

MINUTES of the MEETING of the  
WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
held in the Council Chamber,  
Council Offices, Godalming on  
24 February 2009

\* Cllr Len Bate (Mayor)  
\* Cllr Mrs Pat Frost (Deputy Mayor)

* Cllr Mrs Jean Arrick	* Cllr Robert Knowles
Cllr Cyril Baily	* Cllr Ms Denise Le Gal
* Cllr Mike Band	* Cllr Dr Nicky Lee
Cllr Mrs Gillian Beel	* Cllr Alan Lovell
Cllr Maurice Byham	* Cllr Peter Martin
Cllr Mrs Elizabeth Cable	* Cllr Tom Martin
* Cllr Mike Causey	* Cllr Bryn Morgan
* Cllr Mrs Carole Cockburn	* Cllr Stephen Mulliner
* Cllr Stuart Connolly	* Cllr David Munro
* Cllr Victor Duckett	Cllr Stephen O'Grady
* Cllr Jim Edwards	Cllr Samuel Pritchard
* Cllr Brian Ellis	* Cllr Ken Reed
* Cllr Mrs Patricia Ellis	* Cllr Steven Renshaw
Cllr Mrs Lucinda Fleming	* Cllr Stefan Reynolds
* Cllr Bob Frost	Cllr Ian Sampson
* Cllr Richard Gates	* Cllr John Sandy
* Cllr Michael Goodridge	Cllr Mrs Celia Savage
* Cllr Tony Gordon-Smith	* Cllr John Savage
Cllr Mrs Jill Hargreaves	* Cllr Roger Steel
* Cllr Stephen Hill	* Cllr Adam Taylor-Smith
* Cllr Nicholas Holder	* Cllr Ms Jane Thomson
* Cllr Julian Hubble	Cllr Andrew Thorp
* Cllr Simon Inchbald	Cllr John Ward
* Cllr David Inman	Cllr Mrs Nerissa Warner-O'Neill
* Cllr Peter Isherwood	* Cllr Keith Webster
* Cllr Mrs Diane James	Cllr Ross Welland
* Cllr Mrs Carole King	* Cllr Mrs Liz Wheatley
	* Cllr Andrew Wilson

\* Present

At the commencement of the meeting, prayers were led by the Reverend Margaret Jackson.

50. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 16 December 2009 were confirmed and signed.

51. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Beel, Byham, Mrs Cable, Mrs Fleming, Mrs Hargreaves, O'Grady, Sampson, Mrs Savage, Thorp, Welland, Ward and Mrs Warner-O'Neill.

52. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

The following personal interests were declared in advance of the meeting:-

Cllr Mrs James	Item 158 - Cranleigh Arts	Friend of Cranleigh Arts Centre
	Item 184 - Leisure Centre Tenders	As a member and regular user of Cranleigh Leisure Centre
Cllr Roger Steel	Item 172 - Community Partnership Fund	As a Waverley representative on the Farnham Maltings Management Committee
	Item 185 - Review of Interim Miniplan	As a Farnham Town Councillor

The following personal interests were raised at the meeting:-

Cllr Duckett	Item 172 - Community Partnership Fund	As a friend of Clockhouse and Chairman of the Surrey Heathland Project
Cllr Ms Le Gal	Item 172 - Community Partnership Fund	As a Waverley representative on the Farnham Maltings Management Committee
Cllr Mr Savage	Item 172 - Community Partnership Fund	As a Waverley representative on the Cranleigh Arts Centre

Cllr Duckett also declared a personal and prejudicial interest at the meeting on Item 172 relating to the Community Partnership Fund, specifically with regard to 40 Degreez in Farnham because his partner is Chairman of the Trustees.

53. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor commented that he was glad to be back after his period of absence through ill-health. He thanked the councillors for the continuing support that had been offered to him, particularly the past mayors who had been deputising for him at functions.

The Mayor then encouraged all councillors to continue to support farmers' markets which took place in each area of the borough on a monthly basis. He provided councillors with some dates for their diaries:-

Friday 27 March - Mayor's Civic Reception at Charterhouse  
 Saturday 25 April - Mayor's Youth Challenge with the Army School of Physical Training at Aldershot.

Being Shrove Tuesday, the Mayor congratulated Waverley's team for its success in the Guildford Pancake Race in beating the Guildford Borough Council team earlier in the day.

A petition was also available for all councillors to sign at the end of the meeting to demonstrate the Council's disappointment that Rachel Morris had not been honoured in the same way as her counterparts in the Olympics/Paralympics in Beijing.

