

MINUTES  
OF A MEETING OF THE  
**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WOKING**

held on 3 December 2020

Present:

Cllr Mrs B A Hunwicks (The Mayor)  
Cllr S Hussain (The Deputy Mayor)

Cllr M Ali	Cllr W P Forster
Cllr S Ashall	Cllr D Harlow
Cllr A Azad	Cllr K Howard
Cllr T Aziz	Cllr D E Hughes
Cllr A-M Barker	Cllr I Johnson
Cllr D J Bittleston	Cllr R N Leach
Cllr J E Bond	Cllr L S Lyons
Cllr A J Boote	Cllr R Mohammed
Cllr M A Bridgeman	Cllr L M N Morales
Cllr G G Chrystie	Cllr M I Raja
Cllr G S Cundy	Cllr C Rana
Cllr K M Davis	Cllr J R Sanderson
Cllr G W Elson	Cllr M A Whitehand

Also Present: Claire Storey, Independent Cop-Opted Member.

Absent: Councillors C S Kemp and N Martin.

**1. MINUTES.**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 15 October 2020 be approved and signed as a true and correct record.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Colin Kemp and Councillor Nancy Martin.

**3. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.**

The Mayor reported on events held in recent months, noting that opportunities to celebrate Woking had continued to be held, with many being held virtually. The annual Arts Awards had been held virtually and on the following day the Mayor was due to attend a virtual Carol Service in aid of Guide Dogs for the Blind. The Mayor advised that she had recently recorded a Christmas message with Talking Newspapers, a local charity which provided an audio recording of local news and events for blind and visually impaired residents. Other

events had including the AGM of Citizens Advice Woking, the opening of the Cards for Good Causes shop and the opening of the new Boots store in the Victoria Square development.

**4. URGENT BUSINESS.**

No items of Urgent Business were considered.

**5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor D J Bittleston declared a non-pecuniary interest in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor A Azad declared a nonpecuniary interest in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor C S Kemp declared a nonpecuniary interest in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor D Harlow declared a nonpecuniary interest in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor G S Cundy declared a nonpecuniary interest in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council appointed director. The companies are listed in the attached schedule. The interests were such that speaking and voting were permissible.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Chief Executive, Ray Morgan, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mr Morgan could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mr Spinks could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, Peter Bryant, declared a disclosable personal interest (nonpecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which he was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mr Bryant could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Finance, Leigh Clarke, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mrs Clarke could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Housing, Louise Strongitharm, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mrs Strongitharm could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Community Services, Julie Fisher, declared a disclosable personal interest (nonpecuniary) in any items concerning the companies of which she was a Council-appointed director. The companies were listed in an attached schedule. The interests were such that Mrs Fisher could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Finance, Leigh Clarke, declared a disclosable personal interest (non-pecuniary) in any items concerning Woking Football Club and/or the GoDev Woking Limited development. The interest arose from (i) her husband having a small shareholding in Woking Football Club and (ii) being a Council-appointed director of Kingfield Community Sports Centre Limited. The interest was such that Mrs Clarke could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, Peter Bryant, declared a disclosable personal interest (nonpecuniary) in any items concerning Woking Football Club and/or the GoDev Woking Limited development. The interest arose from (i) him being a member of the Cards Trust (the supporters' club for Woking Football Club), (ii) providing occasional unpaid assistance to Woking Football Club, e.g. acting as returning officer at the election of directors and (iii) being a Council-appointed director of Kingfield Community Sports Centre Limited. The interest was such that Mr Bryant could advise the Council on those items.

In accordance with the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, the Chief Executive, Ray Morgan, declared a disclosable personal interest (pecuniary) in Agenda Item 9E – Recommendations of the Executive – Management Arrangements arising from it relating to his employment with the Council. The interest was such that Mr Morgan left the meeting during the determination of the item.

In accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillor J Bond declared an interest in Agenda Item 12 – Standards Hearings Sub-Committee – 13 October 2020 – as the subject of the investigation by the Sub-Committee. The interest was such that Councillor Bond left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor M Ali and Councillor R Leach declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 – Petition – Determination of Major Planning Applications – following contact with the petitioner in advance of the meeting. The Council was advised by the Director of Legal and Democratic Services that the matter did not constitute an interest within the provisions of the Members Code of Conduct and would not prevent them from speaking and voting on the item.

