MINUTES of the WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the The Great Hall, Farnham Maltings, Bridge Sqaure, Farnham, GU9 7QR on 6 July 2021 at 6.00 pm

* Cllr John Robini (Mayor)
* Cllr John Ward (Deputy Mayor)

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

*Present

Apologies

6 July 2021 - Cllr Brian Adams, Cllr Roger Blishen, Cllr Brian Edmonds, Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass, Cllr Val Henry, Cllr George Hesse, Cllr Jacquie Keen, Cllr Penny Marriott, Cllr Peter Marriott, Cllr Peter Martin, Cllr Julia Potts, Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman and Cllr George Wilson

3 August 2021 - Cllr Kevin Deanus, Simon Dear, Brian Edmonds, George Hesse, Anna James, Jacquie Keen, Robert Knowles, Michaela Martin, Penny Rivers, Richard Seaborne, Liz Townsend and George Wilson

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, prayers were led by Reverend Chris Bessant from St Bartholomew's and St Christopher's in Haslemere.

.

CNL12/21 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda item)

12.1 The Mayor, Councillor Robini, welcomed Members and members of the public to the Council meeting, and introduced the Officers present: the Chief Executive, Tom Horwood; Strategic Directors, Graeme Clark and Annie Righton; Head of Policy & Governance, Robin Taylor; Head of Finance and Property, Peter Vickers; and Borough Solicitor, Daniel Bainbridge.

12.2 The Mayor advised that he would take Item 10 (Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee) before Item 9 (Minutes of the Executive). For ease of reference, minutes are listed below in the order they appeared in the agenda.

12.3 The Mayor confirmed that he was waiving Council Procedure Rule 21.1, the requirement for Members to stand to speak.

CNL13/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda item 1.)

13.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Adams, Blishen, Edmonds, Floyd-Douglass, Henry, Hesse, Ken, Knowles, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Peter Martin, Potts, Rosoman and Wilson. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Wicks.

CNL14/21 MINUTES (Agenda item 2.)

14.1 The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 20 and 27 April 2021 were confirmed and signed following the meeting.

CNL15/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda item 3.)

15.1 The Head of Policy and Governance advised that all members of the Senior Management Team had a personal interest in respect of item 9.2 (Options for collaboration with Guildford Borough Council) due to the HR implications set out in the Exempt Annexe and would leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

CNL16/21 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 4.)

16.1 The Mayor reflected on his first three months in office and welcomed coming out of the present covid restrictions. He praised the work of the staff, Councillors and volunteers in Waverley in supporting the community since March 2020. He had seen an increase in invitations to attend both public and private events across the borough.

16.2 The Mayor announced that he would be raising money for three local charities in his Mayoral year: 'A place to be', a youth club in Haslemere which he had helped to set up in the 1990s; the Hydestile Wildlife Hospital, which was currently looking for premises to house some of their injured

animals; and Skillway, a youth organisation which teaches skills to those that have not had the opportunity of a complete education.

16.3 The Mayor concluded by congratulating Councillor Cockburn on her being awarded the BEM for her work in planning.

CNL17/21 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 5.)

17.1 The Leader opened his announcements by thanking the officers for facilitating the meeting in the Farnham Maltings at short notice. He advised that he had concluded his 1:1 meetings with the Portfolio Holders to review their portfolios and revised descriptions would be circulated to all Members for their information in due course.

The Leader then invited Executive Portfolio Holders to give brief updates on current issues:

17.2 Councillor Clark, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Business Transformation and IT:

- A full time Cyber Security Manager had been employed to manage the Council's defence against cyber criminals and attacks and urged all staff, Councillors and residents to be on their guard.

17.3 Councillor MacLeod, Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy, Services and Brightwells:

- The Brightwells build was progressing well and the first completed apartments were due to be occupied later in the year. The commercial elements were due to open early in 2022.
- Local Plan Part 2 was due to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by the end of the year.

17.4 Councillor Merryweather, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Assets and Commercial Services:

- Expressed his thanks to the team for coordinating the Council meeting at the Maltings.

17.5 Councillor Mirylees, Portfolio Holder for Health, Wellbeing and Culture:

- Recipients of SLA funding had been visited and data was being gathered to shape the future funding priorities, including consulting with town and parish councils on their priorities for their communities post Covid.