#### 54. QUESTIONS

The following questions to the Mayor had been received from members of the public in accordance with Procedure Rule 10:-

i. from Mrs Anne Cooper of Farnham

"Cllr. Taylor Smith reports that a roof-light to Brightwell House has been recently damaged. Way back in 2007 the Farnham Buildings Preservation Trust published a survey of Brightwell House and the Redgrave which demonstrated the very poor condition these buildings were in, due to water penetration, particularly through *"smashing/displacement of roof-lights by intruders and vandals"*. It is noted in the summary that *"most damage and deterioration (appears) to have arisen from neglect over a considerable time."*

My question is: How soon can we expect these listed buildings to be made secure and the various problems rectified, including dry rot?"

The Portfolio Holder for East Street responded as follows:-

"Thank you for your continuing interest in Brightwells House. The damage caused by vandals breaking in to Brightwells House through the roof has now been repaired and the building is wind and watertight. The building has been secured from the inside to prevent a reoccurrence. I confirm that necessary works that are, in the future, required to maintain the security and weather tightness of the building will be dealt with without delay. In accordance with advice from the Fire Service, non-structural works have been recently carried out to build in better fire partitioning in order to separate Brightwells House from the remainder of the structure.

I fully accept and acknowledge Waverley's responsibility to preserve and maintain the fabric and features of Brightwells House. There are a number of building maintenance items that have been identified and some work has taken place. I have asked for a formal maintenance and management plan for Brightwells House to be prepared and work on this plan is ongoing. In the spirit of openness and co-operation I would hope that Waverley will be able to work with the Farnham Building Preservation Trust going forward.

Based on recent inspections, we are not aware of the presence of dry rot in the building, however, in accordance with the ongoing maintenance management plan, if it is subsequently discovered it will be dealt with immediately."

ii. from John Kidd of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

"Our front garden wall has been demolished twice by large lorries delivering to Manns when turning out of Victoria Road towards the High Street. Why are the Council even considering building flats and houses so close to the northern side of Victoria Road when the road is so narrow and the site lines for vehicles will be greatly reduced by the new buildings?"

The Leader of the Council responded as follows:-

"I am sorry that you have had problems with lorries delivering to Manns. Sight lines for any new development must comply with Highways minimum standards, and will be considered by the Highways Authority (Surrey County Council) at the time of any planning application".

iii. from Sue Kidd of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

"All the considered schemes present an enormous parking problem. The Council is fully aware of the parking problems in Rowland and Victoria Roads, and even insisted that any proposals to redevelop the site should ensure that there would be no overspill parking into these streets. Why is the Council considering proposals with insufficient parking provision that will clearly exacerbate the current problems?"

The following response was given by the Leader of the Council:-

"It is a requirement for the Housing Association responsible for the development "to develop a clear parking strategy for the scheme, including the day centre, which avoids overspill parking outside the new development". This will be developed as part of any planning application, which will be the subject of full public consultation."

iv. from Paul McGuinness of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

"As a local resident to this proposed re-development I would like to thank the council for its openness during the procedure so far. I would also like to have confirmation that the local residents and Cranleigh Community will be permitted and encouraged to take part in the ongoing process of determining the most appropriate proposal for this site."

The Leader of the Council replied as follows:-

“If the Executive’s recommendation is accepted at a later point in this evening’s proceedings, then Thames Valley Housing Association’s Option 1 B will be the basis for the development. Local residents have been involved in the selection of this option. If, following the further discussions allowed for in the resolution, a financially viable alternative to Option 1B is put to the Council, then appropriate consultations with all stakeholders, including residents, will take place. We do not intend at this stage to pre-judge what form this consultation may take, however the residents’ expectations are noted.”

v. from Debbie McGuinness of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

“Why is the Council considering a proposal that will ensure over spill parking in both Rowland and Victoria Roads? At the public exhibition, Thames Valley Housing Association said that they were using a formula for necessary car parking spaces based upon 2 spaces for larger properties and 1.5 for 2 bedroom houses. This formula would mean 76 spaces for the option being recommended by the Executive Committee. There are actually only 49 spaces actually shown on the plan, some 40% short.”

