

COUNCIL

27 JANUARY 2016

At the meeting of Watford Borough Council held at the Town Hall, Watford on Wednesday, 27th January, 2016.

Present: Chairman (Councillor K Hastrick)
The Mayor (D Thornhill)

Councillors S Bashir, N Bell, S Bolton, I Brown, J Brown, K Collett, J Connal, S Counter, K Crout, G Derbyshire, J Dhindsa, F Ewudo, M Haley, M Hofman, S Johnson, A Joynes, A Khan, R Martins, B Mauthoor, B Mehta, M Mills, A Rindl, T Rogers, D Scudder, N Shah, I Sharpe, S Silver, P Taylor, L Topping, M Turmaine, D Walford, M Watkin, M Whitman, S Williams and T Williams

Officers: Managing Director
Head of Democracy and Governance
Head of Community and Customer Services
Head of Finance
Corporate and External Communications Section Head
Democratic Services Manager
Member Development and Civic Officer
Mayor's Political Assistant

51 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

52 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Council was informed that, under the Council's Code of Conduct, all Councillors had been given a dispensation by the Monitoring Officer to consider and vote on minute number 56 as all Members had pecuniary interests in that item.

53 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2015 and the Extraordinary Council meeting of 23 November 2015 were submitted and signed.

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Civic Carol Service

The Chairman thanked all the Members who had attended the Civic Carol service and Christ Church for their generous donation to the Chairman's charities from the collection taken at the service.

Watford Lions

The Chairman explained that a presentation event was being held that evening by Watford Lions, when cheques would be presented to her nominated charities, New Hope and Watford Foodbank. There would also be a presentation to the Elected Mayor's nominated charity, New Hope. The Funds had been collected at the annual fireworks display in Cassiobury Park. She thanked everyone who had attended and Watford Lions for organising the collection. In addition she wished to thank Norman and Mavis Tyrwhitt who were attending the presentation on behalf of the Council.

Chairman's Quiz

The Chairman announced she would be holding a charity quiz on 17 March and asked Members to think about their teams.

Management of Conservation Area Task Group Survey

The Task Group was keen to get as many Councillors' views as possible about the management of Watford's conservation areas regardless of whether members had a conservation area in their ward. All members had received e-mails from Ishbel Morren which provided them with a link to the online survey for Councillors. Officers had extended the survey deadline until Sunday 31 January.

Ex-councillor Steve O'Brien

The Chairman reminded members that former Watford Borough Councillor, Steve O'Brien had passed away recently.

Holocaust Memorial Day

The Chairman informed Council that it was Holocaust memorial day and the theme for this year was 'Don't Stand By', the Chairman would be representing the Council at Watford Synagogue on 8 February for their all day event which was aimed at educating students about the holocaust.

The Council held a minute's silence.

MAYOR'S REPORT

A report of the Mayor had been circulated with the agenda.

The Chairman invited Members to indicate whether they wished to ask a question of the Mayor. Councillors Silver, Topping, Mehta, Rogers, Turmaine, Haley, S Williams, Dhindsa, Joynes and Bashir indicated that they wished to ask questions.

- a) Councillor Silver asked the Mayor to inform Council explicitly which measures would be used to evaluate the success of the German Christmas market.

The Mayor responded that she would go on public opinion and what was evident. The German market was an attempt to bring a little more life into the top of town. It had been felt last year that the ice rink was isolated and there needed to be a bit more around it. Watford was not a huge city and therefore it would not attract a massive market. The German Christmas Market was an attempt to bring in more to the High Street at no cost to the Council. The German Market was arranged through the Council's partners Town and Country Markets (TCM) who ran the main market. They had approached the Council about bringing in more stalls at Christmas which was agreed. There had been a mixed reception from the public, however, it cost the Council nothing and added some colour and life. The Council would not be analysing the success of the market in the way suggested by Councillor Silver as there had been no cost.

- b) Councillor Joynes enquired whether it was a design fault that the market did not have the wind screens that had now been put up and could the Council get compensation.

The Mayor responded that it was not a design fault. There had been a cross party working group on the market. The initial proposal was for an outdoor market. Due to pressure from opposition groups it was decided to progress with a market that was similar to the then existing market. However, there were no suitable locations for a full indoor market. Many suggestions were received and a feasibility study was carried out on each one, this resulted in the current location. The Council engaged with stall holders, all parties and had visits to see other markets who had similar arrangements which were successful. In response to a request from the current stall holders the Council found the money to install the screening.