17.6 Councillor Palmer, Portfolio Holder for Operational and Enforcement Services

- Parking usage had returned to average levels pre-Covid; and the next CIL round would start in September and bids for projects were welcomed.

17.7 Councillor Townsend, Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Parks and Leisure:

- The Economic Development team was developing its network through the Covid recovery action plan and the Council was working with Surrey University on a series of webinars on digital connectivity to commence in September.

- Officers were working on a Return to Leisure Strategy and visitor numbers were being monitored.
- Measures had been put in place to deter unauthorised parking around Frensham Pond. Levels of anti-social behaviour at Frensham were unacceptable and a zero tolerance approach had been adopted with all instances being reported to the Police.
- No Mow May had been successful and she thanked the Greenspaces team for their work in contributing to the biodiversity work in the borough.

17.8 Councillor Williams, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability:

- Options were being investigated for the development of a solar farm in the borough to create locally generated sustainable energy.
- Discussions with key stakeholders were ongoing for cycle storage in Farnham.
- Delivery of a retrofitted sustainable Memorial Hall was due in October 2021.
- The Council would be represented at the appeal against the refusal by Surrey County Council to allow the drilling for fossil fuels in Dunsfold.

CNL18/21 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 6.)

18.1. The Mayor advised that no questions had been submitted from members of the public.

CNL19/21 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Agenda item 7.)

19.1 The following question had been received from Councillor Knowles:

"Lloyd's Bank PLC have announced the closure of Haslemere Branch by the end of the year. In my memory Haslemere has two Lloyds Branches, two Nat West, a Midland (HSBC), a Barclays and a number of Building Society Branches including Woolwich, Abbey National, National & Provincial and Halifax. With the closure of Lloyds, there will be no bank or building society in the town, with a population in three counties of some 19000. What representations are the administration making to preserve some vital financial facility in Haslemere"

19.2 The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Townsend, gave the following response:

"Many banks have closed across Waverley in recent years due to decreased financial viability, with customers moving online. The problem is now particularly acute in Haslemere with the news that the last bank in the town (Lloyds) is to close in the autumn. Although the borough is currently well served for post offices which are providing more financial services, there remains a particular issue with regard to access to cash through the day and night.

The Economic Development team has been working with Haslemere Town Council (HTC) and Haslemere Chamber to request installation of a cash machine in the town centre. A proposed site owned by HTC in the central car park was circulated to providers together with evidence of significant local footfall. There was unfortunately little interest pre-Covid. However, with the news of the last bank closure, we have asked the cash point providers to urgently reconsider the situation. We have also provided HTC with details for the CEO of Link and Jeremy Hunt, MP has written to him to support the case for a cash point in Haslemere.

We have put Lloyds mobile banking team in touch with Haslemere Town Council to discuss the provision of a mobile banking service, along the lines of the van they offer in Cranleigh."

19.3 The Leader of the Council asked the following question:

"Several experienced members of this council have suggested in the press that LPP2 has a relationship to our five-year housing land supply, for example more recently in analysing our successful defence of the planning appeal for Land at Lower Weybourne Lane, for which I congratulate our team.

It is my understanding that this relationship is minimal and that LPP2 (although desirable) will not resolve many of the issues the planning system causes for Waverley Borough Council

Could the Head of Planning / PfH for planning outline what (if any) relationship LPP2 has to housing land supply and could they comment upon planning issues facing Waverley Borough Council that are not resolved by LPP2?"

19.4 The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Macleod responded as follows:

"The government's requirement for a five-year housing land supply means the Council must provide evidence that enough homes in the Borough can realistically be completed within five years to meet the housing needed. Although it is desirable to have housing allocations in LPP2 adopted to provide some certainty for our communities, this does not mean that the homes on allocated sites within a Local Plan can automatically be included within the five-year supply, as such housing can only be included where there is clear evidence that the housing will be completed within five years. For the purposes of demonstrating a five-year housing supply the onus is on the Council to provide the evidence to demonstrate these sites will deliver housing within that period, which is not the case with every proposed allocation in either LPP2 or even in the already adopted Part 1.