Councillor L Lyons declared an interest in Agenda Item 9A – Recommendations of the Executive – Review of Fees and Charges – in so far as it made reference to the Hoe Valley School with which he had a contract of employment. The Director of Legal and Democratic

Services advised that the interest was such that Councillor Lyons could remain in the Chamber and would not be prevented from speaking and voting on the item.

**6. PETITION - WITHDRAWAL OF MODIFIED SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT AND RESUBMISSION OF A NEW PLAN WBC20-031.**

The Council had before it a report on a petition seeking the Borough Council to withdraw the modified Site Allocations Development Plan Document and submit a new Plan based on current information and proposed legislation. The petition had been signed by 2,739 individuals and was presented at the meeting. The Mayor welcomed Fiona Syrett, representative for the petitioners.

The Petitioner spoke in support of the petition, emphasising the concern of residents over the loss of green belt land in the east of the Borough and the level of development proposed for the area. It was noted that a local fundraising campaign would be undertaken to raise funds to secure legal advice on behalf of local residents. Members were invited to ask questions of the petitioner before moving to the debate.

The report set out the background to the Development Plan Document and advised that withdrawing the Document at this stage, as requested by the petition, would lead to unacceptable delay and potential loss of control of the Council's ability to manage development across the Borough. It was noted that the Document was going through an Independent Examination and that the Petitioners could choose to submit the petition as part of their representation to the consultation currently underway on the main modifications to the Document, the deadline for which was 14 December 2020.

The matter was debated in full by the Members of the Council and, whilst the concerns of the residents were noted, the Council was not in a position to withdraw the Development Plan Document which had been drawn up over a number of years. Councillor Barker considered that the Council should review the infrastructure challenges faced by the east of the Borough. Councillor Barker moved and Councillor Davis seconded the following motion:

“Council calls for a study on the future infrastructure requirement of the east of Woking, based on both current demand and future demand if developments go ahead.”

Councillor Azad advised that such a study should be undertaken in partnership with Surrey County Council as the Highway Authority and proposed an amendment to the motion as follows:

“Council calls for a joint study with other authorities and partners on the future infrastructure requirements of the east of Woking, based on both current demand and future demand and that the terms of the study come to the next meeting of the Executive.”

Councillor Barker and Councillor Davis confirmed that they were happy to accept the amendment to the motion. The Director of Legal and Democratic Services outlined the recommendations before the Council following the debate namely that:

- i) the petitioner be thanked for the presentation;
- ii) the Council notes the comments set out in the petition and that it was inappropriate to take the action sought by the Petitioners; and

- ii) Council calls for a joint study with other authorities and partners on the future infrastructure requirements of the east of Woking, based on both current demand and future demand and that the terms of the study come to the next meeting of the Executive.

At the request of Councillor Bond, the recommendations before the Council were put to a vote. In accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the names of Members voting for and against the recommendations were recorded.

In favour: Councillors S Ashall, A Azad, A-M Barker, D Bittleston, J Bond, M Bridgeman, G Chrystie, G Cundy, K Davis, G Elson, W Forster, D Harlow, K Howard, D Hughes, S Hussain, I Johnson, R Leach, L Lyons, R Mohammed, L Morales, M I Raja, C Rana, J Sanderson and M Whitehand.

Total in favour: 24

Against: Councillor M Ali, T Aziz and A Boote.

Total against: 3

Present not voting: The Mayor, Councillor Mrs Hunwicks.

Total present not voting: 1

The recommendations were therefore carried by 24 votes in favour to 3 votes against.

#### RESOLVED

- That (i) the petitioner be thanked for the presentation;
- (ii) the Council notes the comments set out in the petition and that it was inappropriate to take the action sought by the Petitioners; and
- (ii) Council calls for a joint study with other authorities and partners on the future infrastructure requirements of the east of Woking, based on both current demand and future demand and that the terms of the study come to the next meeting of the Executive.

#### **7. PETITION - DETERMINATION OF MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS WBC20-032.**

The Council received a report on a petition seeking the Borough Council to not consider any planning applications for more than ten dwellings until the new Site Allocations Development Plan Document had been adopted. The petition had been signed by 473 individuals and was presented at the meeting. The Mayor welcomed Hugh MacDonald, representative for the petitioners.

The Petitioner spoke in support of the petition, emphasising the concern of residents that Officers could unknowingly aid developers against public opinion and recommend proposals that would otherwise be unacceptable. The petition indicated that, in event the Council could not take the action of deferring any such applications, the Council should take the decision that all applications of more than ten dwellings should be subjected to the

comments, recommendations and contents of the Development Plan Document, including public opinion and the Inspector's reports.

