Mover.

Cllr White, referred to Chapter 4, 3.7 Chapter 4. this Motion should be accommodated by a report outlining any financial or contract implications.

After a full discussion, the Monitoring Officer informed Members that the Motion should be deferred to the next meeting with an accompanying report.

Motion 3 Received 29.6.2021 @ 12.22

Proposer Cllr Mynott

Seconder Cllr Naylor

In June 2019, a motion was submitted proposing that the Council go through an Article 4 process to remove permitted development rights on the conversion of office space to residential accommodation, in specific areas of

the borough, and to reinstate the normal Planning process for such proposed conversions.

That motion was carried with overwhelming cross-party support. However, in the two years since then, no step has yet been taken to achieve what was agreed. Recent claims have, moreover, been made that Council acquisitions of a handful of commercial properties in the borough might somehow defend Brentwood borough from the numerous drawbacks of unrestrained office conversion. Nevertheless, piecemeal property acquisition cannot address across the board issues of the kind caused by permitted development rights on office conversions.

This council will abide by its decision of June 26th 2019 on the previous motion, and requests that legal advice is sought on the introduction of an Article 4 restriction be undertaken, as agreed.

Cllr Hossack informed Members that subsequent report will go back to a further meeting of Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee.

After a full discussion, a vote was taken by a show of hands and was LOST.

(Cllr Laplain declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of an employee of British Telecom was mentioned within the debate).

Motion 4 Received 26.9.2021 @ 21.31

**Proposer Cllr Mynott
Aspinell**

Seconder

Cllr

Earlier this year the Government introduced a new Use Class MA, allowing buildings and land within the (itself only recently created) umbrella Class E (commercial, business and service) to be converted into dwellings.

The underlying consequence is once again to prevent local control over the planning process, to rip up a rulebook which isn't the root cause of the current housing shortage, and to circumvent much needed improvements in the availability of affordable housing.

Applications under Class MA have been possible since August the 1st, even though this is yet another change to planning regulations in Britain that has aroused widespread criticism, with the Royal Town Planning Institute, the Town and Country Planning Association, the National Trust and even the British Property Federation opposed to it (amongst others). Introducing a change like this at a time of Covid, when numerous businesses have been under unprecedented pressure for over a year (and nationally one in seven Class E units are already empty) is likely to wreak havoc with the future viability of UK high streets, and to do so irreversibly.

A report from University College London already predicts losses of High Street businesses ranging between 89% and 75%, with four out of five shops likely to go, most of which will be small and locally owned.

This Motion was withdrawn by the Mover, Cllr Mynott.

162. Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting concluded at 21:08