It is also important to point out that the Local Plan is not the only plan allocating sites for housing in the Borough. Some of our local communities have decided to carry out their own site allocations for housing in their neighbourhood plans. Although excellent progress has been made within the Borough overall, some expected housing allocations within neighbourhood plans have yet to be made. As it currently stands LPP2 is only proposing to allocate around 200 homes in Witley parish and approximately 300 in Haslemere, which equates to less than 5% of our total housing requirement for the Local Plan period to 2032 . In Haslemere, most of the sites currently proposed for allocation in LPP2 lie within the built-up area or are on brownfield land; development which current strategic policies adopted in Local Plan Part 1 supports. It is not the case that these brownfield sites have to wait until LPP2 is adopted before they can proceed through the planning application process. Progress in housing being delivered on these sites is therefore not reliant on LPP2 being adopted.

Accordingly, whilst we fully recognise the importance of Local Plan Part 2 and are working hard to take it through to submission to the Secretary of State, simply adopting this Plan will not, in itself, alter the Council's current position of not being

able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, without which countryside areas outside of the Green Belt will continue to be targeted by the development industry. What is really needed, is for sufficient full or reserved matters planning applications to be granted for housing on suitable sites and for developers to get on with delivering on the outstanding planning permissions for almost 3000 homes within the borough that have yet to be commenced."

CNL20/21 MOTIONS (Agenda item 8.)

20.1 The Mayor advised that no motions had been received.

CNL21/21 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Agenda item 9.)

21.1 It was moved by the Leader, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 22 June 2021 be received and noted.

21.2 There were three Part I matters, for Council consideration, from the meeting on 22 June 2021.

CNL22/21 EXE 6/21 LGBCE BOUNDARY REVIEW - WARDING PATTERN SUBMISSION (Agenda item 9.1)

22.1 The Leader of the Council introduced the report which set out the proposals of the Cross Party Working Group to inform the work of the Boundary Commission in their review of the warding patterns in the borough, based on the knowledge of local councillors. With the Mayor's consent, he invited the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ward to speak to the item as the Chairman of the Working Group.

22.2 Councillor Ward advised that following a number of meetings, a broad consensus had been reached. He stressed that the Boundary Commission's timetable had not been altered by the Government in light of the pandemic. A number of cases had been presented by officers and the working group sought as far as possible to avoid single member wards and retain two member wards in the four main towns in the borough and three member wards in the larger rural wards. It was noted that the Boundary Commission was not obliged to follow the Council's advice however it was hoped that it would inform their work. Their final recommendations would be published in October for a further period of consultation before being submitted to Parliament for final approval.

22.3 Councillor Seaborne felt that some of the groupings did not make geographical sense and that there were some numerical differences in the projected figures, however acknowledged the work that had gone into the report and the challenges presented although did not feel able to support the recommendations.

22.4 Councillor Gray disagreed with a number of the geographical groupings and would not be supporting the recommendations. Councillor Nicholson praised the piece of work and welcomed the recommendations. Councillor Goodridge was concerned that three Members representing seven villages and five Parish Councils would be difficult to sustain and there would be a

significant amount of travelling for eastern village Members and would not be able to support the recommendations.

22.5 Councillor Cockburn expressed concern over the proposals for wards in Farnham and felt that the proposals did not follow the natural boundaries.

22.6 The Leader of the Council thanked Councillors for their comments and echoed the comments made about the time which had been spent on this piece of work. He stressed that remote working would enable Members to cover a larger geographical area going forward and noted that the Boundary Commission were not obliged to take the Council's recommendations into account when making their final report. The Leader requested a recorded vote in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4 and the Council

RESOLVED that a submission on future warding patterns be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England comprising Option 2 on Annexe 1 and illustrated in Annexe 2; plus the qualitative comments on warding issues as set out in Annexe 3 of the report.

For (25)
Councillors Baker, Beaman, Clark, D'Arcy, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Gale, Heagin, Hunt, Hyman, MacLeod, Michaela Martin, Merryweather, Mirylees, Neale, Nicholson, Palmer, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Mr Mayor Councillor Robini, Townsend, Mr Deputy Mayor Councillor Ward, Wicks and Williams.

Against (5)
Councillors David Else, Foryszewski, Gray, Isherwood and James,

Abstentions (10)
Councillor Cockburn, Cosser, Deanus, Dear, Ellis, Jenny Else, Goodridge, Mulliner, Sadler and Seaborne.

CNL23/21 EXE 7/21 - OPTIONS FOR COLLABORATION WITH GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL (Agenda item 9.2)

23.1 At 6.54pm, the members of the Senior Management Team left the room and were not present for the duration of this item.