It was not a design fault it was never intended for there to be a wind screen which was what had been agreed by everyone. Only once the market was completed was it realised that there was a wind tunnel effect. The new screen would be ready by the end of March.

The Mayor continued that occupancy rates in the market were up and Watford market was one of TCM's best performing markets. The publication 'Market Times' showed that markets were in decline nationally. The

successful markets were those which were niche or food stalls. The stalls offering food at Watford Market were doing well. Markets were changing nationally and Watford's needed to evolve in response. The market was failing before the move and it was a different market experience that people wanted at the moment.

- c) Councillor Haley noted in the Mayor's report that anti-social behaviour (ASB) had fallen by 8% across Borough. He enquired whether the fall in ASB was consistent across the borough or whether there was an increase in some areas. He commented that the complaints he received were about ASB increasing in the centre of town. This included a report of homeless people fighting in an underpass from Queens' Road to intu in the centre of town during the day.

The Mayor commented that ASB in some parts of the town was non-existent. It was not consistent across the town. When councillors asked residents what they considered to be ASB, in some areas it was inconsiderate parking. Central ward included the town centre and would therefore include everything that went on in an urban town centre. There would not be a town nationally without ASB. The issue was less about numbers and more about how it affected peoples lives.

The Mayor continued that early in her term as Mayor there were children throwing stones at buses and fighting in parks. It was a trend generally that this type of behaviour had decreased. With regards to homeless people fighting, the Mayor presumed that the Councillor had reported this and was also in contact with the ASB officer regularly. If incidents were reported in an area consistently then it would be identified as a hot spot and would get picked up by the Joint Authority Group. The Mayor encouraged the Councillor to engage with the local neighbourhood team and Sergeant Simon Mason. The level of violence in the town had gone down considerably. The Police reacted to any intelligence they received regarding people coming in from London. The Mayor emphasised again that councillors should engage with ASB officers in the Council and the Neighbourhood Teams in the Housing Trust.

- d) Councillor Topping stated that in Watford Market on the week before Christmas, 11 stalls were closed with shutters drawn. This week there had been 10 shutters drawn. Within the market, unit 36 was closed with shutters open due to a large industrial fridge freezer left by a previous occupant that could not be moved, even though she had received assurances from the TCM manager that he had tried. Therefore, no rents had been collected in this unit for 2015. She enquired that she thought footfall was still down and stall holders were more successful in the high street and were using the units as storage whilst they were selling on the high street. Councillor Topping thanked the Mayor for listening to Councillor Mehta's proposals regarding the market wind screen.

The Mayor responded that there was currently 82% occupancy which TCM stated was better than their other markets. With regards to footfall – if there

was a failing business councillors would not ask why people did not go to their shop. Therefore, with market traders why should taxpayers subsidise their failing businesses. The Council used to subsidise the old market at over £120,000 per year for many years. There was a current arrangement where TCM ran the market and if the Councillor was not happy she could bring issues back to the Managing Director. The Council could not force people into the market to buy things they did not want. The Mayor hoped that councillors visited the market to buy things as there were some brilliant stalls who were running successfully. The Market was talking itself down and appearing as a negative story in Watford Observer contributed to people not visiting. A trader could move if being at Watford was not right for them, they were not tied to Watford. TCM had said they were trying to target certain stalls for whom a market would work and they hoped to attract them to effect a change. On average TCM received five new interested traders a week of which two converted to stalls. The market was in transition from an old fashioned style market to something different. Concerns could be taken up with TCM and then the Managing Director.

- e) Councillor Mehta commented that in the last two weeks Watford Community Housing Trust and Watford Borough Council had approved a decision to create a joint venture company to expand the availability of social and affordable housing in Watford. Councillor Mehta believed that there needed to be creative solutions to the town's high waiting list and to help people onto the housing ladder. The Councillor asked whether the Mayor would explain to tenants how they would take away their right-to-buy, or confirm how the council would help tenants to buy their housing association homes.

The Mayor reported that in her maiden speech on the Housing and Planning Bill at the House of Lords the previous day there was cross-bench support for more social and affordable housing and mixed tenures. The Bill was damaging to social housing in Watford as it would allow developers to escape their s.106 agreements so as not to provide social housing. It would take away secure tenancies for the first time, and mean that social housing tenants would be on 3-5 year tenancies. Any person who currently lived in social housing with a household income of above £30,000 was going to be asked to revert to full market rent. During the debate in the House of Lords the Minister spoke of "high earning families".

