

---

## COUNCIL

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Wednesday, 21 March 2018 from 7.00pm - 9.55pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Bobbin, Monique Bonney, Andy Booth, Tina Booth, Lloyd Bowen, Bowles, Roger Clark, Mike Cosgrove, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Duncan Dewar-Whalley, Mark Ellen, Paul Fleming, June Garrad, Sue Gent, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Mike Henderson, Alan Horton, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Samuel Koffie-Williams (Deputy Mayor), Gerry Lewin, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Padmini Nissanga, Prescott (Mayor), Ken Pugh, David Simmons, Ben Stokes, Roger Truelove, Anita Walker, Ghlin Whelan, Mike Whiting, Ted Wilcox, Tony Winckless and John Wright.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Billy Attaway, Katherine Bescoby, Donna Price, Nick Vickers and Emma Wiggins.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Sarah Aldridge, Derek Conway, Mick Galvin and George Samuel.

### 546 PRAYERS

The Mayor's Chaplain said Prayers.

### 547 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Mayor outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 548 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 February 2018 (Minute Nos. 498 – 512) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record, subject to an amendment to page 508, second paragraph, to replace the words 'did not understand' with the following text (shown in bold).

"The Leader of the Labour Group said that many residents **looked at the overall total of their Council Tax bill and did not disaggregate the amounts....**"

### 549 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor John Wright declared a disclosable non pecuniary interest in respect of the urgent motion, as he was appointed by Kent County Council as a Governor at the Medway Hospital.

### 550 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor drew attention to the tabled paper which advised that he had attended 20 engagements since the last Council meeting. He gave an update on the

Carnival Court selections; an evening with St John's Ambulance; promoting the borough; and details of fundraising for his charities.

The Mayor advised that he had accepted a late motion, to enable the Council to respond to the consultation before the deadline.

## **551 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC**

The Mayor advised that four questions had been submitted by members of the public, the answers to which had been provided, can be viewed on the Council's website and are attached as Appendix I to these minutes. The Mayor invited the members of the public who were present to ask a supplementary question. There was no supplementary question to Question Three.

### **Question One**

Mr Richard Palmer asked the Cabinet Member for Regeneration if it was usual for Councils to bid for government funding for schemes yet to be consulted on, and whether any other theoretical schemes had been subject to similar pre-consultation discussions and funding options?

The Cabinet Member responded by saying that Councils had no control over the bidding mechanism and the timing of government funding grants, and so Councils had to bid when funds opened and before they closed, if it was for the benefit of the Borough and other local authorities. The timing was in the hands of the Government.

### **Question Two**

Mr Kane Blackwell welcomed the recent announcements regarding improvements to play equipment, the Swallows Leisure Centre, and the new cinema and shops in Sittingbourne, and asked the Leader if he could explain the benefits of such investment, especially for young people? And asked if he agreed that those who disagreed were out of touch and were betraying the vision for the future?

The Leader agreed that the improvements and development referred to would bring a tremendous boost to the economy of the Borough and would provide job opportunities. He considered that it was a game-changer for Swale, and would especially be of benefit for the younger generation.

### **Question Four**

Mr John Greenhill referred to a recent decision by the Local Government Ombudsman that cast questions on the credibility of members of the authority, and asked the Leader if relevant information had failed to be disclosed in Freedom of Information (FOI) requests, and would he make a public statement about this after an internal inquiry had taken place? He asked the Leader whether he knew that Quinn Estates had been involved in drafting the Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid, about any involvement of Council officers in that process, and if he did, whether he had acquiesced or played any role in that? And what the truth was as there appeared to be a conflict between the Leader and the Council's press office?

The Leader advised that he was not aware of any Local Government Ombudsman reports making any queries regarding the conduct of officers or Members, and so would not answer this question until he had spoken with the Legal Team (a written response would be sent). In respect of the Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid, the bid had been put together by Kent County Council (KCC) officers; Swale officers had also been involved in the draft and representatives of developers had also been asked by KCC to contribute to the final draft. He was delighted that the bid had got through the first round and he sincerely hoped that it would also get through the second round. He refuted any personal knowledge that officers were under investigation. There would be a review of how FOI requests were dealt with, however, he drew attention to the time being spent by officers in regeneration and planning on responding to FOIs.

