

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 19th April 2018.

PRESENT: Councillors Black (Chair), Cooley (Vice Chair), Ainsworth, Allen, Blake-Thomas, Bond, Botten, Bradbury, Cannon, Childs, Compton, Connolly, D. Cooper, M. Cooper, Davies, Duck, Dunbar, Elias, Fisher, Fitzgerald, Harwood, Jecks, Jones, Lee, Lockwood, Manley, Morrow, Parker, Perkins, Prew, Pursehouse, Rujbally, Stead, Steeds, Steer, Thorn, Vickers, Wates, Webster, Weightman, Wren and Young.

263. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd February 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

264. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman thanked those Members and Officers who had attended her civic reception for the voluntary sector at Bletchingley Golf Club on the previous evening. She also congratulated Councillor Pursehouse on his recent award from the Chair of Surrey County Council for his voluntary work in Warlingham. She confirmed that the final fundraising event of her civic year would be a Beetle Drive at St Agatha's Hall, Hurst Green on the evening of Friday, 4th May.

265. QUESTION SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 29(2)

Councillor Bradbury asked the following question:

"Members may recall that, at the 22nd February Council meeting, Councillor Lockwood suggested that I had poor record for attending meetings. She stated that my attendance record was as low as 30%. Please could the Chairman confirm that Members' attendance records, as presented to Annual Council, highlight the actual number of meetings that we could have attended in terms of Full Council and Committees on which we serve. If so, my attendance record for this Municipal Year is 93% as I've only missed 1 out of 13 meetings of Full Council, Housing and O&S."

The Chair responded as follows:

"Thank you for your question Councillor Bradbury. While the 2016/17 attendance schedule presented to last year's Annual Council also identified occasions when non-Committee members were present, individual records highlight attendance at meetings of Committees to which Councillors have been appointed, as well as Full Council. On that basis, I concur that your attendance record for this year is over 90%."

266. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

RESOLVED – that the reports of the following meetings be received and the recommendations therein adopted:

Housing (6th March 2018)*

** subject to the date in the first paragraph of Minute 229 (regarding the expiry of utilities contacts) being changed from 31st to 30th September 2018.*

Planning (8th March 2018)

Community Services Committee (13th March 2018)

Planning Policy (15th March 2018)

Minute 247 – Caterham Masterplan Supplementary Planning document

Councillor Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in the above minute by virtue of the fact that his employer was based in Caterham.

Councillor Botten moved that the resolution to adopt the Caterham Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document be referred back to the Planning Policy Committee. This motion was seconded by Councillor Jones. Councillor Botten requested a recorded vote on the matter which was supported by at least five other Members as required by Standing Order 12. The result of the recoded vote was as follows:

For:

Councillors Allen, Botten, D. Cooper, Davies, Jones, Lee, Lockwood, Manley, Morrow, Pursehouse, Rujbally and Wren. (12)

Against:

Councillors Ainsworth, Black, Blake-Thomas, Bond, Bradbury, Cannon, Childs, Cooley, Compton, Connolly, M. Cooper, Duck, Dunbar, Elias, Fisher, Fitzgerald, Harwood, Jecks, Parker, Perkins, Prew, Stead, Steeds, Steer, Thorn, Vickers, Wates, Webster, Weightman and Young. (30)

The motion was therefore lost.

Resources (22nd March 2018)

Planning (5th April 2018)

267. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(A)

(i) Motion from Councillor Botten

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Botten:

“This Council has lost confidence in the current on-street parking enforcement arrangements in the District and resolves to:

- (a) *ask Surrey County Council to give notice on the current arrangements with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council as soon as possible;*
- (b) *work with Parish Councils and local business groups to understand the requirements for parking enforcement in each locality; and*
- (c) *seek agreement with Surrey County Council to carry out on its behalf a parking enforcement function which is responsive to local needs.”*

The following amendment to Councillor Botten’s motion was tabled by Councillor Elias:

“This Council has lost confidence in the current on-street parking enforcement arrangements in the District and resolves to:

- (a) *ask Surrey County Council to give notice on the current arrangements with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council as soon as possible;*
- (b) *work with Parish Councils, **local District Councillors, the Local Committee** and local business groups to understand the requirements for parking enforcement in each locality; and*
- (c) *seek agreement with Surrey County Council to ~~carry out on its behalf~~ **undertake** a parking enforcement function **on SCC’s behalf** which is responsive to local needs or appoint a third party to do likewise.”*

Upon debating the matter, a motion was agreed in accordance with the amendment put forward by Councillor Elias with the addition of the following words at the end of (c) above:

“.... if, having explored the option of an in-house service, there were good reasons not to pursue it.”