The reason people were concerned about right-to-buy was because it took social housing out of the market. There had never been a time when the houses were replaced one for one. There was a difference replacing one for one or like for like. The Government proposals were currently saying that if a housing association sold off a property in Watford they could replace it in any of their stock nationally.

Nobody could override right-to-buy, there was nothing in the Housing Trust which was trying to cut round this. The reason that the Council and the Trust were coming together was because they recognised the housing crisis. The Mayor hoped that the Government would allow councils to fund

building again. The housing company was nothing but good news for tenants, but the Housing and Planning bill was nothing but bad news.

- f) Councillor Turmaine enquired regarding the closure of the custody suite at Watford Police Station and the Mayor's meeting with the Police Crime Commissioner (PCC), the Mayor had said that she would campaign if the new system did not deliver the results intended. He asked whether the Mayor had received agreement from the PCC that if that was the case the custody suite would be reinstated.

The Mayor reported that she had received agreement from the PCC that he would review it. There was a formal route through Chief Inspector Wheatley and also an informal route, by speaking to those who were making journeys to Hatfield. There was concern about how much time would be spent by the police on the road. This was an issue where everyone had some discomfort. If there was evidence that this was taking the police away from the streets where they were needed then something would have to be done.

The Mayor expressed concern about the magistrates court moving and probation moving to Hemel Hempstead. She hoped that all councillors would agree that we still wanted a police station in Watford. This closure was about the extent of the cuts that were being faced. Things were not going to be good in the next few years. The PCC was going to be looking at the estate and the whole building. The current Watford custody suite was not fit for purpose. The Mayor would continue to monitor the situation along with councillors to be ready to act if it was apparent that the situation was not working as it was an important issue for people in Watford.

- g) Councillor Seamus Williams thanked the Mayor for informing Council about her first speech in the Lords. He continued that the Court of Appeal had ruled that the bedroom tax had wrongly discriminated against a victim of domestic violence and a disabled child and asked whether the Mayor would apologise for supporting the tax for three years.

The Mayor indicated that it was Labour who had brought in the bedroom tax in the private sector. She asked whether the Labour group would be prepared to apologise for treating the private and public sector differently.

- h) Councillor Bashir also enquired about the closure of the police custody suite at Watford Police Station. As the Mayor had already identified there was serious concern in the town about the impact on front line policing with regards to safety, particularly with the night time economy in Watford. For police officers transporting suspects it was a round journey of 30 miles to Hatfield, if Hatfield was full they would be taken to Stevenage Station which was a round journey of 60 miles, about an hour's journey. This would have an impact on officers in front line services. He asked if the Mayor would accept that the intervention with the PCC had been too little too late and an earlier input could have had a different result.

The Mayor responded that the custody suite was not fit for purpose. It could not be brought up to standard as it was located in a 1960s building. The decision had been made by the Conservative PCC.

- i) Councillor Rogers explained that he had attended a councillors' briefing on the Wiggshall Road lane closure. There was concern at the meeting about the major disruption, and that not enough thought had been given about adverse weather conditions that could extend the closure period and working practices where contractors would not be putting in extra hours to ensure it was finished as quickly as possible. He enquired why the County Council was being blamed when it was a Watford Borough Council project.

The Chair reminded Councillor Rogers that there was a motion on this subject later in the agenda.

The Mayor explained that as the legal responsibility rested with Herts Highways, they had to have the final say. If there was any litigation it would go to Herts Highways. The points raised by Councillor Rogers had been covered at the councillors' briefing.

- j) Councillor Dhindsa welcomed the refurbishment of car parks in the town centre and thanked residents for putting up with the inconvenience. He commented on the car parks being locked at night time when residents were trying to find spaces to park in the streets. When residents could not park it had a knock on effect in Vicarage and Holywell. He asked the Mayor whether it would be possible to negotiate for the car park to be available for residents in central ward. If there was extra wear and tear due to people using it at night time and extra costs of staffing to patrol then this could be off set by charges to residents.

The Mayor responded that this was being done. The central ward councillors had already met with the car park owners and they were amenable to this idea.