## **552 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS**

The Mayor advised that eight questions had been submitted by Members, the answers to which had been provided, can be viewed on the Council's website and are attached as Appendix II to these minutes. The Mayor invited Members present to ask a supplementary question.

### **Question One**

Councillor Mike Cosgrove responded to a question from Councillor Roger Truelove about whether young people would prefer to "hang out" in the multi-story car park or outside the Travelodge.

### **Question Two**

Councillor Roger Truelove asked who determined what the 'local economic need' was and what part did the Council play? He emphasised that it should not be what the colleges wanted to provide, irrespective of local economic need.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration advised that the Council would work with a range of commercial companies across the Borough and had strong links with a range of organisations including KCC, South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) and other quasi government departments. He referred to the constraints for young people in terms of access to further education and travel time/cost and it had recently been recognised in a further education area review that there was not reasonable provision for all in Swale. He welcomed the cooperation of Members across the Council to help address this issue for young people.

### **Question Three**

There was no supplementary question.

### **Question Four**

Councillor Mike Baldock referred to the response given, and asked if the Cabinet Member could explain why in August 2017, when discussing the Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid, a senior officer had said in an email to KCC and Swale's Head of Planning "I have tried to introduce some words about progressing the Kent

Science Park site in parallel with the Local Plan as a major opportunity” and asked if it was usual for a Council to try to aid a private company to get Government money for a site not in the Local Plan and not submitted?

The Cabinet Member for Planning advised that this was fresh evidence and agreed to provide a written response.

#### **Question Five**

Councillor Ghlin Whelan advised that he had checked records at Companies House and said that Mark Quinn had a significant controlling interest in the Spirit of Sittingbourne partnership. He asked the Cabinet Member, did he not realise that his own administration was of public concern?

The Cabinet Member for Planning clarified his response in that Quinn Estates was not part of the original partnership, but had been brought in by the two original partners (U & I and Essential Land).

#### **Question Six**

Councillor Monique Bonney asked the Leader if there had been any written agreement between officers and members with Mark Quinn to work on the Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid?

The Leader said ‘no’.

#### **Question Seven**

Councillor Monique Bonney referred to transport modelling, and asked the Cabinet Member if he agreed that it was unfair that a major developer had such a significant influence on the core data for the Local Development Plan?

The Cabinet Member for Planning advised that it was common practice for developers to support transport modelling. There was a due process and the information it produced was public information. He understood that there had been more than one developer involved.

#### **Question Eight**

Councillor Mike Henderson asked the Cabinet Member if he considered if the target number of housing 10 Syrian families should be increased, as other Councils had housed more? He also asked when he would get a written answer to a question that he had asked two meetings ago?

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Wellbeing advised that they had housed six Syrian families on the Isle of Sheppey and were seeking to house another four, which was what the Council had agreed to do. He encouraged support from people in Faversham. In respect of his second question, a written response would be sent.

**553 MOTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE RULE 15****A – Motion re Voting Age**

Councillor Roger Truelove proposed the following Motion:

“This Council supports the principle of extending the franchise to vote in key national and local elections to 16 year olds.”

In proposing the motion, Councillor Roger Truelove referred to the history of democracy in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, which had first focussed on property and wealth before health, poverty and education. He emphasised the importance for 16 and 17 year olds to have a vote so that their interests were protected, and anticipated that others might say that young people were not sufficiently well informed or interested or mature enough to have a vote. He considered that liberal democracy was at risk and there was a need for proper information and for more education about democracy in schools. He believed that it would help democracy if young people could vote.

This was seconded by Councillor Ghlin Whelan.

