

THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 21ST FEBRUARY 2002

BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE

**AT THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE,
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN,
STAINES ON THURSDAY 21ST FEBRUARY, 2002 AT 7.30PM**

Amos Mrs P C	Forsbrey G E	Ponton Mrs J E
Appleyard M A	Fullbrook J M	Read E I J
Ayers F	Grant Mrs D L	Searancke E J
Beardsmore I J	Hermes A W	Sider R W (Deputy Mayor)
Blampied G G	Hirst A P	Smith J E H
Burrell L J W	James P R	Smith Mrs P A
Ceaser G S	Martin Mrs M J	Smith-Ainsley R A
Crabb T W	Napper Mrs I	Stubbs T
Culnane E K	Norcross Mrs G A	Trussler G F
Davies F (Leader)	O'Hara E	Watkins R
Drinkwater H V (Mayor)	Packman J D (Deputy Leader)	Weston Mrs P
Fisher C M	Paton J M	Wood-Dow Mrs J M

Mr M. Litvak the Chairman of the Standards Committee was also in attendance

H.V. Drinkwater, Mayor, in the Chair

38/02 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors V. Agarwal, Mrs M. Hyams, Ms Leedham and Mrs H.E.L. Mellett.

39/02 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13th December 2001, were approved as a correct record.

40/02 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Under Standing Order 12, Mr L.J.F. Brotherton of 1 Link Way, Staines asked the following question to the Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor G.S. Ceaser: -

"I have come here tonight to this council meeting to complain about and protest at the council's handling of the planning application for the erection of mobile phone mast. The manner in which the council has carried out this exercise leaves many questions.

To get an answer to why when related to the mobile phone mast it be sited at the corner of Link Way and the Glade, a survey of 39 separate houses produced the following result:

33 Households	Against
6 Households	Unable to contact
0 Households	In favour

1.

The planning application was approved and, as one Orange phone user observed, what for – reception is good around here.

2. The council committee which passed this planning application, together with 5 other masts, did not have a representative of the wards affected.
3. There was a cheaper safer solution to the problem available.
4. The planning department of the council were so secretive and unhelpful.
 - a. Only a fraction of the households affected were notified.
 - b. No notice was put up in our road, only a single miniscule sheet posted on a telegraph pole which is in a cul de sac and never seen by 80% of the households affected.
 - c. The notice failed to give details of what kind of mast Micro, Macro, etc.
 - d. The notice failed to give the energy of the radiation transmitted by the mast.
 - e. The notice failed to give information on the frequency of the radiation emitted by the mast.
 - f. The notice of the actual power output of the mast now or its possible power in the future.
 - g. The notice gave no warning of possible risks to residents from radiation emitted by the mast.
 - h. No indication whatever was given that there were to be 5 additional masts to be erected.

Trying to get additional information from the planning department was difficult leaving me with the feeling that every detail had to be levered out of them.

Phone calls to the council offices to attempt to speak to Mr Peters were ignored. Mr Peters' secretary when questioned said that she had informed him and that she could not explain why he had not spoken to me.

The one officer of the council that I spoke to referred me to the STEWART REPORT saying that there was no danger from the mobile phone masts.

I have read the Stewart Report and I was looking for the words No Risks, No Danger, Absolutely Safe and I did not find them in a single paragraph. But then having spent a large part of my working life working on radiological safety, I knew that no-one would be that positive.

At this moment in time the damage that radiation can do from mobile phone mast is unknown and it will take 10 to 15 years to have any idea of the risks involved, until such time we should avoid them at all cost where possible. Remember using a mobile phone is a personal choice. A mobile phone mast is like passive smoking, you know it is harmful but its difficult to avoid.

Another problem is that the council could have opened the floodgates and have to let other mobile phone companies have the same rights. There are only 8 houses in our street, we could end up with one outside each house.

The Hounslow council had the same problem and they held meetings with the public and with representatives of Orange present and then voted against the planning application. Why did the Spelthorne Council react in the same way?

The mobile phone company Orange spend a great deal of money and effort advertising their products. So if there was nothing to hide why did they not send all

of Spelthorne's residents leaflets saying how lucky we are that they have selected our area to erect mobile phone masts.

