

**AT AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the Desborough Suite - Town Hall on Monday, 28th January, 2019**

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Paul Lion), Councillor M. Airey, N. Airey, Alexander, Bateson, Beer, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Cannon, Coppinger, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, Gilmore, Hill, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Jones, Kellaway, Lion, Love, Luxton, Majeed, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, S. Rayner, Richards, Sharma, Sharp, Sharpe, Shelim, Smith, Story, Stretton, Targowska, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong.

Officers: Mary Severin, Andy Jeffs, Jenifer Jackson, Suzanne Martin, Maddie Pinkham and Ben Smith

82. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Burbage, Carroll, Clark, Cox, Da Costa, Dr L. Evans, Lenton, Pryer and Saunders.

83. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors S Rayner, Alexander, Shelim, M Airey, Bicknell, Quick and E Wilson would leave the room for the duration of the discussion and vote on the item 'Petition for Debate – Alma Road' as Members of the Windsor Urban Development Management Panel who would be considering a related item on 30 January 2019 at a Panel meeting.

Councillor Bowden declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate – Alma Road' as he lived adjacent to the conservation area and his property would be overlooked by the development. He would address the meeting in relation to the item but would not take part in the vote.

84. PETITION FOR DEBATE - ALMA ROAD

Members debated the following petition:

*'We the undersigned petition The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to defend the unanimous decision of the Windsor Urban Development Management Panel with whatever resource (legal and otherwise) necessary to fully and adequately protect our town from the proposed gross overdevelopment at the forthcoming appeal of planning application 18/00095/FULL.'*

Jenifer Jackson, Head of Planning, explained that a planning application for the redevelopment of the site was received by the council on 12 January 2018. The application sought a mixed re-use of the site, including 217 apartments in buildings ranging from 1 to 7 storeys in height and for around 16,000 square metres of office floor space. This was a major planning application which had a target determination period of 13 weeks; the Council had not reached a decision within that period and, in late May 2018, the applicant chose to appeal direct to the Planning Inspector for non-determination. To respond to the appeal submission council officers would need to know what the grounds for the council's case at appeal would be and a report was

## COUNCIL - 28.01.19

therefore brought to the Windsor Urban Development Management Panel in June 2018. Following the resolution of the meeting the council's position on appeal was then communicated to the appellant and officers had proceeded on this basis.

Officers had been engaged in ensuring the resource necessary was available to defend the appeal, as they would do for any appeal against refusal of permission in the borough.

Councillor Rankin spoke as lead petitioner. He explained that hundreds of Windsorians, in unprecedented numbers, wrote to object to the gross overdevelopment in question. Over a thousand had signed the subsequent petition, which was the largest in Royal Borough history originating from Windsor. Members from Windsor would already know of its significance, others may not. The extant permission granted on the sensitive site was contentious and litigious, ending up in the Court of Appeal. At that session, which the Borough insufficiently resourced, it lost, leaving local residents with the possible fall-out. That application was now not deemed enough by the developers and they had come back for more.

In June last year, with officer recommendation, Windsor Members refused the new application unanimously, to the great relief of the community. However there was now another appeal; this time the council must robustly defend it as the large number of petitioners did not want a rerun of history. The council must understand how damaging the development would be and the petitioners demanded the Royal Borough defended it as robustly as possible.

Councillor Rankin explained that Alma Road was set within a conservation area and made an attractive contribution to the town, a low density of attractive late Victorian and Edwardian properties. The wider setting of the site was the listed Victorian churches of St Edward's and Holy Trinity Garrison Church, Vansittart Recreation Ground and its green open space for the community. In comparison seven storeys of buy-to-let flats were proposed here, at a density close to downtown Beijing. Those who knew the site and its surroundings would be horrified by the footprint of the buildings proposed, the height, the articulation on the site and the relationship to the site boundaries; all were in excess of the already consented scheme. All these would result in a cramped form of development which was massively detrimental to the character of the area. The development would breach a range of policies in the adopted Local Plan and design guidance in the NPPF. There was certainly a material impact on the immediately adjacent conservation area and non-designated heritage assets such as Camperdown House. All these arguments had been accepted by officers and panel members.