The following response was given by the Leader of the Council:-

“It is a requirement for the Housing Association responsible for the development “to develop a clear parking strategy for the scheme, including the day centre, which avoids overspill parking outside the new development”. This will be developed as part of any planning application, which will be the subject of full public consultation.”

vi. from D E Higham of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

“Given its stated commitment to an extensive consultation process and that “the views and concerns of the local residents, especially those adjacent to the site will be crucial” to the success of this scheme, will the Borough Council ensure that any potential new option that emerges will be considered in same way as the original six options? Local residents will expect a second public exhibition to vote for either the Council’s and the resident’s preferred option or any new option that emerges in the next three months. Residents will also expect the Council’s original Special Interest Group to consider the two options taking into account not only their views but also those of the Parish Council.”

The Leader of the Council replied as follows:-

“If the Executive’s recommendation is accepted at a later point in this evening’s proceedings, then Thames Valley Housing Association’s Option 1 B will be the basis for the development. Local residents have been involved in the selection of this option. If, following the further discussions allowed for in the resolution, a financially viable alternative to Option 1B is put to the Council, then appropriate consultations with

all stakeholders, including residents, will take place. We do not intend at this stage to pre-judge what form this consultation may take, however the residents' expectations are noted."

vii. from R G Higham of Cranleigh regarding the Rowland House Redevelopment

"What faith can the local residents have in the Council not to exacerbate the parking problems in Rowland and Victoria Roads, when already the original requirement of "there must be **no parking overspill** into the surrounding streets" has been significantly downgraded to having a car parking strategy, whatever that is, which "**avoids overspill parking** outside the new development?"

The following response was given by the Leader of the Council:-

"It is a requirement for the Housing Association responsible for the development "to develop a clear parking strategy for the scheme, including the day centre, which avoids overspill parking outside the new development". This will be developed as part of any planning application, which will be the subject of full public consultation."

55. PRESENTATION OF PETITION

The Mayor received a petition, presented by Mr Bob Nicholls, on behalf of 240 signatories, the prayer of which was as follows:-

"We the undersigned support the need for a multi-use games areas for local youth activities. Of the three proposed sites we strongly oppose the proposed Nursery Road park entrance and Summers Road tennis court locations, which would greatly affect neighbouring residential properties amenity with daily noise and devaluation.

The central park site beside the football pitch and pathway, although not ideal, is the only proposed option not affecting any residential properties amenity".

In accordance with Procedure Rule 10.13, the Mayor informed the petitioner and the Council that the petition was to be referred to the Executive at its next available meeting for consideration.

56. BUDGET 2009/2010 (Appendices A.1 - A.5)

The Chairman of the Executive presented the reports at Appendix A to the agenda, and in connection therewith, delivered a Budget Statement to the Council, a copy of which is enclosed as Annexe 1 to these minutes. This was followed by statements from the Portfolio Holder for Finance, the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group and the Deputy Leader of the Independent Group.

56.1 General Fund Revenue Estimates 2009/2010 (Appendix A.1)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the report of the Executive at Appendix A.1 be approved and the recommendations contained therein adopted.

56.2 General Fund Capital Programme 2009/2010 (Appendix A.2)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive and duly seconded that the report of the Executive at Appendix A.2 be approved and adopted.

(i) Amendment re. Pool Car

It was moved and seconded that “the purchase of the low carbon pool car (capital expenditure £8,000 in the financial period 2009/2010) be deferred by six months to August 2009, to facilitate/allow:

1. completion of the WBC Transport Strategy Review previously identified; and
2. relevant development and scrutiny of car provision and usage by WBC employees”.

Having received an assurance from the Leader of the Council that the pool car would not be purchased until August 2009, the amendment was withdrawn.

(ii) Amendment re. Bus Shelters

It was moved and seconded that “the bus shelter replacement programme (capital expenditure £10,000 in the financial period 2009/2010) be deferred by six months to August 2009, to facilitate/allow:

1. completion of a WBC review as to whether WBC should continue to support this item OR transfer remaining bus shelters to bus operations; and
2. whether sufficient funding has been identified to cover pan borough replacement provision.”

Having clarified the reasons for the inclusion of this item in the Capital Programme for 2009/2010, the amendment was withdrawn.

56.3 Housing Revenue Account Revenue Estimates 2009/2010 (Appendix A.3)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive and duly seconded that the report of the Executive at Appendix A.3 be approved and adopted.

(i) Amendment to Recommendations 21 and 22

It was moved and seconded that a rent increase of 3.8% be agreed instead of 5.2%, and amendments 21 and 22 amended accordingly to now read

- “21. the average actual rent level of Council dwellings be increased by 3.8% from 6 April 2009; and
22. the weekly charge for a separate garage rented by both Council and non-Council tenants be increased by 3.8% from 6 April 2009.”