56

FINANCIAL PLANNING: DRAFT REVENUE AND CAPITAL ESTIMATES 2016/2019 AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2016-2019

Council received a report of Cabinet, including the original report presented to Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January 2016 and an additional report from the Shared Director of Finance setting out the Council Tax Resolution for 2015/2016.

The Mayor moved the Budget report, incorporating the following amendment agreed at Cabinet, which was seconded by Councillor Watkin.

“In light of the Budget Panels recommendations and a further review by officers of the Equality Impact Assessment and benchmarking exercise agrees that the increase in charges for 2016/17 for burials is reduced by 50%. That officers review the impact of this increase on demand and undertake further benchmarking during that financial year with a view to securing:

- cost recovery in the face of budget pressures and reduction in government grant
- income to facilitate additional resourcing requirements of the Cemetery Strategy
- alignment of the council's costs with those of similar authorities
- management of the demand for diminishing cemetery space.

It is agreed that the fees to non-residents remain at 3 times the charges made to residents as this is a key policy to manage the demand on the depleting stock of available grave space.”

Councillor Bell moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Khan –

“We propose our amended version of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) following appropriate scrutiny. This will include a freeze to Council Tax, no change to residents burial costs and a five times rise for non-resident burial costs, a free collection of 3-bulky items and extra savings through a 10% cut in councillor’s special responsibility allowance and the Mayoral allowance and by cutting the costs of the council’s printing by a third (£41,000.)

In order to protect the most vulnerable people in our town, we propose £1million to be kept in reserves for Homelessness prevention and to go for further growth by allocating up to £1.5 million to the capital programme for St Albans Road, promoting jobs, growth and regeneration for the local economy”

Members debated the original motion and the amendment.

The amendment was then put to the vote

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 the votes were recorded as follows –

Those Members voting in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Bashir, Bell, Connal, Dhindsa, Ewudo, Haley, Joynes, Khan, Mauthoor, Mills, Shah, Turmaine and S Williams

Those Members voting against the amendment:

Mayor Thornhill, The Chairman Councillor Hastrick, Councillors Bolton, I Brown, J Brown, Collett, Counter, Crout, Derbyshire, Hofman, Johnson, Martins, Rindl, Scudder, Sharpe, Taylor, Walford, Watkin and T Williams

Those Members abstaining from voting

Councillors Mehta, Rogers, Silver, Topping and Whitman

The amendment was LOST by 13 votes to 19 and 5 abstentions

The original motion was then put to Council.

Those Members voting in favour of the original motion:

Mayor Thornhill, The Chairman Councillor Hastrick, Councillors Bolton, I Brown, J Brown, Collett, Counter, Crout, Derbyshire, Hofman, Johnson, Martins, Rindl, Scudder, Sharpe, Taylor, Walford, Watkin and T Williams

Those Members voting against the original motion:

None

Those Members abstaining from voting

Councillors Bashir, Bell, Connal, Dhindsa, Ewudo, Haley, Joynes, Khan, Muthor, Mehta, Mills, Rogers, Shah, Silver, Topping, Turmaine, Whitman and S Williams

The motion was CARRIED by 19 votes to 0 with 18 abstentions

RESOLVED –

1. To agree proposals recommended by Cabinet on 18 January 2016:

- a. That the Council's net General Fund expenditure for 2016/17 shall be £16,035,060.
- b. That the Capital Programme shall be as set out in the Cabinet report.

and in approving these recommendations

- c. To have regard to the Director of Finance's assessment of financial risks and the level of balances and provisions required, as set out in the Cabinet report.

2. That Watford Borough Council's Council Tax Base for 2016/17 has been calculated at 31,315 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 made under Section 31B (1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended.

3. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (A) *Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act.
(Effectively the gross expenditure and transfers to reserves)*

£68,409,160

- (B) *Being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.
(Effectively the gross income and transfers from reserves)* **£60,585,493**
- (C) *Being the amount by which the aggregate at 2.3 (A) above exceeds the aggregate at 2.3 (B) above calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A (4) of the Act as its Council Tax Requirement for the year* **£7,823,667**
- (D) *Being the amount at paragraph 2.3 (C) divided by amount at 2.2 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 (at Band D)* **£249.84**

(E)

Council Tax Valuation Bands	Conversion Factor to Band D	Watford's Share (£)
A	6 / 9	166.56
B	7 / 9	194.32
C	8 / 9	222.08
D	1	249.84
E	11 / 9	305.36
F	13 / 9	360.88
G	15 / 9	416.40
H	2	499.68

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at paragraph 2.3 (D) 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 2016/17 in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands

4. That a report including precepts of both the Hertfordshire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner be presented to the Council Functions Committee on 25 February 2016 to set the total Council Tax.