Some of the points may have been counterweighted if the scheme had other benefits. For example, Windsor was in dire need of new houses, but these needed to be family homes and affordable homes. To be policy compliant the development would have required 65 affordable homes, but it had zero. If the council was to deliver affordable housing in the borough, then it needed to consistently say no to developers who wished to shirk their obligations. Everybody knew how acute the shortage of parking was in central Windsor. The application offered half a car parking space per flat. He questioned whether this was appropriate.

Councillor Rankin acknowledged that some of the planning arguments were not the function of the petition debate, but what Members needed to understand, specifically

## COUNCIL - 28.01.19

Councillors Coppinger, Dudley and Saunders, was the strength of feeling, of widespread general outrage at the unbelievable plans. Further, importantly, the lack of trust from residents that the borough would appropriately defend and resource an appeal. It was not acceptable to have standard, cheap, pooled legal representation standing for residents, and five QCs for the other side. Regardless of the merits of that case, the council would not win and would be danced around. To understand the lack of confidence, Members must understand the history of the site and the prior appeal.

1,140 residents signed the petition, without any particular large push. Councillor Rankin stated that he had not needed to get signatures weekend after weekend on Peascod Street. He had not needed to profile and financially boost his social media posts to drive people towards the petition, it had been achieved by simple organic word-of-mouth.

Councillor Rankin asked that the borough pull out all the stops to defend the appeal. He asked the Lead Member to outline how he understood the strength of feeling, to give Windsor his assurances that the council would properly resource and contend the appeal and, noting the report to the Windsor Panel on Wednesday, outline the strategy briefly to do so. It would also be useful if he could explain why some of the reasons for refusal were being stepped down.

Jenifer Jackson confirmed that the council had appointed Mark Beard from 6 Pump Court to advise on the case. Mark had been involved in the matter since the planning application came forward and was also the barrister advising and representing the council in relation to the Borough Local Plan submission version. Mark, therefore, in her view, had a very good understanding of the borough and local planning policies which would relate to design considerations on which the refusal was based and the general planning considerations which would be pertinent to the appeal. Sue Rowlands, a Director with Tibbalds, had been appointed as the council's urban design consultant and was involved in the planning application. Sian Saadeh, the area team manager, was co-ordinating the council team and also working on the planning case.

The borough needed to deliver housing but high quality was expected. Housing land supply would be an issue for the appeal and a robust case would be put together to demonstrate a five year supply. Mark Beard was the right barrister to put the case. Along with the area team manager, the Head of Planning had earlier that day met with a small number of the local residents to update them on the ongoing discussions. The reason for refusal relating to loss of employment land was weak and therefore the removal of this condition would be considered by the Development Management Panel on 31 January 2018. The focus would of the appeal would then be on issues of bulk and scale. This would enable the Inspector to understand the dispute between the parties at the public inquiry on 26 March 2019 at Windsor Racecourse.

Councillor E. Wilson stated that it was good to hear the appeal would be properly resourced. The council did well when it did the right things in the right way. There was no doubt that any developer would throw the kitchen sink at such an appeal therefore the council had to be absolutely right in terms of its decision-making procedure, the way it approached the application and to be fair to both objectors and the applicant. He welcomed the petition and the reassurances the appeal would be robustly defended.

Councillor Coppinger commented that as the Lead Member for Planning he was therefore ultimately responsible for the planning service. Despite being a Maidenhead councillor he had the advantage of knowing the site better than the majority of people as in 1983 he had started to work for Rank Hovis McDougall at 67 Alma Road and did so for many years and although it later move to King Edward Court, he had come back to what was now Genesis behind the police station. Councillor Coppinger therefore knew the area exceedingly well and fully understood why residents were fighting against the development. He would work with officers at every stage to ensure that the wishes of both residents and Members were made clear at all times and were driven through the legal process. Officers and the legal team would do everything they could to win the appeal.

Councillor Stretton stated that she supported the petition and agreed that the council must do the right thing. Her concern was that the council needed to learn how it got to this point. She questioned why the application had not been determined in time. This laid the council open to appeal before a decision had even made. She was very concerned at what the Panel was being asked to do in relation to removing reasons for refusal. A number of reasons were discussed including lack of affordable housing and lack of parking but in the end only three were given as reasons for refusal. She felt the loss of employment land was a still a valid issue as it was contrary the NPPF and E6 of the adopted Local Plan.