It was therefore **RESOLVED** – that:

“This Council has lost confidence in the current on-street parking enforcement arrangements in the District and resolves to:

- (a) ask Surrey County Council to give notice on the current arrangements with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council as soon as possible;
- (b) work with Parish Councils, local District Councillors, the Local Committee and local business groups to understand the requirements for parking enforcement in each locality; and
- (c) seek agreement with Surrey County Council to undertake a parking enforcement function on SCC’s behalf which is responsive to local needs or appoint a third party to do likewise if, having explored the option of an in-house service, there were good reasons not to pursue it.

(ii) Motion from Councillor Pursehouse

The following motion was proposed by Pursehouse

“This Council agrees that a time limit should no longer be imposed on the length of speeches at Committee and Sub-Committee meetings. Standing Order 11 is reasonable in so far as the rules of debate at Council meetings are concerned, including the clause stating that:

‘no speech shall exceed ten minutes in the case of a mover of a motion, or the Chair of a Committee in replying to a debate, and five minutes in all other cases, including the mover of an amendment, except by consent of the Council’

It is noted that Standing Order 22 extends those rules to Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, except those parts which relate to standing and to speaking more than once. This Council now considers that Standing Order 22 should be amended by the addition of the words “ and the length of speeches” to those exceptions. While Members will then be able to speak without time limits at Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, the Chairmen of the respective meetings should be able to control the length of debates through conventional, common sense judgements about when extended speeches can be justified or when Members should be encouraged to bring their speeches to an end when they are not adding further value to the debate.”

The following amendment to Councillor Pursehouse's motion was tabled by Councillor Bond:

*"This Council agrees that, **subject to the discretion of the Chair**, a time limit should no longer be imposed on the length of speeches at Committee and Sub-Committee meetings. Standing Order 11 is reasonable in so far as the rules of debate at Council meetings are concerned, including the clause stating that:*

'no speech shall exceed ten minutes in the case of a mover of a motion, or the Chair of a Committee in replying to a debate, and five minutes in all other cases, including the mover of an amendment, except by consent of the Council'.

*It is noted that Standing Order 22 extends those rules to Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, except those parts which relate to standing and to speaking more than once. This Council now considers that Standing Order 22 should be amended **with reference to the length of speeches as follows**: ~~by the addition of the words "and the length of speeches" to those exceptions. While Members will then be able to speak without time limits at Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, the Chairmen of the respective meetings should be able to control the length of debates through conventional, common sense judgements about when extended speeches can be justified or when Members should be encouraged to bring their speeches to an end when they are not adding further value to the debate."~~*

No. 22

STANDING ORDERS TO APPLY TO COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES

Subject to the following exceptions, the Standing Order of the Council headed "Rules of debate for Council meetings" (Standing Order No. 11) shall, with any necessary modification, apply to Committee and Sub-Committee meetings:

- (i) Members, when speaking, will not have to stand;**
- (ii) Members may speak more than once during any debate; and**
- (iii) there be no automatic time limit for the length of speeches, although the Chairs of relevant Committee / Sub-Committee meetings may curtail the length of Councillors' speeches to no more than five minutes if they consider it to be justified having regard to the nature of the debate**

Councillor Pursehouse supported the amendment, subject to the discretionary power in (iii) above only being exercised in exceptional circumstances.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** – that:

“This Council agrees that, subject to the discretion of the Chair, a time limit should no longer be imposed on the length of speeches at Committee and Sub-Committee meetings. Standing Order 11 is reasonable in so far as the rules of debate at Council meetings are concerned, including the clause stating that:

‘no speech shall exceed ten minutes in the case of a mover of a motion, or the Chair of a Committee in replying to a debate, and five minutes in all other cases, including the mover of an amendment, except by consent of the Council’

It is noted that Standing Order 22 extends those rules to Committee and Sub-Committee meetings, except those parts which relate to standing and to speaking more than once. This Council now considers that Standing Order 22 should be amended with reference to the length of speeches as follows:

No. 22

STANDING ORDERS TO APPLY TO COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES

Subject to the following exceptions, the Standing Order of the Council headed “Rules of debate for Council meetings” (Standing Order No. 11) shall, with any necessary modification, apply to Committee and Sub-Committee meetings:

- (i) Members, when speaking, will not have to stand;
- (ii) Members may speak more than once during any debate; and
- (iii) there be no automatic time limit for the length of speeches, although the Chairs of relevant Committee / Sub-Committee meetings may curtail the length of Councillors’ speeches to no more than five minutes if they consider it to be justified having regard to the nature of the debate.

268. CHAIR’S CLOSING REMARKS

The Chair expressed thanks to all other Members for their valued support during her year in office. She also acknowledged that some Councillors would not be contesting the forthcoming elections and thanked them for their services to the District and wished them well for the future. She paid special tribute to Councillors Compton and Perkins who had served for 18 and 16 years respectively.

Rising: 10.20 pm.