

MINUTES of the WAVERLEY  
BOROUGH COUNCIL held in  
the Council Chamber, Council  
Offices, The Burys, Godalming  
on 16 July 2019 at 7.00 pm

---

- \* Cllr Mary Forszewski (Mayor)
- \* Cllr Penny Marriott (Deputy Mayor)

- |                           |                           |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| * Cllr Brian Adams        | * Cllr Peter Isherwood    |
| * Cllr Christine Baker    | * Cllr Jacquie Keen       |
| * Cllr David Beaman       | * Cllr Robert Knowles     |
| * Cllr Roger Blishen      | * Cllr Anna James         |
| * Cllr Peter Clark        | * Cllr Jack Lee           |
| Cllr Carole Cockburn      | * Cllr Andy MacLeod       |
| Cllr Richard Cole         | * Cllr Peter Marriott     |
| * Cllr Steve Cosser       | * Cllr Michaela Martin    |
| * Cllr Martin D'Arcy      | * Cllr Peter Martin       |
| Cllr Jerome Davidson      | * Cllr Mark Merryweather  |
| * Cllr Kevin Deanus       | * Cllr Kika Mirylees      |
| * Cllr Simon Dear         | * Cllr Stephen Mulliner   |
| * Cllr Sally Dickson      | * Cllr John Neale         |
| * Cllr Brian Edmonds      | * Cllr Peter Nicholson    |
| * Cllr Patricia Ellis     | * Cllr Nick Palmer        |
| * Cllr David Else         | * Cllr Julia Potts        |
| * Cllr Jenny Else         | * Cllr Ruth Reed          |
| * Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass | * Cllr Paul Rivers        |
| * Cllr Paul Follows       | * Cllr Penny Rivers       |
| * Cllr Michael Goodridge  | * Cllr John Robini        |
| * Cllr John Gray          | * Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman |
| * Cllr Michaela Gray      | Cllr Trevor Sadler        |
| Cllr Joan Heagin          | * Cllr Richard Seaborne   |
| Cllr Val Henry            | * Cllr Liz Townsend       |
| * Cllr George Hesse       | * Cllr John Ward          |
| * Cllr Chris Howard       | * Cllr Steve Williams     |
| * Cllr Daniel Hunt        | * Cllr George Wilson      |
| * Cllr Jerry Hyman        |                           |

\*Present

### **Apologies**

Cllr Carole Cockburn, Cllr Richard Cole, Cllr Jerome Davidson, Cllr Joan Heagin,  
Cllr Val Henry and Cllr Trevor Sadler

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, prayers were led by  
the Reverend Ian Maslin.

CNL10/19 MINUTES (Agenda item 1.)

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 19 March 2019 were confirmed and signed.

CNL11/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda item 2.)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Carole Cockburn, Richard Cole, Jerome Davidson, Joan Heagin, Val Henry and Trevor Sadler.

CNL12/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 3.)

There were no interests declared under this heading.

CNL13/19 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 4.)

The Mayor reminded Councillors of her campaign to raise awareness of male suicides, and the difficulty of providing support for men struggling with their mental health. The Mayor related how earlier in the day she had spent time with the mother of a young man from Witley who had killed himself, which had brought home the tragic loss and lasting impact of this event.

The Mayor encouraged Members to support her charity, the Compton-based *Mane Chance Sanctuary*, by purchasing a 'Rufus the Hound' mug.

The Mayor reported that she continued to be very busy attending a wide range of engagements, and had been thrilled to attend the University of Creative Arts graduation ceremony at the Royal Festival Hall in London which had been a brilliant celebration of the achievements of the university students.

Lastly, the Mayor encouraged Councillors to follow her on Facebook.

CNL14/19 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 5.)

There were no questions from members of the public.

CNL15/19 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Agenda item 6.)