Councillor Stretton was advised that the debate should not relate to the planning application or the issues to be discussed at the Development Management Panel on 31 January 2019. Councillor Stretton reiterated that the council needed to learn from lessons of the past. It was confirmed that as a non-Panel Member Councillor Stretton would be able to speak at the Panel meeting on 31 January 2019.

Councillor Dudley commented that Windsor was a beautiful place. There was huge public support to ensure the borough discharged the will of residents to provide appropriate resources to the appeal. The council had £8m of reserves which would increase next year. The council would ensure it retained top legal representation and would do everything possible to defend against something that would have a severe detrimental effect on Windsor.

Councillor Bowden stated that he had spoken in objection to the planning application at the last panel meeting, where he had highlighted that Alma Road was a bus and coach route into the town and had commented on the transport plan. In this part of Windsor aircraft were at 1600 feet. The top storey of the proposed development would be 1350 feet. He also questioned how a crane of such height could be put in place in the location.

Councillor N. Airey endorsed the petition. She had lived in Oxford Street when she was younger and was therefore aware of the challenges relating to parking and the density of housing. The NPPF was for sustainable development; this was a case of overdevelopment.

Councillor Jones stated that she supported Councillor Rankin's statement. He had raised a number of questions which she believed had not yet been answered. If it were not possible for them to be answered at the meeting, she would appreciate if this could be done afterwards.

It was recommended by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Dudley and:

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council:**

- i) Acknowledges the petition and underlying concerns from Windsor residents.**
- ii) Commits to resourcing the legal appeal appropriate to the scale of these concerns and the implications of development.**

Councillors S Rayner, Alexander, Shelim, M Airey, Bicknell, Quick and E Wilson left the room for the duration of the discussion and vote on the item.

85. PETITION FOR DEBATE - BRAYWICK CROSSING

Members debated the following petition:

*'We the undersigned petition The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to install a pedestrian crossing on Braywick Road, leading to Braywick Park.'*

Ben Smith, Head of Commissioning – Communities, explained that the online petition had received just over 1000 signatures. The request for a pedestrian crossing had previously been requested and investigated but not taken forward at that stage because of low levels of demand, although it had been recognised that the road was difficult to cross. The situation had changed with the new leisure centre coming online and the potential for development on the golf course site. The report proposed consultation with residents and stakeholders on the location and final design of a crossing and the commitment of £150,000 of funding in 2020/21 to install a crossing to coincide with the opening of the leisure centre.

John Hudson spoke on behalf of the lead petitioner Rachel Clapp. He explained that he was the Chairman of the Rushington Avenue Residents Association (RARA). He and Rachel had held a number of protest meetings with local residents from the association and adjoining roads during the summer. The petition had been ably and enthusiastically supported by the three ward councillors. Mr Hudson explained that he had moved to the area 8 years previously and had been staggered to discover it had been a matter of appeal to the council for 18 years.

Mr Hudson read out a statement from Rachel Clapp, the lead petitioner. Ms Clapp apologised that she was unable to attend the meeting in person. She thanked Mr Hudson for representing her, and Councillors Hill and Majeed for helping the petition to get such great support. What was being requested was straightforward; a safe way to cross a busy and dangerous dual carriageway. The issue had been first raised 18 years previously by concerned residents but had never been given the attention it deserved. She struggled to see how it could not now be a priority given the increase in the population in Maidenhead. In addition to the green spaces, a crossing would give access to the brand new leisure centre and Braywick Court school. Ms Clapp's daughters loved the nature centre but were not old enough to see the irony that it was in walking distance but they needed to be driven there because of the dangerous road.

Councillor D. Wilson thanked Mr Hudson and Ms Clapp. He commented that the proposal had been part of developer obligations for a substantial amount of time; he had been the councillor who had included it originally. The council had been awaiting

## COUNCIL - 28.01.19

further development to get it secured. He was therefore delighted with the recommendation. Safety was paramount as although the road had a 40mph limit traffic was often in excess of this speed.