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST. Cllrs Reed, Mr Savage, Mrs James and Lovell asked that their votes in favour of the amendment be recorded.

(ii) Recommendations 21 and 22

Cllrs Reed, Mr Savage, Mrs James and Lovell asked that their votes against these recommendations be recorded.

56.4 Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme and Social Housing Grant 2009/2010 (Appendix A.4)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the report of the Executive at Appendix A.4 be approved and the recommendations contained therein adopted.

56.5 Council Tax Setting 2009/2010 (Appendix A.5)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that

1. The following amounts having been calculated by the Council for the year 2009/2010 in accordance with the Regulations made under Section 33 (5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 be approved:

- (a) 54,152.8 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 (as amended) as its Council Tax Base for the year;

(b) Part of the Council's area – Tax Base Band D Equivalents

Alfold	479.9	being the amounts calculated by the Council in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
Bramley	1,694.7	
Busbridge	426.3	
Chiddingfold	1,380.0	
Churt	657.1	
Cranleigh	5,252.6	
Dockenfield	221.6	
Dunsfold	539.3	
Elstead	1,226.4	
Ewhurst	1,202.6	
Farnham	16,978.5	



Frensham	839.6
Godalming	9,043.4
Hambledon	434.7
Hascombe	164.1
Haslemere	7,560.8
Peper Harow	98.0
Thursley	352.6
Tilford	346.9
Witley	3,505.2
Wonersh	1,748.5

2. The following amounts have been calculated for the Council for 2009/2010 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (a) £55,035,557 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (2) (a) to (e) of the Act;
- (b) £38,161,340 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32 (3) (a) to (c) of the Act;
- (c) £16,874,217 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32 (4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;
- (d) £ 6,091,094 being the aggregate of the sums that will be payable for the year into the Council's General Fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant, increased by the amount of the sum which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Council Tax surplus).
- (e) £199.18 being the amount at (c) above less the amount at (d) above, all divided by the amount at 23.1(a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 33 (1) of the Act and rounded for administrative purposes, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year;
- (f) £2,223,217 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34 (1) of the Act;
- (g) £158.13 being the amount at (e) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (f) above by the amount at 23.1 (a) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with the Section 34 (2) of the Act and

rounded for administrative purposes, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates;

(h) Part of Council's area

	£	
Alfold	209.49	being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (g) above the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 23.1 (b) above calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34 (3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
Bramley	180.14	
Busbridge	181.59	
Chiddingfold	206.05	
Churt	199.81	
Cranleigh	201.30	
Dockenfield	173.02	
Dunsfold	200.78	
Elstead	179.70	
Ewhurst	202.57	
Farnham	209.19	
Frensham	196.24	
Godalming	205.46	
Hambledon	180.39	
Hascombe	202.01	
Haslemere	184.61	
Peper Harow	163.23	
Thursley	176.56	
Tilford	184.36	
Witley	195.50	
Wonersh	177.35	

(i) Valuation Bands

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
Alfold	139.66	162.94	186.21	209.49	256.04	302.60	349.15	418.98
Bramley	120.09	140.11	160.12	180.14	220.17	260.20	300.23	360.28
Busbridge	121.06	141.24	161.41	181.59	221.94	262.30	302.65	363.18
Chiddingfold	137.37	160.26	183.16	206.05	251.84	297.63	343.42	412.10
Churt	133.21	155.41	177.61	199.81	244.21	288.61	333.02	399.62
Cranleigh	134.20	156.57	178.93	201.30	246.03	290.77	335.50	402.60
Dockenfield	115.35	134.57	153.80	173.02	211.47	249.92	288.37	346.04
Dunsfold	133.85	156.16	178.47	200.78	245.40	290.02	334.63	401.56

Elstead	119.80	139.77	159.73	179.70	219.63	259.57	299.50	359.40
Ewhurst	135.05	157.55	180.06	202.57	247.59	292.60	337.62	405.14
Farnham	139.46	162.70	185.95	209.19	255.68	302.16	348.65	418.38
Frensham	130.83	152.63	174.44	196.24	239.85	283.46	327.07	392.48
Godalming	136.97	159.80	182.63	205.46	251.12	296.78	342.43	410.92
Hambledon	120.26	140.30	160.35	180.39	220.48	260.56	300.65	360.78
Hascombe	134.67	157.12	179.56	202.01	246.90	291.79	336.68	404.02
Haslemere	123.07	143.59	164.10	184.61	225.63	266.66	307.68	369.22
Peper Harow	108.82	126.96	145.09	163.23	199.50	235.78	272.05	326.46
Thursley	117.71	137.32	156.94	176.56	215.80	255.03	294.27	353.12
Tilford	122.91	143.39	163.88	184.36	225.33	266.30	307.27	368.72
Witley	130.33	152.06	173.78	195.50	238.94	282.39	325.83	391.00
Wonersh	118.23	137.94	157.64	177.35	216.76	256.17	295.58	354.70