57

PROPERTY INVESTMENT STRATEGY, GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Council received a report of Cabinet, including the original report presented to Cabinet at its meeting on 18 January.

The motion to increase the key decision limit to £3m for decisions relating to the investment portfolio was moved by Councillor Sharpe and seconded by Councillor Watkin.

On being put to Council the motion was CARRIED

RESOLVED

To increase the key decision limit to £3m for decisions relating to the investment portfolio.

58 **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.0**

No questions had been received.

59 **PETITIONS PRESENTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12.0**

No petitions had been received.

60 **BUSINESS ESPECIALLY BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE CHAIRMAN OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE WHICH IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIRMAN SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.**

There was no urgent business.

61 **MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 13.0**

Council was informed that three motions had been received.

- 1) The following motion was proposed by Councillor Sharpe and seconded by Councillor Taylor:

“This council notes that

- Hertfordshire County Council is proposing further significant cuts to bus services across the county as part of its budget for 2016–17.
- This is part of £20 million cuts envisaged in the county council’s budget proposals, alongside a 3.99% (maximum possible) council tax rise.
- Among the proposals is a possible axing of the £390,000 grant to Transport for London for routes that cross the boundary between Hertfordshire and Greater London, which could threaten the popular 142 and 258 routes from Watford to Brent Cross and Harrow.
- This follows a £1.5 million cut in funding for bus routes by the county council last year.

This council believes that

- These routes provide an essential service to students attending the Bushey schools, as well as to passengers travelling to destinations in North London, including accessing the Underground network.
- The financial settlement from the Conservative government is forcing drastic cuts on local communities, the county council should make every effort to protect vital public transport routes, such as the 142 and 258.

This council calls on Hertfordshire County Council to ensure that any arrangement with Transport for London maintains the current level of service on the 142 and 258 routes.”

Councillor Mehta moved the following amendment seconded by Councillor Silver:

“Replace all wording with:

This council notes

- That all public bodies have a duty to review the spending of public money in order to ensure that public money is being appropriately spent
- That Hertfordshire County Council have stated they are working towards an agreement with TfL as part of the natural end of their funding agreement, and that the 142 and 258 services are commercially viable
- In Financial Year 2014/15 the 142 and 258 bus route services were used by 2,060,340 passengers

This council believes

- Businesses that are able to pay for themselves out of profits should not be further subsidised by taxpayers
- 142 and 258 bus routes should continue to operate in the same fashion as they do now, either through support from Hertfordshire County Council or by virtue of the fact that they are commercially viable and no longer need taxpayers money to support them

This council calls on Hertfordshire County Council to maintain its current policy to ensure that any arrangement with TfL maintains the current level of service on the 142 and 258 routes.”

The following amendment was moved by Councillor S Williams seconded by Councillor Haley:

“Under “This Council believes that...”

These routes also serve the residents of Bushey, who use these routes to commute to Watford to make use of local services, to Watford General Hospital as patients, visitors or workers”

Councillor Sharpe accepted Councillor S William’s amendment for inclusion in the original motion.

On being put to Council Councillor Mehta’s amendment was LOST

On being put to Council the substantive motion was CARRIED

RESOLVED:

This council notes that

- Hertfordshire County Council is proposing further significant cuts to bus services across the county as part of its budget for 2016–17.
- This is part of £20 million cuts envisaged in the county council’s budget proposals, alongside a 3.99% (maximum possible) council tax rise.
- Among the proposals is a possible axing of the £390,000 grant to Transport for London for routes that cross the boundary between Hertfordshire and Greater London, which could threaten the popular 142 and 258 routes from Watford to Brent Cross and Harrow.
- This follows a £1.5 million cut in funding for bus routes by the county council last year.

This council believes that

- These routes also serve the residents of Bushey, who use these routes to commute to Watford to make use of local services, to Watford General Hospital as patients, visitors or workers.
- These routes provide an essential service to students attending the Bushey schools, as well as to passengers travelling to destinations in North London, including accessing the Underground network.
- The financial settlement from the Conservative government is forcing drastic cuts on local communities, the county council should make every effort to protect vital public transport routes, such as the 142 and 258.