The report provided the advice of Counsel on the ability to defer the determination of major planning applications and noted that the legislation did not provide for Authorities to take such action, that the Council had a statutory obligation to accept all planning applications submitted, including those for more than 10 dwellings and could not lawfully decide not to consider them. The Council was also reminded that, when determining planning applications, the local planning authority gave due weight to any development plan document being produced as well as taking into account representations received on all planning applications.

Members were invited to ask questions of the petitioner before moving to the debate. Whilst Members acknowledged that applications could not be deferred until such time that the Development Plan Document had been adopted, it was felt that the second element of the petition could be supported. Councillor Forster moved and Councillor Morales seconded that:

"The Council agrees that decisions made by the Planning Committee and Planning Officers will take into account the proposed DPD and other emerging planning policies."

Councillor Azad subsequently moved and Councillor Ashall seconded an amendment to the substantive motion that:

"The Council agrees that decisions made by the Planning Committee and Planning Officers will take into account the proposed DPD and other emerging planning policies and that the concerns of residents be sought as part of the consultation on the new Town Centre Masterplan announced by the Leader of the Council."

In accordance with Standing Order 10.8 the names of Members voting for and against the amendment to the substantive motion were recorded.

In favour: Councillors M Ali, S Ashall, A Azad, T Aziz, D Bittleston, G Cundy, K Davis, G Elson, D Harlow, S Hussain, R Mohammed, M I Raja, C Rana, and M Whitehand.

Total in favour: 14

Against: Councillors J Bond, M Bridgeman, A Boote, G Chrystie, D Hughes and L Morales.

Total against: 6

Present not voting: The Mayor, Councillor Mrs Hunwicks, A-M Barker, W Forster, K Howard, I Johnson, R Leach, L Lyons and J Sanderson

Total present not voting: 8

The amendment to the substantive motion was therefore carried by 14 votes in favour to 6 votes against. The substantive motion, as amended, was now before the Council and, in the absence of a request for a vote, it was

RESOLVED

- That (i) the petitioner be thanked for the presentation; and
- (ii) decisions made by the Planning Committee and Planning Officers will take into account the proposed DPD and other emerging planning policies and that the concerns of residents be sought as part of the consultation on the new Town Centre Masterplan announced by the Leader of the Council.

**8. QUESTIONS.**

Copies of questions submitted under Standing Order 8.1 together with draft replies had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting. Supplementary questions had been received and replies were given at the meeting.

**9. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE WBC20-036.**

Councillor A Azad moved and Councillor S Ashall seconded the reception and adoption of the report and recommendations from the meeting of the Executive held on 19 November 2020.

**9A. REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2021-22 EXE20-027.**

Councillor Ashall introduced the recommendations of the Executive in respect of the fees and charges for the coming financial year and advised that the majority of the Council's fees and charges would remain at the existing level. A summary of the changes had been set out in the original report to the Executive.

Attention was drawn to the proposed increase for taxi licensing fees and the Council questioned whether this was the right time to do so, taking into account the impact of Covid-19 restrictions on the taxi trade. It was noted that the costs of the meals on wheels service would be increasing after having been kept at the same level for a number of years. It would be important to ensure that no-one was put off using the service as a result of the change.

Councillor Ashall responded to the points raised before moving to the recommendation of the Executive.

RESOLVED

That the discretionary fees and charges, as set out in Appendices 1 – 4 of the report, be approved.

**9B. NEXT STEPS ACCOMMODATION PROGRAMME EXE20-125.**

The Council had before it recommendations for the acquisition of 121 Chertsey Road for use as move-on accommodation for rough sleepers who had been accommodated during the Covid-19 pandemic. The recommendations were introduced by Councillor Harlow, Portfolio Holder for Housing, and were welcomed by the Council.

RESOLVED

- That (i) subject to the Government grant funding being secured, the acquisition of 121 Chertsey Road for use as move-on accommodation be approved at a total cost of up to £6.7million; and
- (ii) the Director of Housing, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing, be authorised to take all necessary actions to secure the grant funding and deliver the scheme.

**9C. DRAFT INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2020-21 TO 2024-25 EXE20-031.**

Councillor Ashall, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Financial Planning and Policy, introduced the recommendations of the Executive in respect of the draft Investment Programme 2020-21 to 2024-25. The considerable impact of the Covid pandemic on local government finances was noted, together with the high level of uncertainty going forward. In order to protect the Council's reserves from the financial impact of the pandemic, a number of projects had been temporarily removed from the funded Investment Programme, including some of the Borough's flood defence proposals.