Orange even used a subsidiary company, Waycom, so that in years to come it will be more difficult to sue them for damaging the health of people.

The cigarette companies and asbestos manufacturers suppressed information on the effects their products were having on their health for as long as possible in pursuit of profits.

Orange and other mobile phone companies do seem to be acting in a similar manner.

Finally, I would like the council to explain why in writing that they cannot reverse their decision and get the mobile phone masts moved and replaced up by one of the reservoirs by a single macro mast with a Orange of 22 miles where it will be of no danger whatsoever to the residents of Spelthorne."

Councillor Ceaser replied as follows:

"I acknowledge receipt of the concerns set out in the letter from Mr Brotherton and I have instigated a full response from the Council's Head of Planning Services. Many of the points of concern raised by Mr Brotherton, especially those relating to health matters, fall entirely outside the control of the Council. When dealing with any telecommunication developments less than 15 metres in height only siting and appearance can be considered - nothing else at all. From the report I have instigated I am satisfied that all relevant issues were properly taken into account. For the record however I would add that the mast was 8 metres in height and the application had to be decided with in 42 days and was therefore delegated to Officers and did not come before Committee. The pole is designed as a brown telephone pole and the siting and appearance could only be considered. There are other poles in the vicinity and it was considered suitable. There are no grounds to rescind or revoke the decision once made and we can only consider the application as submitted to us.

However in order to deal with Mr Brotherton's concerns in detail I have asked the Head of Planning to forward a copy of the report on the investigations undertaken direct to Mr Brotherton which I hope gives a more satisfactory answer but if not please let me know."

Due to the number of questions being asked (under standing order 12) of the Leader of the Council on the closure of Clarence Street Bridge works in Staines the Leader indicated that he would listen to all questions first then he would make his response.

Under Standing Order 12, the following questions relating to the closure off Clarence Street Bridge works in Staines was asked of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies.

Barbara Hunt representing the Staines Town Society asked the following questions:

"We are very concerned to hear that east bound traffic is to be diverted along Church Street for at least nine months, with the consequent loss of trade to small businesses in the Conservation Area and the potential for structural damage being caused to the older buildings by very heavy lorries, once the existing 7.5 ton limit is removed.

Whilst appreciating that it may be necessary for vehicles servicing some High Street shops to be diverted along this route, Two Rivers (or Staines by-pass) should be the preferred route for any other heavy traffic heading east. No vehicles over the 7.5 ton limit should be coming into Staines over Staines Bridge and it is unlikely that lorries going west along Clarence Street should want to double-back along Church Street. Therefore, the majority of large vehicles approaching Staines and heading east would be coming along Wraysbury Road, from M25, making the Hale Street entrance to Two Rivers the nearest, widest and most suitable route. There would be less threat of physical damage to either pedestrians or buildings from heavy lorries and less traffic pollution would be caused. Therefore we wish to raise the following questions:

Will the 7.5 ton limit on Staines Bridge be rigorously enforced to reduce the number of heavy lorries going through the Church Street/Bridge Street junction? (Why not with CCTV?)

What steps are to be taken to monitor any movement caused by subsidence and vibration to the old Church Street buildings, which have very shallow foundations on unstable sub-soil? The County Council should at least carry out a structural survey of the listed buildings and apply 'tell-tale' monitoring?"

Mr Ray Blowers of Blowers Hairdressers, 21 Church Street, Staines asked the following question:

"Why has it taken so long for Spelthorne Council to do anything about the problems Church Street and Clarence Street will encounter with reference to the repair of the Clarence Street bridge and diversion of traffic through Church Street?"

Mr R. King of 15/17 Church Street, Staines on behalf of the forty plus businesses operating in Church Street asked the following questions:

Can the Council confirm what other diversion routes were considered, the reason these were turned down and why only Church Street has been proposed?

Can the Council explain why in 1987 a 7.5 ton weight limit was applied to Church Street and now at the stroke of a pen it has been cancelled?

Can the Council guarantee that the bridge in Church Street is able to withstand an increase in vehicle weight from 7.5 ton to up to 44 tons?

Will the Council undertake to carefully and strictly monitor the levels of air pollution/vibration and noise disturbance in Church Street for the duration of the diversion?

Can the Council confirm there will be no alteration to the current number of parking bays in Church Street and the waiting time restriction on these bays?