A debate ensued, which centred on the following themes:

That young people's opinions should be trusted and valued; the positive experience of changing the voting age in Scotland for the Scottish Independence Referendum; that it was wrong that 16 and 17 year olds could join the army, get married, reproduce and pay tax but could not vote; that it would be a leap forward and a key milestone in history to lower the voting age; the impact of social media on democracy and results of social medial polls undertaken by a Member; that 16 and 17 year olds did not have a separate legal status from their parents; that young people were keen to be involved; that there were opportunities for young people to be involved in political organisations from a young age, such as animal rights groups and trade unions; that young people were affected by decisions made by the Council; that there was a need for better education in schools, colleges, further education and universities about democracy; and that the voting age should not be lowered referring to the fact that the voting age had been 21.

In summing up, Councillor Roger Truelove welcomed comments from Members in support of the Motion.

**During the debate, a recorded vote was requested and voting was as follows:**

For = Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Richard Darby, Mark Ellen, June Garrad, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Harrison, Mike Henderson, Roger Truelove, Ghlin Whelan and Tony Winckless. Total = 13.

Against = Councillors George Bobbin, Andy Booth, Tina Booth, Lloyd Bowen, Bowles, Roger Clark, Mike Cosgrove, Mike Dendor, Duncan Dewar-Whalley, Paul Fleming, Sue Gent, Alan Horton, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Samuel Koffie-Williams, Gerry Lewin, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Mini Nissanga,

Prescott, Ken Pugh, David Simmons, Ben Stokes, Anita Walker and Ted Wilcox.  
Total = 26.

Abstain = Councillors Mike Whiting and John Wright. Total = 2.

The Mayor advised that the Motion was lost.

### **B – Urgent Motion re Acute Stroke Services**

The Mayor drew attention to the tabled paper, that set out amended wording for the Motion.

Councillor John Wright proposed the following Motion:

“That this Council supports and urges that Medway hospital is chosen as one of the 4 hospitals for provision of acute stroke services in Kent. Swale Borough Council has looked at the consultation options and concluded that Medway Hospital and additionally Kent and Canterbury Hospital and their provision of acute services are critical for the health and wellbeing of ALL Swale’s residents.”

This was seconded by Councillor Ken Pugh, who reserved his right to speak.

In proposing the Motion, Councillor John Wright referred to the amended wording of the consultation to that previously circulated. He explained that the wording had been revised to include Canterbury Hospital, to reflect that it had just been announced that Canterbury had won a bid for a nursing centre and medical school. He spoke of the need for patients to have quick access to high quality acute stroke services, which was why the preferred option was Medway Hospital; and that it would make sense to have a facility in Canterbury which could be accessed quickly by residents of Faversham. Whilst the Canterbury option had been discounted at stage 2 of the consultation, he considered that things had moved on since that time, with the announcement referred to earlier. He encouraged Members to support the Motion, and to respond to the consultation.

A debate ensued, during which Members referred to the original Motion (that did not include reference to Canterbury Hospital) and their support for it, but questioned the revised wording as Medway Hospital should be the priority and they would not want Medway Hospital to lose out to the Kent and Canterbury Hospital. Comments were also made about the need to have regard to all residents of the Borough, not just those in Sittingbourne and the Isle of Sheppey; the need for a facility for Faversham residents; that the Kent and Canterbury Hospital should not be overlooked; tribute was paid to first class service provided by acute stroke services and their staff; the need for a ‘world class’ service for all in Kent; flaws in the public consultation; and the need to acknowledge that there could be four and not three hospitals in Kent for acute stroke services.

Councillor Mike Henderson proposed an amendment to the Motion (amendments shown in bold).

“That this Council supports and urges that Medway hospital is chosen as one of **what should be 4** hospitals for provision of acute stroke services in Kent. Swale

Borough Council has looked at the consultation options and concluded that Medway Hospital and additionally Kent and Canterbury Hospital and their provision of acute services **including stroke services** are critical for the health and wellbeing of ALL Swale's residents."