Councillor Hill stated that he fully supported the proposal which was much overdue. He thanked Rachel Clapp for collecting signatures and submitting the petition. He thanked Councillor Dudley for his signature and Councillor D. Wilson for his short video. It was a shame they had not been more active until now as the crossing had been need for nearly two decades. He had tried to get the proposal included in the highways budget when he had been the lead member responsible some years previously but it had been kicked into the long grass. Councillor Hill referred to a number of anecdotes demonstrating the need for a crossing: the dog walker who drove his dog to the park; the young mother trying to cross the road four times a day to get her children to school; the father who put his son on his shoulder to cross the road as he could not run fast enough.

Councillor Hill requested that a footbridge be considered because of the traffic on the road and the concern for accidents. He also asked for the work to be accelerated as 2020 was another year away.

Councillor Dudley thanked Mr Hudson and Ms Clapp and all the signatories. The Conservative administration agreed that it was a no-brainer. The fundamentals of the area would be changing for the better and it made no sense to not have a crossing for residents when the new leisure centre was being built and, subject to planning, Forest Bridge School and Braywick Court School as well. The golf course development could also see a 2500 pupil school and therefore increase the number wishing to access the leisure centre from that side of the road. The crossing would be in place before the leisure centre opened in late spring/summer 2020. Design work would start immediately and would include consultation with residents in relation to location and design. The council had considered the option of a footbridge. It was not a matter of money but engineering practicalities and human behaviour. Commercial vehicles used the road therefore there would need to be a high clearance, necessitating steps set back. Additionally, barriers would be needed along the road to prevent people from taking the shortest route an crossing the road on foot. This was the reason a bridge option would not be pursued. Councillor Dudley thanked all ward councillors for the work they had done on the issue.

Councillor Bicknell explained that he had met Mr Hudson at his house a year previously in his role as Lead Member for Highways and Transport at which time he had made the suggestion to put a petition together. It showed a community with a strong voice could get what it needed.

Councillor Richards joined the meeting at 8.26pm.

Councillor S Rayner stated that she supported the recommendation. She had been in correspondence with Mr Hudson a year ago in relation to the leisure centre. She was pleased that the crossing would be in place before the leisure centre opened.

It was proposed by Councillor Bicknell, seconded by Councillor Dudley and:

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council notes the report and:**

- i) Acknowledges the petition and fully supports the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Braywick Road**
- ii) Approves funding of £150,000 in the 2020/21 capital programme to deliver the pedestrian crossing**

86. POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACES REVIEW 2018

Members considered the recommendations of the cross-party polling district and polling places working group and the Returning Officer for reviewing the boundaries of the Borough's parliamentary polling districts and designation of polling places for all types of elections.

Councillor Gilmore, Chairman of the working group explained that the polling district scheme appeared as the Appendix to the report, which set out the details of the polling district names and codes, and corresponding polling places for each of the 62 polling districts. The electorate figures referred to the local government electorate at September 2018.

The 2018 polling district review had been a mandatory exercise following the redrawing of the boundaries of the borough's electoral wards by the Local Government Boundary Commission. One of the effects of the review was that polling districts now crossed multiple wards. It was not possible to administer an election under these arrangements, and polling districts must be contained in one ward.

The objective of the polling district review working group had been to recommend change to the polling districts only where it was necessary. The report stated that change was recommended for 31 polling districts, either a change to the boundary and/or polling place. It should be noted that where change was proposed to the polling district boundary, for the vast majority of polling districts this was a simple change to make the existing polling district boundary coterminous with the new ward boundary. New polling districts had not been drawn from scratch.

For polling places, the working group had again endeavoured to follow the principle of minimal change. The group was recommending the adoption of six new polling station venues, one of which was a temporary building on St Leonard's Hill. The proposed new polling stations (with the exception of the mobile unit), had been visited by officers and deemed to be suitable polling locations.

Councillor Gilmore referred to the specific situation in Pinkney's Green. He had proposed a more central location for a polling station to reduce the distances people would have to travel, but the new location had access issues therefore the group had agreed to retain the original station at Pinkney's Green Youth and Community Centre. RBWM as the local authority responsible for administering the review, was required to carry out public consultation on the proposed scheme. Modifications had been made to the scheme in light of feedback from residents, Members, parish councils and local community groups. Public engagement in the review had been very high, with over 50 responses received to the first consultation in October 2018.