Can the Council confirm that the facility to deliver/load and unload by both public and delivery carriers to businesses in Church Street will be unaffected by the diversion?

What form of compensation will be paid to businesses in Church Street who may find that their turnover is seriously reduced owing to the diversion?

What contingency plans have been produced in the event of traffic gridlock at this end of the town caused by the diversion?

Will the Council confirm that the £50,000 given to them by the Developers of Two Rivers for environmental improvements to Church Street is being held in a separate account? That the balance of that money not already spent will be used to provide the improvements promised nearly two years ago?"

Councillor E. O'Hara, ward councillor for Staines Town, asked the following questions to the Leader of the Council:

"Would the Leader report on any further matters arising out of bridge repair works in Clarence Street, and would he also please ensure that a report is presented to the Executive to investigate assisting with the resurfacing of Gorings Square in view of its de facto use as a right of way and bearing in mind the Church Street traders ability to contribute to the costs?"

Prior to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies, responding to the above questions he outlined the importance of members of the public sticking to the questions they had submitted and read out the second question submitted by the Staines Town Society and confirmed that he would investigate whether the buildings in Church Street were listed.

The Leader of the Council replied as follows:

"The work being carried out to strengthen the Clarence Street Bridge is being managed by Surrey County Council. The Borough Councils only involvement with this scheme was to draft and advertise the necessary traffic orders as instructed by the County Council who were responsible for designing the diversionary routes being proposed. Similarly the Borough Council have had no involvement in consultation with the local community or advising them of the proposed works. Again this is the responsibility of the County Council. As I understand it the works are essential as the Clarence Street Bridge has failed its strength assessment and without this work being carried out would have to have a weight limit imposed on it. This would mean large vehicles which could not pass under the Iron Bridge in London Road would have no other means of accessing Staines Town Centre.

The weight limit imposed on the bridge in Church Street is an environmental restriction and not a restriction based on the condition of the bridge. It is therefore perfectly capable of carrying all highway traffic.

As a result of discussions with Surrey County Council last week the County have reassured us that the 7.5 tonne weight limit on Staines Bridge will remain in place, temporary traffic lights will be installed to replace the existing traffic light system at the junction of Clarence Street with Bridge Street and these temporary lights together with all the other traffic lights around the Town Centre will be closely monitored by the County's traffic signal engineers to ensure disruption and congestion is minimized.

The County have agreed to fund a traffic warden who will be employed by the Police to ensure that the parking restrictions in the area are strictly enforced once again to ensure that any disruption which could be caused by illegal parking is kept to a minimum. This should also help with the loading and unloading to the businesses in Church Street and the surrounding area.

Recognizing the additional traffic being diverted along Church Street dedicated noise and vibration engineers will regularly monitor Church Street during the works.

I am now satisfied that the County Council are taking the concerns of local businesses and residents seriously and will work with the local community to minimize the inconvenience caused by these essential works. I understand that last Friday County Councillor Carruthers met with traders and the County Council have written to all the residents and businesses in the area explaining the need for the works and providing them with a contact telephone number which should be used in the event of problems arising.

Whilst the Borough Council has done everything possible to protect the interests of the local community it must be remembered that this project is a Surrey County Council project and any issues arising from it should be directed to the County Council."

With reference to the question raised by Councillor O'Hara I will ask the Director of Community Services to investigate the status and cost of resurfacing works and to report to the Executive at the earliest opportunity.

A copy of the response will be available to all concerned."

41/02 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A.P. Hirst declared an interest in minute number 46/02 (Planning Appeal – Chelsea Village Plc).

42/02 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor, Councillor H.V. Drinkwater, reminded members of the following events with details and tickets being obtained from the Mayor's Secretary, Pam Cross.

Quiz Night – 28th February 2002

Mayor's Ball – 9th March 2002

He also gave notice of his Music Concert to be held at Echelford School, Ashford, with full details of the arrangements being announced shortly.

43/02 REVIEW OF INCOME AND FEES AND CHARGES 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION

The Council considered the recommendations of the Executive on a proposed schedule of fees and charges to be operational from 1st April 2002.