This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney who considered the amendment clarified the position and made it clearer that the consultation referred to three hospitals; and that there was a clear need for two hospitals to serve Swale residents.

The amendment was put to the vote, but was lost.

Councillor Ken Pugh, as seconder of the original motion, advised that the NHS would only sanction three hospitals in Kent based on the population; that the announcement regarding a medical school in Canterbury could mean that it would be possible for acute services in Canterbury in future years; and he emphasised the need for acute services to be operational now and spread across Kent.

In summing up, Councillor John Wright encouraged Members to support the Motion.

**A recorded vote was requested, and voting was as follows:**

For: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, George Bobbin, Andy Booth, Lloyd Bowen, Bowles, Roger Clark, Mike Cosgrove, Richard Darby, Mike Dendor, Duncan Dewar-Whalley, Mark Ellen, Paul Fleming, June Garrad, Sue Gent, James Hall, Nicholas Hampshire, Mike Henderson, Alan Horton, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton, Nigel Kay, Samuel Koffie-Williams, Gerry Lewin, Peter Marchington, Bryan Mulhern, Mini Nissanga, Prescott, Ken Pugh, David Simmons, Ben Stokes, Roger Truelove, Anita Walker, Ghlin Whelan, Mike Whiting, Ted Wilcox, Tony Winckless and John Wright. Total = 38.

Against: 0

Abstain: Councillors Monique Bonney, Tina Booth and Harrison. Total = 3.

The Mayor advised that the Motion was agreed.

**Resolved:**

***(1) That this Council supports and urges that Medway hospital is chosen as one of the 4 hospitals for provision of acute stroke services in Kent. Swale Borough Council has looked at the consultation options and concluded that Medway Hospital and additionally Kent and Canterbury Hospital and their provision of acute services are critical for the health and wellbeing of ALL Swale's residents.***

**554 LEADER'S STATEMENT**

The Leader gave a verbal update on the Housing Infrastructure Fund Forward Funding Bid and the funding announced for a medical school in Canterbury, before answering questions on the Leader's Statement.

**Housing Infrastructure Fund Forward Funding Bid**

The Leader advised that he was pleased to announce that the Housing Infrastructure Fund Forward Funding Bid had got through to the second round. The £31m was for Grovehurst Junction improvements, £6m for Key Street junction improvements and £3m for feasibility and design work for the Northern Relief Road and possibly the Southern Relief Road. Members welcomed the news and asked questions.

A Member referred to the increasing costs of the improvement works to Key Street and the impact of a planning application in Wises Lane, and asked if the Leader would be having a glass of champagne with Mr Quinn?

Another Member advised that the funding would concentrate on weaknesses in highway infrastructure identified by the Local Plan Inspector, and asked if the Leader agreed?

The Leader responded by saying that he hoped all Members welcomed the news, and that he would be having a cup of tea at home.

**Queenborough and Rushenden – Housing Infrastructure Viability Fund**

A Member asked if the Leader knew that the announcement of funding had sped up work, and that as a result of this 60 residents were now facing eviction from their moorings until 2022? He asked if the Leader would speak to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to see if there was a possibility for them to stay there?

In response to the questions, he agreed to raise the matter regarding moorings with the HCA in his next contact with them.

**Sittingbourne Town Centre Regeneration Scheme Update**

Questions were asked regarding how much the ribbon-cutting event would cost; did the Leader applaud that this was good news to shout about and would result in long term jobs; what the Leader's view was on recent media coverage and what financial diligence had been done regarding the new party; and how did the Council intend to manage the retail units?

The Leader responded by saying that his understanding was that partners changed their name when they amalgamated with another company but he would come back on that point; that he had no details regarding the ribbon-cutting event but that it was usual for the Mayor to attend such ceremonies throughout the Borough; and emphasised the importance of attracting more money into the economy and more jobs in the Borough.



## Health Update

The Leader gave a verbal update regarding the announcement of funding for a medical school in Canterbury and welcomed the benefits that this would bring to the area. He paid credit to the MP for Faversham and Mid Kent and the former MP for Canterbury.