15.1 The following question has been received from Cllr Richard Seaborne in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.2:

“On 8<sup>th</sup> June Councillor Deanus sent an email to the Leader, copied to all councillors, requesting details of how the new Executive plans to oversee developments at Dunsfold Park. I followed this up two days later with another open email to the Leader, copied to all councillors, echoing Councillor Deanus’s concern and asking for an explanation of how an Executive drawn exclusively from Farnham and Godalming members will be structured to ensure that issues relating to Cranleigh, Haslemere and the rural wards are fully covered in Executive deliberations.

In response to these two open emails Councillor Deanus has received a personal response and I have heard nothing.

Would the Leader be kind enough to outline to Members, and indeed residents, of wards containing around half of the Borough's population, how the new Executive will ensure that Cranleigh, Haslemere and the Villages get adequate focus in Executive discussions and particularly how the major development at Dunsfold Park will get the attention it deserves as the single largest new housing development in the Borough?

Councillor Richard Seaborne  
Bramley, Busbridge & Hascombe”

15.2 The Leader of the Council, Cllr John Ward, responded:

“Thank you for your question. As you rightly say I did answer Cllr Deanus's question and I had thought that my answer had also satisfied your echoing query. However as this is the third time the same question has been asked, possibly for the advantage of the members of the public, the answer will be the same; but with more detail; that the Executive team was chosen on their abilities and not their geographical location. Also it would have been impossible to include all 21 Parishes - but I shall endeavour to put some flesh on the bones of my decision. Before doing so may I correct the impression that the Executive is exclusively from Farnham and Godalming as for instance one member lives in the Frensham, Dockenfield & Tilford Ward which, I know you are well aware, is certainly not in Farnham.

At the last election the public gave a majority of the seats to a combination of the Lib Dems and the *Farnham Residents Parties*, who decided to form a joint administration. I and the Leader of the Lib Dems believe in meritocracy and so, when selecting members of the Executive from the available pool, those whose talents best fitted the various portfolio roles were offered seats on the Executive. It is obvious that *Farnham Residents* come exclusively from Farnham and by a quirk of the election process a large number of Lib Dems and other non-Tories were elected in the Godalming area. Whilst I congratulate the last, very large, administration in managing to create a geographically balanced Executive team, I did not have the luxury of size they enjoyed and my prime concern was, as I have pointed out earlier, the skills and availability of Councillors, not where individuals lived.

I am confident that all those on the Executive will do their utmost to improve the lives of all the residents of the Borough and will not be so parochial as to attempt to favour the residents who live near to them. The members of my Executive are deeply hurt and insulted by the insinuation of bias apparent in continued, politically motivated, questions.

I can also assure you that the concerns you have expressed over Dunsfold are unfounded and we are taking great interest in ensuring that this area is developed in a speedy and constructive manner. In addition to the usual work in progress, I and a number of my Executive have already been down to Dunsfold to have a meeting with the owner, as pictured in this week's *Haslemere Herald*, and the Deputy Leader, the Planning Portfolio Holder and I are scheduled to meet with him again next week. Regular meetings will continue and we are in the late stages of the process of establishing a

*Dunsfold Park Garden Village Governance Board* which will include both Executive and local members.

Finally, may I gently remind you that no such concerns of geography seemed to trouble you when at the last Election your Party nominated a swarm of candidates from Haslemere, Godalming, Churt and other places to stand for Farnham seats? Also, as we all know, the Haslemere and Cranleigh areas have a number of Conservative Councillors and when choosing the Executive I offered places on it to all the Parties but the Conservative leadership declined the offer. Perhaps these sudden concerns about geographical representation might be better directed elsewhere?"

- 15.3 The Deputy Leader, Cllr Paul Follows, added that he understood that no one from Cranleigh had served on the Executive for the last 11 years of Conservative control; and that all councillors had signed a declaration of acceptance of office as Waverley Members, not just representatives of their Ward.

**Secretary's note:**

**Subsequent to the Council meeting, it was noted that:**

**Cllr Mike Band (Cons), ward Member for Cranleigh North and Shamley Green, was a member of the Executive from May 2007 to May 2014.**

**Cllr Stewart Stennett (Cons), ward Member for Cranleigh East, was a member of the Executive from December 2014 to August 2015.**

CNL16/19 MOTIONS (Agenda item 7.)