RESOLVED:

1. That subject to 2 below, and inclusion of the amendments to electoral registration (statutory fees) and fees for commercial refuse collection, the proposed fees and charges for 2002/2003 as set out in [Appendix A](#) of the Director of Resources report to the Executive on 12th February, 2002 be approved;
2. That in respect of car parking charges in Staines Town Centre, the charge for over 4 hours parking in short stay car parks be increased from £3.50 to £10 and that the charge for over 4 hours parking in long stay car parks be increased from £1.50 to £3.50;

3. That a Notice of Intent to increase car-parking charges in Staines Town Centre car parks be published;
4. That subject to there being no objection, the Order be made; and
5. The charges be reviewed once the Best Value Review on Car Parking Services has been completed.

44/02 TOTAL BORROWING REQUIREMENT 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive based on the statutory requirement of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, for the Borough Council to authorise the total borrowing requirement for the financial year 2002/2003.

RESOLVED that the Council approve the maximum borrowing for the year 2002/2003 of £7,000,000 all of which would be short-term, with 100% of interest payable at variable rates.

45/02 SPELTHORNE PAY AWARD 2002 – KEY DECISION

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on proposals for a Spelthorne Pay award for 2002.

RESOLVED that the local Spelthorne pay award for 2002 be 4% with effect from 1st April, subject to a review if the national 2002 pay award is settled at a higher rate.

46/02 PLANNING APPEAL – CHELSEA VILLAGE PLC – KEY DECISION

RESOLVED that the Council approve the inclusion of £120,000 in the Council's Revenue Budget 2002/2003 in order to meet the costs of engaging a planning consultant/planning solicitor and barrister 'team' to represent the Council's case at the forthcoming planning appeal by Chelsea Village plc.

47/02 GRAFFITI STRATEGY

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive on proposals to establish a policy to deal with graffiti and its removal, including the setting up of a Graffiti Removal Response Team.

RESOLVED:

1. That the principle of introducing an immediate graffiti clean up scheme at a cost of £50,000 be agreed; and
2. That the level of provision be included in next year's Budget, subject to a report on the detail and guidelines of such a scheme being submitted to the Executive meeting in March 2002.

48/02 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES – REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive to support the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel appointed to consider Member's Allowances. The report from the Independent Panel had been circulated to all members of the Council.

RESOLVED:

1. That a Special Responsibility Allowance be paid to the Chairman of the Licensing Committee at the same level as the allowance paid to the Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and the Planning Committee;
2. That a Childcare and Dependent Carers Allowance be made available to those Councillors who incur expenditure for the care of dependent relatives or children while they are undertaking approved Council duties with the actual costs being reimbursed;
3. That in respect of 2 above no specific limits for such payments be proposed at this time but be considered in light of experience of claims received; and
4. That no other changes be made to the Council's current Scheme for Allowances, but that a further review take place later this year in the context of the Council's review of the Executive arrangements which have operated since 1st September, 2001.

49/02 REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2002/2003 – KEY DECISION

The Council considered the report of the Director of Resources on the Revenue expenditure budget for 2002/2003 and Revenue Budget summaries for the year ending 31st March 2003.

The Mayor, Councillor Drinkwater, gave his consent under Standing Order 16.4 for the budget speech of each of the Group Leaders to exceed five minutes but not to exceed 10 minutes.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor F. Davies, made a statement on the Budget and Council Tax. The Leaders of the opposition Groups, Councillors M.A. Appleyard and I.J. Beardsmore also made statements.

A copy of the Leader's statement was made available for other Members, the press and public at the meeting and is **attached at [Appendix A](#)**.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Beardsmore and seconded by Councillor Fisher to make a reduction of £10,000 in the proposed budget for the Chief Executive's Directorate, so that the overall service expenditure for 2002/2003 was reduced from £15,460,190 to £15,450,190 and the net expenditure was reduced from £13,152,720 to £13,142,720 and the maximum amount to be transferred from reserves was reduced from £2,345,310 to 2,335,310. The amendment was lost.