23.2 The Leader of the Council introduced and moved the recommendation and amendment, which was duly seconded by Councillor Clark, to submit a further report to Council setting out draft heads of terms of the joint inter authority agreement, the draft job description for a joint chief executive and the establishment of a joint appointments committee.

23.3 Councillor Mulliner raised a point of order relating to missing information from South East Employers. It was noted that supplementary papers had been circulated to Members by email the previous Friday and published to the Modern.gov app. In addition to this, hard copies were circulated by officers in the meeting to those Members who were missing the document. The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 7.10pm to enable Members to read the supplementary document.

23.4 The Mayor resumed the meeting at 7.23pm. Councillor Mulliner proposed deferring the item to a future meeting on the grounds that the cost sharing advice from South East Employers was missing, which was duly seconded by Councillor Cosser, and this was debated. Some Members expressed concern that there had not been sufficient time to consider the material. Those opposed to the motion to defer felt that Members had received the relevant information with sufficient time to consider and that the amendment proposed by the Leader would address those concerns. In addition, it was felt that there was a financial imperative to achieving the savings set out in the report and avoiding any further delay. At the conclusion of the debate, the Mayor called for a vote on the deferral which was lost: votes in favour 15; votes against 22; abstentions 2.

23.5 In response to questions from Members, the Leader clarified the purpose of the recommendation and amendment which was to authorise officers to begin the process to bring further information back to a further meeting of the Council and read it out so that Members could write it down in the absence of facilities to print the recommendations for Members to read. Councillor Mulliner proposed an amended wording to include arrangements for sharing costs, liabilities and savings and the Leader agreed that this wording be included in his amendment. The Mayor called for a vote on the amendment which was carried: votes in favour 22; votes against 8; abstentions 8.

23.6 There followed a lengthy debate on the substantive issue and Councillors Beaman, Clark, Cockburn, Cosser, Dickson, Deanus, Jenny Else, Foryszewski, Goodridge, Gray, Hyman, MacLeod, Merryweather, Mulliner, Palmer and Williams made comments. Some Councillors expressed concern that the proposals were premature and should be looked at as part of the budget process for next year. There would be significant upfront costs which would cancel out any immediate savings, and the projected savings were not significant enough to justify the upheaval of a major change in the way the Council operates. There was also concern expressed that the vision for collaboration was not achievable and that there would be an impact on the staff. Some Councillors spoke in support of pursuing option b set out in the report, that some form of collaboration should be supported and other ways to achieve savings should be looked at, but that it was felt that further information and clarity was needed. There was a suggestion that it be considered by the Audit Committee in view of the risks involved.

23.7 Some Councillors felt that the financial pressures on the Council due to Government cutbacks required it to identify savings and therefore it was not appropriate to delay the proposals any further. It was felt that officers had been neutral and professional, setting out the risks for Members to consider but noting that not all risks were likely to happen and all risks could be mitigated by the Inter Authority Agreement, which would come back to Council for approval. The proposals would increase the resilience of both Councils to face the financial pressures by increased collaborative working. Some felt that the proposals provided an opportunity to be ahead of the curve and offer advice to neighbours going through a similar process in the future.

23.8 The Leader summed up the debate by responding to some of the concerns expressed. The collaboration would be evidence and business case led, but

also politically led due to both organisations being political entities. The recommendations gave an opportunity to take action to make savings and reminded Members that there would be further opportunities to scrutinise each stage of the collaboration. There was a brief discussion on whether the recommendations could be taken separately and officers advised that due to the interdependency of the recommendations, that they should be voted on together.

23.9 The Leader requested a recorded vote, in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, supported by five Members and it was

RESOLVED that

1. **Full Council pursues the option of creating a single management team, comprised of statutory officers (Head of Paid Service; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer), directors and heads of service as the most appropriate means for bringing forward business cases for future collaboration;**
2. **Full Council asks the Council's HR Manager to take the necessary action, in consultation with Guildford Borough Council and with the support and advice from South East Employers and as set out within the addendum to annexe 3 of this report, to make arrangements for a recruitment and selection of a single joint Chief Executive (acting as Head of Paid Service for both Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils), including making arrangements for a senior officer recruitment panel (to include the Leader of the Principal Opposition Group and the Council Leader), so that a report may be brought to a future meeting of Full Council recommending the appointment of a suitable candidate; and**
3. **A report be submitted to a session of full council on the following matters a) heads of terms for the proposed Inter Authority Agreement to establish governance arrangements for joint working and identify how costs, liabilities and savings will be shared b) the proposed Job Description and Terms and Conditions in respect of the appointment of a joint Chief Executive and c) the establishment of a joint appointments committee including its composition.**