Councillor Gilmore thanked officers, members of the working group and residents who had responded to the consultation. Council was being asked to endorse the adoption of the polling district scheme in full so that the 2019 local elections could be administered under the new ward boundaries.

## COUNCIL - 28.01.19

Councillor Hilton highlighted that the report referred to changes in 31 out of 62 areas. In some cases voters would need to go to a new polling station within the same area, in others a group of properties would be moved to a new station as a result of the boundary changes. Only time would reveal the consequences. On 2 May 2019 he was keen that he did not hear stories of voters saying they had gone to a polling station to find it was closed or they had been told to go elsewhere. He asked what actions were being taken to ensure residents across the borough would be fully aware of the changes and how they would be affected.

Councillor Sharma welcomed the amendments in Furze Platt ward; in particular the use of St Peters made sense. However he questioned why there was no reference to MFP1.

Councillor Hill asked if there would be adequate parking outside the Town Hall for voters in Oldfield and the new St Mary's ward given the town hall car park was due to close. Councillor Hill commented that his opposition to the changes was well known; he believed a reduction from 57 to 41 councillors was a retrograde step that would lead to a loss of representation and would limit access to democracy. Councillor Hill was advised that the reduction in councillors was not relevant to the report before Members for consideration.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that changes in the population in Oldfield ward had necessitated the boundary review. He requested that when the new electoral registers were published in February that a map was also provided to show the amended boundaries.

Councillor Stretton highlighted that she had raised at the all-Member briefing the previous week her concern that not enough resources were being put into ensuring residents were clear about the changes.

Councillor E. Wilson welcomed the changes in Clewer and Dedworth West, in particular the removal of Homer School as a polling station. Homer was a small school that struggled with the requirements of being a polling station. He was also grateful for the continued use of Tinkers Lane. He thanked officers for their work on what was a difficult and complex task.

Councillor N. Airey, as Lead Member for Children's Services, welcomed the changes meaning that less schools would need to close to be used as polling stations.

Councillor Dudley echoed the words of Councillor E. Wilson; the officers had done excellent work in a professional manner. In response to Councillor Hill, he explained that the Members' parking area was constrained by the contract with the DWP. The disabled bays previously adjacent to the Town Hall had been reprovided in the Members' parking area. Alternative parking for voters would be available in Grove Road car park and Nicholson's car park. He would be happy to ensure all Member parking spaces were made available for voters on election day.

Councillor Targowska thanked the officers and Members on the working group. As Lead Member she agreed a good communications plan would be very important.

It was proposed by Councillor Gilmore, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and:**

- i) That the revised polling district boundaries and designation of the polling places affecting the following wards be approved, (as detailed in Appendix 1):**
  - Belmont, Boyn Hill, Furze Platt, Oldfield, Riverside, St Mary's, Ascot & Sunninghill, Clewer & Dedworth East, Clewer & Dedworth West, Clewer East, Datchet, Horton & Wraysbury, Eton & Castle, Old Windsor and Sunningdale & Cheapside.**
- ii) That the Returning Officer reviews the polling districts and polling places following the May 2019 elections and recommend further revisions to the scheme where necessary, with the support of the polling district and polling places working group. If a further review is required, proposals will be referred to Council by no later than 31 January 2020.**

87. APPOINTMENT OF MANAGING DIRECTOR AND HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

Members considered appointment of the Managing Director and Head of Paid Service.

Councillor Targowska explained the recommendation was being put to Council following an extensive recruitment process. She highlighted the fantastic work of officers, including the Head of HR and Corporate Projects, in finding the best possible candidate. The process had begun in August 2018 with the appointment of Solace. The advert had received 39 applications which was reduced to a short list of 11 following a technical assessment by a former London borough Chief Executive. A shortlist of five candidates attended an assessment day which included psychometric testing, a panel discussion with external stakeholders and one on one meetings with the Leader and Deputy Leader. Two candidates had attended a final panel selection interview. The panel comprised the Leader, Deputy Leader, and Lead Members for HR, Children's Services, Adult Services and Planning. The panel unanimously agreed to recommend the appointment of Duncan Sharkey.