RESOLVED:

1. That in accordance with decisions taken earlier in the meeting the 2002/2003 Revenue Budget should include £50,000 for graffiti removal, £2,370 Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, an adjusted amount of £136,000 for additional Pension Fund contributions and 4% for Spelthorne Local Pay.
2. That in support of an increase of 6% in the Spelthorne element of the Council Tax for 2002/2003 the following proposals be agreed: -

- (i) The Revenue Estimates as set out in the report of the Director of Resources be approved;
 - (ii) An amount not exceeding £2,345,310 as set out in the report of the Director of Resources, be appropriated from Reserves in aid of Spelthorne's local Council Tax for 2002/2003;
 - (iii) To note that the council tax base for the year 2002/2003 is 38,633.8, calculated in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as amended, made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (iv) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2002/2003 in accordance with Sections 32 and 33 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

	£	
(a)	33,230,800	Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act.
(b)	23,408,390	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)	9,822,410	Being the amount by which the aggregate at 4(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 4(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year.
(d)	5,499,290	Being the aggregate sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant or additional grant, increased by 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) and increased by the sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its Collection Fund to its General Fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) Directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 made on 7 th February 1994 (Community Charge surplus)
(e)	£111.90	Being the sum 4(c) above less the amount at 4(d) above, all divided by the amount at 3 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.

- (v) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2002/2003 in accordance with Section 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Valuation Bands

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
74.60	87.03	99.47	111.90	136.77	161.63	186.50	223.80

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 4(e) 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 band.

- (vi) That it be noted that for the year 2002/2003 the Surrey County Council and the Surrey Police have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 as amended of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below.

Precepting Authority	Valuation Bands							
	A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
Surrey C. C.	481.32	561.54	641.76	721.98	882.42	1042.86	1203.30	1443.96
Surrey Police	64.29	75.01	85.72	96.44	117.87	139.30	160.73	192.88

- (vii) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at (vi) 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 year 2002/2003 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below: -

Valuation Bands

A £	B £	C £	D £	E £	F £	G £	H £
620.21	723.58	826.95	930.32	1137.06	1343.79	1550.53	1860.64

In accordance with Standing Order 18.4 a request was made for the voting on the above matter to be recorded.

The voting was as follows:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| For | Mrs P.C. Amos, F.Ayres, I.J. Beardsmore, G.G. Blampied, L.J.W. Burrell, G.S. Ceaser, T.W. Crabb, E.K. Culnane, F. Davies, H.V. Drinkwater, C. Fisher, G.E. Forsbrey, J.M. Fullbrook, Mrs D.L. Grant, A.W. Hermes, A.P. Hirst, P.R. James, Mrs I.Napper, E. O'Hara, J.D. Packman, J.M. Paton, Mrs J.E. Ponton, E.J. Searancke, R.W. Sider, R.A. Smith Ainsley, T. Stubbs, G.F. Trussler, Mrs P. Weston and Mrs J.M. Wood-Dow. |
| Against | - |
| Abstaining | M.A. Appleyard, Mrs M.J. Martin, Mrs G.A. Norcross, E.I.J. Read, J.E.H. Smith, Mrs P.A. Smith and R.Watkins. |

50/02 50/02 COUNCIL AND STAFF JOINT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED that the establishment of a Council and Staff Joint Committee be not supported.

51/02 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS – 2002/2003

The Council considered the recommendation of the Executive including the arrangements to set up a Committee to review the practical working arrangements of the Council's Executive arrangements.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Committee timetable for 2002/2003, as submitted to the Executive on 12th February, 2002, be approved;
2. That the specific issues identified in Section 3 of the report of the Chief Executive to the Executive be noted;
3. That a Democracy Committee be convened with the political apportionment of seats being as previously, 6 Conservatives, 2 Labour and 1 Liberal Democrats;
4. That the Terms of Reference of the Committee be:
 - a. To review the practical working of the Council's Executive arrangements, and in particular the operation of overview and scrutiny and its relationship with best value reviews and advise the Council on any changes it considers would be appropriate; and
 - b. To support the continuation of regular Members' Seminars on the type of topics summarised in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive to the Executive at its meeting on 12th February 2002.

52/02 BOROUGH OF SPELTHORNE – MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT

The Council considered the recommendation of the Standards Committee on the adoption of a local Code of Conduct for all members and co-opted members. In considering the arrangements for the Code the Council put on record their thanks to both the Chairman and members of the Standards Committee and the Monitoring Officer, Ann Davey.

RESOLVED that the local Code of Conduct for Spelthorne, as submitted, be adopted.