For (23)
Councillors Baker, Beaman, Clark, D'Arcy, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Gale, Heagin, Hunt, MacLeod, Michaela Martin, Merryweather, Mirylees, Neale, Nicholson, Palmer, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Mr Mayor Councillor Robini, Townsend, Mr Deputy Mayor Councillor Ward and Williams.

Against (16)
Councillors Cockburn, Cosser, Deanus, Dear, Ellis, David Else, Jenny Else, Foryszewski, Goodridge, Gray, Isherwood, James, Mulliner, Sadler, Seaborne and Wicks.

Abstentions (1)
Councillor Hyman

At 9.10pm the Mayor adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break and resumed the meeting at 9.15pm at which point the members of the Senior Management Team returned to the meeting.

CNL24/21 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (Agenda item 9.3)

24.1 At 9.15pm, the Mayor moved the recommendation and it was **RESOLVED** that, pursuant to Procedure Rule 20 and in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following Property matter on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information (as defined by Section 100I of the Act) of the description specified Paragraph 3 of the revised Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, namely: Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

CNL25/21 EXE 8/21 - PROPERTY MATTER (Agenda item 9.4)

25.1 At 9.15pm, the Council moved into Exempt session to consider the recommendations set out in the Exempt report.

25.2 At 9.50pm, in accordance with Procedure Rule 9, Council **RESOLVED** to extend the meeting by 30 minutes to 10.30pm at which point the meeting would stand adjourned.

25.3 The Mayor moved the recommendations set out in the Exempt report (as amended in the Exempt session), which the Council **RESOLVED** to agree, by 24 votes in favour; 14 against and 1 abstention.

For (24)
Councillors Baker, Beaman, Clark, D'Arcy, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Gale, Heagin, Hunt, Hyman, MacLeod, Michaela Martin, Merryweather, Mirylees, Neale, Nicholson, Palmer, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Mr Mayor Councillor Robini, Townsend, Mr Deputy Mayor Councillor Ward and Williams.

Against (14)
Councillors Cockburn, Cosser, Deanus, Dear, Ellis, David Else, Jenny Else, Goodridge, Gray, Isherwood, James, Mulliner, Sadler and Seaborne.

Abstention (1)
Councillor Foryszewski

CNL26/21 MINUTES OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE (Agenda item 10.)

26.1 It was moved by Cllr Goodridge, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded and **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 14 June 2021 be approved received and noted.

26.2 There were no matters for Council consideration in Part I, and no requests to speak on Part II matters.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 10.30pm to be reconvened at a future date.

The Mayor resumed the meeting at 6.00pm on Tuesday 3 August 2021.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kevin Deanus, Simon Dear, Brian Edmonds, George Hesse, Anna James, Jacquie Keen, Robert Knowles, Michaela Martin, Penny Rivers, Richard Seaborne, Liz Townsend and George Wilson.

CNL27/21 EXECUTIVE MINUTES - PART II MATTERS FOR INFORMATION (Agenda item)

27.1 The Mayor invited the following councillors who had registered to speak on Part II matters to make their statement:

27.2 In respect of EXE 9/21 (Mental Health report from Community O&S Committee), Councillor Foryszewski thanked the Leader and former Leader for taking such a sensitive subject on board and agreeing a constructive approach, thanked the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, all Members and officers for their work on this issue.

27.4 In respect of EXE 9/21 (Mental Health report from Community O&S Committee), Councillor Hyman reiterated the comments he made at the Executive meeting on 22 June 2021 and asked that percentages of staff to be trained and costs should be brought back to a future meeting of the Executive.

27.6 In respect of EXE 11/21 (Take the Jump), Councillor Hyman felt that the recommendations in the report were virtue signalling and that the Council should not be taking part in the initiative.

27.8 In respect of EXE 12/21 (Capital Projects), Councillor Hyman felt that the recommendations should be put before the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for consideration before spending money on feasibility studies.

The reconvened meeting ended at 6.13pm on Tuesday 3 August 2021

Mayor