Councillor Jones stated that she had not been allowed to attend the Part II element of the Employment and Member Standards Panel meeting that had established the process. She understood the reasons for this, however she was subsequently surprised that no Opposition Members had been invited to participate in the selection or shortlisting process. Without this participation she did not feel that she had enough evidence to make a decision and would therefore abstain.

Councillor Stretton echoed the comments of Councillor Jones. It sounded like a robust process but she had no evidence. Councillor Hunt commented that all councillors would have liked to have been involved but she understood it was left in the best hands to decide the process. Councillor Stretton responded that she did not expect all to be involved, but she would have expected at least one representative from the Opposition to have been included.

Councillor Hill commented on 'the incredible HR mystery' that had led to the loss of a credible Head of Paid Service. He felt that questions from councillors on this had gone unanswered. He had attended the Employment and Member Standards Panel as a substitute and had tried to raise concerns in the Part I section of the meeting but had been stopped. He would abstain due to a lack of information.

Councillor Dudley stated that the recruitment had been an enormously rigorous process. The advert had been placed in the Sunday Times, the MJ and via Linked In. a significant number of applicants had come forward. Six members of Cabinet were involved in the last part of the process with the two final candidates. All panel members had independently recommended Duncan Sharkey and therefore the decision was unanimous. On behalf of all Members, Councillor Dudley placed on record his thanks to Russell O'Keefe who was an extremely skilled and competent local government officer and had done an excellent job as Acting Managing Director. He also thanked Andy Jeffs, Executive Director and other senior officers. Duncan Sharkey was joining the borough from Milton Keynes. He had already dealt with a number of the issues the borough needed to address. Councillor Dudley was sure that Duncan Sharkey would be pleased to meet with Councillor Jones and the rest of the Opposition.

Councillor Targowska explained that the interview panel recommended the appointment to the Employment and Member Standards Panel; the decision was then brought to Full Council for ratification. In response to Councillor Hill she stated that she did not believe that any Councillor questions had gone unanswered. Councillor Hill had not been stopped from speaking; as Chairman she had stopped him from speaking on a Part II item in Part I. He had been given a full opportunity to speak in the Part II section of the meeting. Councillor Targowska thanked Russell O'Keefe for his hard work as Acting Managing Director.

It was proposed by Councillor Targowska, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

**RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and approves the recommendation from the Employment and Member Standards Panel that:**

- i) Duncan Sharkey be appointed to the permanent position of Managing Director and Head of Paid Service.**
- ii) The appointment to commence from February 2019.**
- iii) The appointment at a salary of £149,000 per annum, within the Managing Director salary band of £122,400 - £149,083.**

**(41 Councillors voted for the motion; Councillor M. Airey, N. Airey, Alexander, Bateson, Bhatti, Bicknell, Bowden, Brimacombe, Bullock, Cannon, Coppinger, Diment, Dudley, D. Evans, Gilmore, Hilton, Hollingsworth, Hunt, Ilyas, Kellaway, Lion, Love, Luxton, Majeed, McWilliams, Mills, Muir, Quick, Rankin, S. Rayner, Richards, Sharma, Sharp, Sharpe, Shelim, Smith, Story, Targowska, D. Wilson, E. Wilson and Yong. 4 Councillors abstained: Councillors Beer, Hill, Jones and Stretton)**

88. REVIEW AND REPUBLISHING OF RBWM'S GAMBLING ACT 2005 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Members considered approval of the revised Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2019-2022.

Councillor M. Airey explained that the report was a procedural one. The borough was required, as a Licensing Authority under the Act, to produce a statement of principles and update it every three years. The appendix detailed the proposed changes which

COUNCIL - 28.01.19

were mainly administrative in nature. The statement had been unanimously agreed for recommendation to Full Council by the Licensing Panel on 8 January 2019. The only query raised had related to the requirement for door supervisors to be SIA licensed.

It was proposed by Councillor M. Airey, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and endorses the recommendation from the Licensing Panel that the RBWM Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2019 – 2022 be approved for immediate implementation.**

The meeting, which began at 7.30pm, ended at 9.03pm.

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....