53/02 REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council, Councillor F. Davies, presented his report which outlined the various matters the Executive had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

54/02 COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Community Committee, Councillor G.F. Trussler, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

55/02 ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

In the absence of the Chairman of the Economic Committee the Vice Chairman, Councillor A.W. Hermes, presented a report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting and gave an undertaking to ensure the question raised by Councillor Mrs Norcross regarding the relocation of the Museum to the Old Town Hall was answered.

56/02 ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Environment Committee, Councillor G.E. Forsbrey, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

57/02 LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor Mrs Weston, presented her report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with at its meeting on 16th January and gave a verbal update on the outcome of the meeting held on 13th February, 2002.

58/02 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Planning Committee, Councillor G.S. Ceaser, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee had dealt with since the last Council meeting. During the discussion the issue of funding Hillingdon Borough Council would be receiving from BAA to help process the number of planning applications associated with T5 was raised.

59/02 STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Standards Committee, Mr Murray Litvak, presented his report which outlined the matters the Committee, had dealt with since the last Council meeting.

60/02 QUESTIONS ON WARD ISSUES

Under Standing Order 13 Councillor E. O'Hara asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Davies, the following questions:

“Would the Leader please provide an update on progress in relation to the following developments in Staines Town?

Pedestrianisation of the High Street and relocation of the Drinking Fountain from Moore Lane and the Memorial Gardens project?

The Leader of the Council replied as follows

“Work had started on the pedestrianisation of Staines High Street and the local businesses would be kept informed of progress etc. and the drinking fountain would

be relocated to the High Street at the appropriate time. The Memorial Gardens and Riverside Car Park scheme was progressing well.”

61/02 GENERAL QUESTIONS

Under Standing Order 13 Councillor Fisher asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“The Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 12th February 2002 record the attendance of Councillors Appleyard and O’Hara but of no other non-executive Councillors. The Minutes also record Councillor O’Hara speaking under item 101, which is the last item to be minuted.

These Minutes therefore give the impression that Councillor O’Hara was present for the entire meeting and that no Liberal Democrat councillor was present. This impression is wrong on two points. Firstly, item 101 was dealt with at the beginning of the Agenda and Councillor O’Hara left the meeting soon after – he should therefore be recorded as present part-time. Conversely, I attended the meeting as a representative of the Liberal Democrat Group from a very early stage, having signed the Attendance Book and I remained to the end of the meeting, therefore I should be recorded as having been in attendance.

Will the Leader assure me that these points, particularly the omission of my name as being in attendance, are simple errors which will be corrected before the Minutes are signed, and are not the result of minuting policy?”

Councillor Davies replied as follows:

“Under our normal minuting policy, items are recorded in the order they appear on the Agenda and not the order they are dealt with at the meeting. In this way, there should be no confusion for persons who were not present at the meeting, who wish at a later date to read the minutes in conjunction with the order of items shown on the Agenda.

Minute 101 does indicate that Councillor O’Hara was present as Ward Member and that he spoke on that item, having given prior notice to the Chairman. However, in the interests of clarity, I will arrange for the attendance list to be corrected to indicate that Councillor O’Hara was only present for Minute 101.

With reference to your own attendance, our practice is only to record Members who can participate in the business of the meeting, such as the Ward Member for a particular item or the Leaders of the Opposition Groups who can speak on Key Decisions.”

62/02 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

(a) St Mary’s C of E Junior School, Clare Road, Stanwell

RESOLVED that:

1. St Mary’s School be advised that the Council is unable to fill the appointment, at this time; and
2. the matter only be submitted to Council in the future if nominations to fill the appointment have been received in advance of the meeting.

(b) Shortwood Infants School, Stanwell New Road, Staines

RESOLVED that:

1. Shortwood Infant School be advised that the Council is unable to fill the appointment at this time; and

2. the matter only be reported to future meetings of the Council if nominations to fill the appointment have been received in advance of the meeting.

(c) **Buckland Junior School Berryscroft Road, Laleham**

RESOLVED that the previous representative Mrs Varndell of 78 Brightside Avenue, Staines be appointed to serve as a Council representative on the Governing Body of Buckland Junior School, Laleham, until 19th April, 2006.