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at (g) and (h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5 (1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36 (1) of the Act as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- That it be noted that for 2009/2010 the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

Valuation Bands

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
S.C.C.	726.12	847.14	968.16	1089.18	1331.22	1573.26	1815.30	2178.36
Surrey Police	131.40	153.30	175.20	197.10	240.90	284.70	328.50	394.20

- That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 23.2 (i) and 23.3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 (2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the financial year commencing on 1st April 2009 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Valuation Bands</u>							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Alfold	997.18	1,163.38	1,329.57	1,495.77	1,828.16	2,160.56	2,492.95	2,991.54
Bramley	977.61	1,140.55	1,303.48	1,466.42	1,792.29	2,118.16	2,444.03	2,932.84
Busbridge	978.58	1,141.68	1,304.77	1,467.87	1,794.06	2,120.26	2,446.45	2,935.74
Chiddingfold	994.89	1,160.70	1,326.52	1,492.33	1,823.96	2,155.59	2,487.22	2,984.66
Churt	990.73	1,155.85	1,320.97	1,486.09	1,816.33	2,146.57	2,476.82	2,972.18
Cranleigh	991.72	1,157.01	1,322.29	1,487.58	1,818.15	2,148.73	2,479.30	2,975.16
Dockenfield	972.87	1,135.01	1,297.16	1,459.30	1,783.59	2,107.88	2,432.17	2,918.60
Dunsfold	991.37	1,156.60	1,321.83	1,487.06	1,817.52	2,147.98	2,478.43	2,974.12
Elstead	977.32	1,140.21	1,303.09	1,465.98	1,791.75	2,117.53	2,443.30	2,931.96
Ewhurst	992.57	1,157.99	1,323.42	1,488.85	1,819.71	2,150.56	2,481.42	2,977.70
Farnham	996.98	1,163.14	1,329.31	1,495.47	1,827.80	2,160.12	2,492.45	2,990.94
Frensham	988.35	1,153.07	1,317.80	1,482.52	1,811.97	2,141.42	2,470.87	2,965.04
Godalming	994.49	1,160.24	1,325.99	1,491.74	1,823.24	2,154.74	2,486.23	2,983.48
Hambledon	977.78	1,140.74	1,303.71	1,466.67	1,792.60	2,118.52	2,444.45	2,933.34
Hascombe	992.19	1,157.56	1,322.92	1,488.29	1,819.02	2,149.75	2,480.48	2,976.58
Haslemere	980.59	1,144.03	1,307.46	1,470.89	1,797.75	2,124.62	2,451.48	2,941.78
Peper Harow	966.34	1,127.40	1,288.45	1,449.51	1,771.62	2,093.74	2,415.85	2,899.02
Thursley	975.23	1,137.76	1,300.30	1,462.84	1,787.92	2,112.99	2,438.07	2,925.68
Tilford	980.43	1,143.83	1,307.24	1,470.64	1,797.45	2,124.26	2,451.07	2,941.28
Witley	987.85	1,152.50	1,317.14	1,481.78	1,811.06	2,140.35	2,469.63	2,963.56
Wonersh	975.75	1,138.38	1,301.00	1,463.63	1,788.88	2,114.13	2,439.38	2,927.26

## 57. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

### 57.1 Meeting of 6 January 2009

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive held on 6 January 2009 be approved and the recommendations contained therein adopted.

57.2 Meeting of 10 February 2009 (rescheduled from 3 February 2009)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Executive, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive held on 10 February 2009 be approved and the recommendations contained therein adopted.

58. CONTINUATION OF MEETING

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9, at 9.49 p.m. it was proposed, and the Council concurred, that the meeting should continue until the business on the agenda had been transacted.

59. MINUTES OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

A revised set of minutes was tabled which clarified the position with regard to the deferral of the fees and charges for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Operators. It was then moved by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded and

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 14 January 2009 be approved.

The meeting concluded at 10.02 p.m.

Mayor

comms/council/2008-09/058 minutes