

Minutes of the Development Sub-Committee
31 January 2022

Present:

Councillor R.J. Noble (Chairman)

Councillors:

S. Buttar

H. Harvey

S.C. Mooney

J.T.F. Doran

L. E. Nichols

In Attendance: Councillors C. Bateson and M. Beecher

31/22 Apologies for absence & Substitutions

No apologies for absence were received.

Councillor R Smith-Ainsley attended the meeting via Microsoft Teams.

32/22 Minutes

The Committee **resolved** to agree the minutes.

The Committee considered the following outstanding action from the meeting held on 24 January 2022:

The Committee had asked the Assets Team to provide costings and details of the viability of the 91-93 High Street, Staines proposed development. The Property and Development Manager advised the Committee that this work had not been completed and that it would be presented to the Committee once the figures had been finalised.

33/22 Disclosures of Interest

Councillors Helen Harvey, Doran and Noble advised the Committee that they were Planning Committee members and therefore would not be making comment on any applications due to come before the Planning Committee.

Councillor S Mooney advised the Committee that she was a Surrey County Councillor and asked that this disclosure was put on future minutes as a standing item.

34/22 Questions from members of the Public

There were none.

35/22 Ward Issues

There were none.

36/22 Urgent Actions

There were none.

37/22 Exclusion of Public and Press (Exempt Business)

It was proposed by Councillor Buttar, Seconded by Councillor Nichols and **resolved** that the public and press be excluded during consideration of the following items, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) because it was likely to disclose information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because, disclosure to the public would prejudice the financial position of the authority in being able to undertake even-handed negotiations and finalising acceptable contract terms.

38/22 Benwell Phase One End-of-Project Report

The Committee **resolved** to move this item into the Part II session of the meeting so members could discuss the report and all the appendices.

The Committee considered a report from the Development and Property Manager, that sought to share with the Committee the feedback from two 3 hour 'lessons learnt' workshops that involved a wide number of Assets Teams officers both from the development and property management teams.

The Committee members provided feedback on the format of the report and any areas of improvement for subsequent reports.

39/22 Long Lane Pavilion

The Committee considered a report from the Development & Property Manager, Nick Cummings on the Long Lane Pavillion, Stanwell.

The Committee **resolved** to approve the Council entering into an agreement with Stanwell Events

40/22 Urgent business

This item was an urgent item on Benwell Phase II Development. This item was considered urgent because delays in approval of a revised scheme to be submitted to the Planning Committee would increase the amount of ongoing costs to the Council.

This item was considered by the Committee after Benwell Phase I End-of-Project Report (minute no. 38/22)

Reason for exemption

This report contained exempt information within the meaning of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 and by the Local Government (Access to information) (Variation) Order 2006:

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because, disclosure to the public would prejudice the financial position of the authority in the bidding process for the site/services by allowing other bidders to know the position of the Council. This in turn prejudices the Council by (i) distorting the bids process and (ii) prejudicing the opportunity for the Council to acquire a site/services in order to enable regeneration in the Borough.

The Development and Property Manager, Nick Cummings advised the Committee that there were currently issues with Ashford Multi-Storey Car Park in respect of anti-social behaviour and health and safety.