No motions had been received.

CNL17/19 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Agenda item 8.)

- 17.1 It was moved by the Leader of the Council, duly seconded by the Deputy Leader, and

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive held on 9 July 2019 be received and noted.**

The Leader reported that there was one Part I item recommended to Council, and there had been two requests to speak in relation to Part II of the Minutes.

**CNL 17.2 REVISED STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- 17.2.1 The Leader introduced the revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). This had last been updated in 2014, and there was a need to update it every five years. There had been no changes in circumstances since 2014 in terms of legislation, policy or guidance that warranted more than a 'light touch' review. The proposed amendments reflected changes in legislation, factual updates, and new consultation methods reflecting wider use of social media. The SCI set out the minimum level of consultation the council would

do and was not prescriptive.

17.2.2 Cllr Goodridge welcomed the 'light touch' review, but suggested that it would have been helpful to provide a version of the SCI with 'tracked changes' so that Members could see clearly the proposed amendments. He was pleased that there was no suggestion that Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) might be re-opened, and asked when the new Executive proposed to bring forward Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2).

17.2.3 A number of Members echoed the sentiments regarding showing tracked changes to documents, and Cllr Adams asked for a response on the issues that were causing a delay, which Development Management policies had not been finalised, which site allocations were still outstanding, and the planned date for adoption of LPP2.

17.2.4 The Leader reported that the Executive was considering the next steps in relation to LPP1, and the work on LPP2 would follow on from that.

17.2.5 Cllr Hyman advised Members that he had checked the proposed changes and confirmed that they were very minor, but there was a departure from the requirement to consult on the SCI itself, and a number of other matters that he had covered in his proposed amendments, as follows:

**“That the Revised Statement of Community Involvement 2019 be adopted as an extension to the 2014 document, subject to**

- (a) the insertion of “9.16 The Tests of Soundness are:” prior to the relevant text box, and changing the reference in paragraph 9.21 from “9.15” to “9.16” as appropriate, and**
- (b) delegation to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader, prior to publication, of**
  - (i) the correction of paragraph 5.2, and**
  - (ii) the reinstatement of consultation upon changes to the SCI in paragraph 8.4, and**
  - (iii) the insertion of a paragraph clearly explaining the Council’s policy regarding the provision of advice and assistance in making and modifying Neighbourhood development Plans, if necessary to ensure compliance with s18 subsection 2 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004,**

**and that Members instruct Officers to prepare an assessment of the effectiveness of the SCI as a priority, to inform a public consultation upon the appropriate revision and adoption of an improved SCI as soon as reasonably possible.”**

The amendment was seconded by Cllr Potts.

17.2.6 Speaking the amendment, Cllr Follows, Cllr Beaman, Cllr MacLeod and Cllr Ward agreed that a tracked changes version of the revised SCI would have been helpful, but it was hard to follow the proposed amendments at such short notice. Cllr Ward commented that he would not be supporting the amendment, but if Council had concerns, he would ask that the SCI be given

an early review.