Councillor Ashall responded to the points raised during the debate following which the Mayor referred the Councillors to the recommendation before them which proposed an increase in the loan facility to Thamesway Energy for the expanded Poole Road Energy Centre.

RESOLVED

That the loan facility provided to Thamesway Energy Ltd for the expanded Poole Road Energy Centre be increased to £35.6m.

**9D. CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2021-22 EXE20-028.**

The Council considered the proposed calendar of meeting for the forthcoming year. A concern was raised that the proposed dates would result in a significant period time between the Council meeting at the beginning of April and the subsequent Council meeting at the end of July.

The Leader of the Council explained that the Council's accounts had to be approved by the end of July and that the proposed Calendar ensured that ample time was provided for the development of the accounts. The calendar would be revisited in the event changes to the regulations for the accounts altered the statutory timescale.

RESOLVED

That the Calendar of Meetings 2021/22 be approved as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

**9E. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS EXE20-123.**

Councillor Azad, Leader of the Council, moved and Councillor Ashall seconded a proposal to defer consideration of the management arrangements to the next meeting of Council.

No requests for a formal named vote were received and the proposal was therefore agreed nem con.

RESOLVED

That the recommendations of the Executive in respect of management arrangements be deferred to the meeting of Council in February 2021.

**10. REDESIGNATION OF THE PYRFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM WBC20-037.**

The Council was presented with a report proposing the re-designation of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum. The Neighbourhood Forum had been designated in 2014 and the Council was advised that the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 specified that a Neighbourhood Forum ceased to have effect after five years. The report therefore recommended the re-designation of the Forum to ensure that it continued to represent the community in preparing, reviewing or monitoring the delivery of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan.

The application had been widely publicised and consulted on, with details published on the Council's website for eight weeks, a press release prepared and notices published in local newspapers. In addition, letters had been sent to all households within the Neighbourhood Area. Six individuals had submitted representations, details of which were set out in the report.

RESOLVED

- That (i) pursuant to Section 61F(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) the Council approves the re-designation of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum for a further period of 5 years for the purposes of supporting the future review of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan and to ensure the effective delivery of its requirements; and
- (ii) the effective date for the re-designation of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum should be the date of the Council's decision on the application, in this regard, 3 December 2020.

**11. POLLING PLACE DESIGNATION - WALTON ROAD POLLING DISTRICT WBC20-030.**

The report before the Council advised that a new polling place would be required for the Walton Road polling district of the Canalside ward as the Red Cross Centre was no longer available for hire. There were no suitable venues within the polling district and it was therefore proposed to use the Maybury Centre on Board School Road which lay just outside the polling district. It was noted that the existing parking controls at the Maybury Centre would not apply on the day of the election to ensure no voters were charged for their visit.

RESOLVED

That the Maybury Centre be designated the polling place for the Walton Road polling district (B3) of the Canalside Ward.

**12. STANDARDS HEARINGS SUB-COMMITTEE - 13 OCTOBER 2020 WBC20-033.**

The Council received a report which advised of a recent decision made by the Standards Hearings Sub-Committee on 13 October 2020 in regard to a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct. The Sub-Committee had taken the decision to report its findings to the Council meeting.

RESOLVED

That the findings of the Standards Hearings Sub-Committee on 13 October 2020 be noted.

**13. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS WBC20-034.**

The Council was invited to approve a number of changes to the membership of Committees and Working Groups, details of which were set out in the report. A further change, to the Governance Review Task Group, was proposed at the meeting.

RESOLVED

That the changes to the Committees and Working Groups of the Council as set out below be agreed.

Appeals Cttee	Cllr N Martin to replace Cllr G Elson
Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	Cllr D Bittleston to replace Cllr C Rana
Planning Cttee	Cllr G Cundy and Cllr M Whitehand to replace Cllr S Ashall and Cllr G Elson.
Standards and Audit Committee/Standards Hearings Sub-Cttee	Cllr R Mohammed and Cllr N Martin to replace Cllr G Elson and Cllr M Whitehand.
Housing Task Group	Cllr M Whitehand to replace Cllr C Kemp.
Sheerwater Regeneration Delivery and Oversight Panel	Cllr M Whitehand to replace Cllr S Ashall.
Victoria Square Oversight Panel	Cllr S Ashall to replace Cllr N Martin.
Governance Review Task Group	Cllr A Azad to replace Cllr M Whitehand.