This council calls on Hertfordshire County Council to ensure that any arrangement with Transport for London maintains the current level of service on the 142 and 258 routes.

2) The following motion was proposed by Councillor Haley and seconded by Councillor Dhindsa

“This council notes the massive disruption caused by the poorly planned road works on Wiggshall Road that had been continuous for the last two weeks and is ongoing.

This disruption is creating havoc for local residents, particularly in Watford Fields and West Watford, with short journeys across Watford taking hours. Workers are finding it difficult to get to work on time, and students are being late for school.

The disruption is also having a detrimental effect on the local economy as shoppers avoid coming into town., and local businesses are being hit.

The ill planned works have created a rat-run through Watford Fields, as forewarned by the Watford Fields Residents Association, past a popular local school.

The mayor promised that disruption would be kept to "a minimum" but the everyday gridlock caused by this poorly planned road closure demonstrates the incompetency of this fading and tired regime.

Council is called upon to take immediate action and work with Herts County Council to reduce the detrimental impact of the road works, and that for any future large scale road closures that Watford Council consults and engages with residents who would be directly affected when plans are being formulated and not when they are about to be implemented."

Members then debated the motion.

During the debate Councillor Mehta raised a point of order following a comment made by Councillor Sharpe and the language of the Chair.

The Chair apologised. Councillor Scudder explained that Councillor Mehta had misunderstood Councillor Sharpe's comment.

Later in the debate Councillor Sharpe made a point of personal explanation in response to a comment from Councillor Dhindsa that in the past he did not oppose a road to a hospital but rather to an industrial estate. The Managing Director explained the difference to Members between a point of order and a point of personal explanation as set out in the constitution.

Following a question from Councillor Ewudo the Head of Democracy and Governance explained that in order to make a point of personal explanation the Councillor did not have to wait for another Councillor to finish speaking but could stand up and make the point, it was then up to the Chair's discretion when to allow them to speak.

On being put to Council the motion was LOST

WAIVING OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8.0

During the previous debate the Chairman moved that Council Procedure Rule 8.0 be waived to allow the meeting to finish at 10.45pm and then 11.00pm

Prior to the final motion the Chairman moved that Council Procedure Rule 8.0 be waived to allow the meeting to finish at 11.10pm

On being put to the meeting these motions were declared to be CARRIED

- 3) The following motion was proposed by Councillor Rogers and seconded by Councillor Mehta:

“Warner Brothers Studio Expansion.

Council notes the continued success of the Warner Brothers Studios and Harry Potter Tours, as well as the significant benefits these have brought to the area, including the positive manner in which they communicate with local residents. Additionally, Council welcomes the positive manner in which the local residents in Woodside regard the Studios and their operations.

Council welcomes the application of Warner Brothers Studios for further expansion of the Leavesden Studios filming facilities and Tours and notes the confidence this shows in our local area. The Council looks forward to working with Warner Brothers and Three Rivers District Council on their future plans which bring so much pleasure to so many.

Council therefore requests that the Mayor writes to Warner Brothers with this message.”

Members then debated the motion

During the debate Councillor Silver made a point of personal explanation in response to a comment made by Councillor S Williams that he had supported the housing of refugees in Watford at a previous Council meeting. He had felt however it was not something that the Council should rule on. Councillor Mehta also made a point of personal explanation that she was the daughter of a refugee but had felt that the Council should not be ruling on a Westminster motion.

Following a complaint by Councillor Mehta the Chair asked Councillor S Williams to apologise for his language. Councillor S Williams apologised.

On being put to Council the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

Warner Brothers Studio Expansion.

Council notes the continued success of the Warner Brothers Studios and Harry Potter Tours, as well as the significant benefits these have brought to the area, including the positive manner in which they communicate with local residents. Additionally, Council welcomes the positive manner in

which the local residents in Woodside regard the Studios and their operations.

Council welcomes the application of Warner Brothers Studios for further expansion of the Leavesden Studios filming facilities and Tours and notes the confidence this shows in our local area. The Council looks forward to working with Warner Brothers and Three Rivers District Council on their future plans which bring so much pleasure to so many.

Council therefore requests that the Mayor writes to Warner Brothers with this message.

Chairman

The Meeting started at 7.30 pm
and finished at 11.00 pm