- 17.2.7 As a point of personal explanation, Cllr Hyman noted that the SCI had not been scrutinised by Overview & Scrutiny, and the formatting had been amended been Executive and Council. His amendment was fairly simple, but without it in his view the SCI would not be lawful and he would vote against it.
- 17.2.8 The Mayor asked the Borough Solicitor to comment on the amendment. In response the Borough Solicitor, Daniel Bainbridge, commented that the formatting suggestion under (a) was acceptable; and the 'correction' to paragraph 5.2 was unnecessary. He would not comment on the matters in b(ii) and b(iii) without further detail, and questioned whether Council would be happy with the proposed delegation.
- 17.2.9 Cllr Follows was concerned that Council was being 'bounced' into considering a detailed amendment at short notice, and Cllr Palmer suggested that a way forward would be to agree the SCI in front of Council, and to review it as soon as possible. Cllr Cosser agreed that it was disappointing the amendment had been brought forward so late, and he wanted assurance that all the matters raised in it would be considered.
- 17.2.10 Cllr Hyman's amendment, seconded by Cllr Potts, was put to the vote:  
 For = 24 votes, Against = 25 votes, Abstentions = 2  
 The amendment was therefore lost.
- 17.2.11 Cllr Follows proposed an amendment, **to delegate temporary powers to the Leader and to the Planning Portfolio Holder in order to make the necessary amendments, to draft those and to bring them to the next available Full Council for ratification by this Chamber.** The amendment was seconded by Cllr Beaman. Cllr Peter Martin reminded Council that the delegation would need to be to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Leader and Planning Portfolio, which Cllr Follows accepted.
- 17.2.12 The Mayor reminded Members that it was important that the SCI was adopted by Council this evening, as there would not be time to bring further revisions back to Council before mid-August.
- 17.2.13 Cllr Follows therefore agreed to amend the wording of his amendment to read, **that the current recommendation to approve this document, with its known and noted inaccuracies, plus the amendment to allow that delegation to rectify that, so this document would be therefore be valid upon passing, and the recommendation to amend would then be brought back to the next Full Council in September or October, whenever it is, so that this Chamber can review it properly then.**
- 17.2.14 The Mayor put the amendment to the vote:  
 For = 47 votes, Against = 1, Abstentions = 1  
 The amendment was therefore carried.

17.2.15 The Leader summed up by endorsing the recommendation to adopt the SCI, as amended by Cllr Follows, and it was

RESOLVED that the Statement of Community Involvement be adopted, subject to a delegation to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Leader and the Planning Portfolio Holder to make the necessary amendments, to draft those and to bring them to the next available Full Council for ratification by this Chamber.

### **CNL 17.3 MATTERS OF REPORT**

#### **General Fund Financial Out-turn Report 018/19 (EXE 6/19)**

Cllr Hyman noted that the Special Executive on 27 March 2019 had approved a virement from the budget for the Frensham Heathland Hub to settle the contract on the Memorial Hall, which had been justified on the basis that grant-funding had been sought to fund the Frensham Heathland Hub. The grant application had not been successful and there was now a £780, 000 budget gap on the Heathland Hub. Had any consideration been given to using the budget surplus to fund this project?

#### **Funding bid – Alfold Sports and Social Club (EXE 8/19)**

Cllr Deanus advised that he had been involved with the Alfold Sports and Social Club and Alfold Village Hall for many years, and the funding granted would enable significant improvements to be made. He thanked officers, and Cllr Beaman and the previous Finance Portfolio Holder, Ged Hall, for their work in bringing this forward, and looked forward to more of this kind of support for community facilities.

#### **Appointments to Outside Bodies (EXE9/19)**

Cllr Peter Martin welcomed the appointment of Cllrs Jack Lee and Paul Follows as Armed Forces Champions, but was disappointed to note there were still some appointments outstanding, and asked when it was expected that these would be filled?

The Leader responded that he accepted the comments about outstanding appointments, and he hoped to have appointments completed soon. He would be wanting appointees to report back on their outside bodies in due course.

### **CNL18/19 MINUTES OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE (Agenda item 9.)**

18.1 It was moved by the Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Robert Knowles, duly seconded by the Deputy Chairman, Cllr Peter Clark, and

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Licensing & Regulatory Committee held on 17 June 2019 be received and noted.**

18.2 The Chairman reported that there no matters for Council to consider in Part I, and he had received no requests from Members to speak on the matter in Part II.

CNL19/19 MINUTES OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE (Agenda item 10.) (Pages 11 - 14)

19.1 It was moved by the Chairman of the Committee, Cllr John Robini, duly seconded by the Deputy Chairman, Cllr Michael Goodridge, and

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Licensing & Regulatory Committee held on 1 July 2019 be received and noted.**

The Chairman reported that there were four matters in Part I recommended to the Council.

**CNL 19.2 DEFINITION OF THE PRINCIPAL OPPOSITION GROUP WITHIN THE COUNCIL**

19.2.1 The Standards Committee had reviewed the wording of the Constitution that described the Executive and the position of political groups within the Council, and recommended minor amendments as set out in the Annexe to the Minutes that clearly defined the Principal Opposition Group as the largest group not represented on the Executive.