**14. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT AVAILABLE THROUGH THE SURREY LEADERS' GROUP WBC20-035.**

(NOTE: Councillor Johnson declared an interest in this item in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, arising from a relative's position on the Trust. The interest was such that Councillor Johnson left the meeting during consideration of the item.)

The Council was invited to make a nomination to a position available through the Surrey Leaders' Group on the Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust. Councillor Azad moved and Councillor Ashall seconded the nomination of Councillor Whitehand to the position. No further nominations were received and it was accordingly

RESOLVED

That Councillor Whitehand be nominated to the appointment available on the Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (Mental Health Foundation Trust).

**15. NOTICES OF MOTION WBC20-038.**

The Mayor referred to a report published earlier in the day which set out the details of three Notices of Motion received from Councillors following the publication of the agenda but before the deadline for Notices of Motion.

Councillor L Lyons

The following motion was moved by Councillor Lyons and seconded by Councillor Barker. At the request of Councillor Lyons, the Notice of Motion was debated and determined on the night.

"The current Design Supplementary Planning Document does not provide clarity on the permissible height and scale of new buildings across Woking, particularly those in the town centre. It is therefore proposed that officers should produce a report at the earliest opportunity, setting out existing guidance, along with the consequential impacts which may arise from any changes, with a view to updating the Design Supplementary Planning Document, if appropriate."

Councillor Lyons introduced his motion, explaining that it had been drawn up in light of concerns over the number of planning applications received by the Council for large scale tower blocks and the changing character of the Town Centre. The Councillors discussed the merits of the motion and welcomed the proposal to receive a report at a future meeting on the current guidance and the possibility of adopting restrictions for the height of buildings in the Town Centre.

RESOLVED

That the motion be supported.

Councillor T Aziz

The following motion was moved by Councillor Aziz and seconded by Councillor Lyons and referred to the Executive on 14 January 2021 in accordance with Standing Order 5.7.

“Motion on viability of affordable homes

Since 2012 WBC has been relying on the opinion of a sole company to determine viability of affordable homes on site for developments. This has resulted in almost all cases being declared unviable by that company.

It's good practise to seek multiple opinions and not limit to sole opinion.

This motion calls that WBC to employ services of more than one company to determine the viability of affordable homes in future developments before being presented to planning committee.”

Councillor T Aziz

The following motion was moved by Councillor Aziz and seconded by Councillor Barker. At the request of Councillor Aziz, the Notice of Motion was debated and determined on the night.

“While the importance of collecting unpaid Council Tax and Business Rate debt is fully appreciated this Council requests that Officers:-

- 1) act compassionately with residents and businesses during these COVID times and provide flexibility in making suitable payment arrangements that reduce the risk of severe hardship; and
- 2) consider the adoption of the CAB Protocol (link below) or similar and report thereon to a future meeting of the Executive.

This motion be considered in this meeting today (3<sup>rd</sup> Dec 2020)

CAB Protocol

<https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/Global/CitizensAdvice/campaigns/Council%20Tax/Citizens%20Advice%20Council%20Tax%20Protocol%202017.pdf>

At the request of Councillor Aziz, the motion was considered on the night. Councillor Aziz introduced the motion and spoke in support of the proposal, expressing sympathy for those struggling financially as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Councillor Barker welcomed the motion and suggested an amendment to include a third point as follows:

“(3) promote the need for those struggling to contact the Council at the earliest opportunity.”

It was noted that the suggested amendment had been discussed with Councillor Aziz in advance of the meeting and was accepted by him.

The Council supported the ambition of the motion and the aim to further encourage any individuals or businesses struggling to meet their financial obligations to Woking Borough Council to contact the Authority as early as possible to consider the payment options available.

RESOLVED

That the amended motion, as set out below, be supported.

“While the importance of collecting unpaid Council Tax and Business Rate debt is fully appreciated this Council requests that Officers:-

- 1) act compassionately with residents and businesses during these COVID times and provide flexibility in making suitable payment arrangements that reduce the risk of severe hardship; and
- 2) consider the adoption of the CAB Protocol (link below) or similar and report thereon to a future meeting of the Executive.

This motion be considered in this meeting today (3<sup>rd</sup> Dec 2020)

CAB Protocol

<https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/Global/CitizensAdvice/campaigns/Council%20Tax/Citizens%20Advice%20Council%20Tax%20Protocol%202017.pdf>

- (3) promote the need for those struggling to contact the Council at the earliest opportunity.”

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and ended at 11.14 pm

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_