19.2.2 It was moved by the Chairman, and duly seconded by the Deputy Chairman, and

**RESOLVED that the amendments to the Constitution, Part 1 (Summary and Explanation) paragraphs 4.0 and 5.3; and Part 4 (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules) paragraph 1, as set out in the Annexe to the Standards Committee minutes, be approved.**

**CNL 19.3 REINSTATEMENT OF INFORMAL QUESTIONS BEFORE MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

19.3.1 The Chairman reported that this proposal had come from the Executive, and it reflected their wish for there to be the opportunity for a greater level of engagement with residents. The proposal allowed for up to 15 minutes of informal questions prior to the start of meetings of the Executive, where members of the public can come to the Council Chamber and ask a question within having given prior notice. The detail of the amendments to the Council Procedure Rule 10, and the Executive Procedure Rule 2.9, were set out in the Annexe to the Minutes.

19.3.2 The Leader and Deputy Leader endorsed the recommendation, which was they saw as the first step of many they wished to take to make the Council more open and transparent.

19.3.3 Cllr Hyman welcomed the move, and looked forward to informal questions also being reinstated before Council meetings. Cllr Reed also welcomed the move, which would open up the opportunity for engagement to those less able to submit written questions.

19.3.4 It was moved by the Chairman, duly seconded by Cllr Follows, and

**RESOLVED that informal questions be reinstated before meetings of**



the Executive , and the amendments to the Council Procedure Rule 10, and the Executive Procedure Rule 2.9, set out in the Annexe to the Minutes of the Standards Committee be approved.

#### **CNL 19.4 AMENDMENTS TO THE REMITS OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

19.4.1 The Chairman advised that the Committee had considered a proposal to amend the remits of the Environment and Community Wellbeing Overview & Scrutiny Committees. The Chairman reported that since the Standards Committee meeting, he had received feedback from Overview & Scrutiny Members about the proposed amendment. As a result, he wished to propose that the recommendation be withdrawn, and referred to the next meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Co-ordinating Board.

19.4.2 Cllr Follows seconded the amendment, that the recommendation be withdrawn, and thanked Cllr D'Arcy and Cllr Townsend for their helpful comments following the Standards Committee meeting.

19.4.3 There were no further speakers on the amendment, which was carried without opposition. It was then moved by the Chairman, duly seconded and

**RESOLVED that the recommendation be withdrawn, and the matter referred to the next meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Co-ordinating Board.**

#### **CNL 19.4 AMENDMENT TO CALL-IN ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

19.4.1 The Chairman explained that the proposed amendment was a minor textual change that did not change the way the call-in arrangements operated for Members, but responded to a recommendation made by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman in a recent report, to provide clarification about the arrangements in relation to representations received on planning applications.

19.4.2 It was moved, duly seconded by Cllr Goodridge, and

**RESOLVED that the minor amendment to the Scheme of Delegation as shown in the agenda paper, be approved.**

The meeting concluded at 8.40 pm

Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Definition of Principal Opposition Group**Constitution, Part 1 (Summary and Explanation)**4.0 How decisions are made**

- The largest political group, or a combination of groups, shall form the administration of the Council (the Executive).
- The largest political group not represented on the Executive shall be the Principal Opposition Group.
- The Executive is the part of the Council which is responsible for delegated decisions.
- The Executive is made up of the Leader and up to nine councillors appointed by the Leader (including the Deputy Leader) with the Executive's responsibilities divided into areas of responsibility (portfolios), each member leading on a specific group of policy issues.
- When major decisions are to be discussed or made, these are published in the Executive's Forward Programme of Key Decisions in so far as they can be anticipated.
- If these major decisions are to be discussed with council officers at a meeting of the Executive, this will generally be open to councillors and the public to attend except where personal or confidential matters are being discussed.
- The Executive has to make decisions which are in line with the Council's overall policies and budget. If it wishes to make a decision which is outside the budget or policy framework, this must be referred to the Council as a whole to decide.

**5.0 Overview and Scrutiny Committees**

- 5.3 In the event of a single party Executive, the Chairmen of the four Overview and Scrutiny Committees shall be elected from nominations put forward by the largest minority political group on the Council (this can include non-members of the largest minority group or members of the majority group). The Chairmen of the four Overview and Scrutiny Committees shall be elected from nominations put forward by the Principal Opposition Group of the Council (this can include non-members of the Principal Opposition Group or members of the administration group(s)) subject to the total number of Opposition members on the Council exceeding 10% of the overall membership (in the current composition of the Council, this would equate to 6 members). The Vice-Chairman of each Overview and Scrutiny Committee

shall usually not be from the same political group as the Chairman. Without consent of the Council, no member can be Chairman or Vice-Chairman of more than one Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**NB. Amended Paragraph 5.3 to replace the equivalent wording in paragraph 1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution.**

---

## Reinstatement of Informal Questions

### Council Procedure Rules

#### 10. QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

##### 10.1 General

Members of the public who have a legitimate interest in the Borough, by way of work or residency, may ask a question at ordinary meetings of the Council, Executive and Committees. Questions by the public will not be included as an agenda item on agendas for Special or Extraordinary meetings. The rules for asking a written question are set out in Procedure Rules 10.2-10.7 below.

#### Written questions

##### 10.2 Notice of written questions

A written question may only be asked if notice has been given by delivering it in writing or by electronic mail to the Head of Policy and Governance no later than close of business (5.00pm), 4 clear working days before the day of the meeting. Each question must give the name and address of the questioner.

##### 10.3 Order of questions

Questions will be asked in the order notice of them was received, except that the Mayor or Chairman may group together similar questions.

##### 10.4 Number of questions

At any one meeting no person may submit more than 1 written question and no more than 1 such question may be asked on behalf of one organisation.

##### 10.5 Scope of questions

The Chief Executive may reject a question if it:

- is not a matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the Borough;
- is defamatory, frivolous or offensive;
- is substantially the same as a question which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the past six months;

- requires the disclosure of confidential or exempt information;
- is not substantially in the form of a question, or the length of the preamble is disproportionate to the question.

#### 10.6 Record of **written** questions

The Chief Executive will immediately send a copy of the question to the Chairman of the Executive and relevant Portfolio Holder. Where the Chief Executive recommends that the question be rejected, reasons for rejection will be stated.

Copies of all questions will be circulated and made available to councillors and the public attending the meeting. All **written** questions submitted will receive a prepared answer.

#### 10.7 Reference of question to the Executive

Unless the Mayor decides otherwise, no discussion will take place on any question, but any member may move that a matter raised by a question be referred to the Executive or the appropriate named Committee or Sub-Committee. Once seconded, such a motion will be voted on without discussion.

#### Informal questions at the Executive

10.8 Members of the public may ask informal questions of the Executive before the start of each ordinary meeting of the Executive, in accordance with the arrangements at Executive Procedure Rule 2.9

#### Petitions

#### 10.9 Presentation of petitions

Members of the public can submit petitions electronically through the Waverley website or in hard copy addressed to the Chief Executive. The petition will be dealt with in accordance with the Waverley Petition Scheme.

### Executive Procedure Rules

#### 2.9 Questions by the Public

##### Written questions

2.9.1 Members of the public may ask **written** questions at ordinary meetings of the Executive in accordance with the provisions in **Council** Procedure Rules **10.2 – 10.7**. The Leader and/or the Deputy Leader or appropriate Portfolio Holder should be invited to respond to the question.

## Informal questions

2.9.2 Informal questions may be asked of the Leader, Deputy Leader or an appropriate Portfolio Holder before the start of each ordinary meeting of the Executive for up to 15 minutes, including replies. No prior notice needs to be given. Questions will be taken in the order in which questioners register with the Democratic Services Officer prior to the start of question time. When read out, each question must be concluded within 2 minutes. In the event that it is not possible to give a verbal response, a written response will be provided following the meeting.