Members welcomed the news in the updates, and also thanked others involved in respect of the campaign for a medical school in Canterbury, including the former MP for Canterbury and Mr Ken Rogers.

## Recent bad weather

A Member praised officers for their efforts but referred to the problems which resulted in 5000 residents not having water. Concern was expressed about the state of the water infrastructure, referring to other issues on the Isle of Sheppey in 2016, and the potential for further problems with additional development. The Leader was asked did he share those concerns and would he support an urgent meeting with the water companies regarding this? Was there anything more that could be done to address the issue?

Other Members praised staff and referred to the transformation project and the introduction of Skype that had meant many staff had been able to work from home. The Leader was asked if he disagreed with press coverage that officers had been 'skiving' and that instead it should have said 'Skyping'; and if he could comment on how the transformation project had helped?

The Leader was also asked if he agreed that the issue of compensation being given to residents by the water company was unfair, given that residents on the Isle of Sheppey had not been offered any compensation when they had similar problems in 2016? Other Members asked whether water infrastructure was an issue that the Scrutiny Committee could consider, and whether liaison meetings with the water companies should be reinstated?

Another Member asked whether there were other ways of informing residents other than social media about changes to bin collections during bad weather? Another Member asked if it was possible for Democratic Services to circulate details of a consultation from water companies to all Members?

During the discussion on this item, officers were praised for their efforts during the bad weather, particularly those in the cleansing team.

The Leader responded by thanking Members for the positive comments and praise for staff, referring to the number who had been able to work from home. He failed to understand the logic regarding the compensation from the water company, but would ask at the next opportunity. He was not sure what else could be done to inform residents of changes to bin collections, but welcomed ideas. He agreed that the water shortage might be a topic for the Scrutiny Committee to review, but that this was a matter for the Committee to determine. Lastly, he referred to the consultation by water companies and encouraged Members to respond.

### **Faversham Recreation Ground**

A Member asked the Leader if the Council had sufficient resource and resilience to work on this project? Another Member asked if the Leader was aware that the bid included extra staffing for implementation of the activity plan, including an apprentice?

The Leader responded by welcoming the project and said he was confident that there was sufficient resource to manage it.

### **Consultation for the Open Spaces and Play Strategy**

There were no questions on this item.

### **Local Government Finance**

A Member asked the Leader what his Government was going to do about the local government spending cuts?

The Leader responded by saying that local government had shown amazing resilience, and that he was doing all he could via the District Councils Network to lobby for a fair share of funding, as was the Local Government Association.

## **555 SHEERNESS COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - FEEDBACK FROM CONSULTATION AND NEXT STEPS**

The Leader introduced the report; congratulated residents of Sheerness in having their say on local governance; and proposed the recommendations in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Gerry Lewin.

The Leader of The Swale Group spoke in support of the report, praised all those involved in the review, but questioned whether there should be more than nine councillors on any new town council.

The Leader of the Labour Group advised that he was happy to go to the next stage of the consultation; and asked for clarification on the next stage of the process, asking whether Sheerness residents would be asked to vote on it?

The Leader of the Independent Group said he was surprised and delighted with the level of consultation response, given the low response in the previous community governance review.

Discussion ensued during which Members referred to the high volume of consultation responses; referred to Appendix I and expressed concern that some people might not understand that the town council would not replace Swale Borough Council, and that there may be misapprehensions and misunderstandings; asked whether the next stage of consultation would be a full postal ballot; that further consultation should be clear and should correct misunderstandings; and that Members should make sure that residents were aware of the facts.

The Leader referred to the previous report to Council which contained the timetable for the Community Governance Review; drew attention to paragraph 5.7 of the report that set out details of the next phase of consultation; and considered that nine Members would be the correct number of Members for a new town council as it would allow for a contested election.

**Resolved:**

**(1) That Council notes the consultation response to the Community Governance Review.**

**(2) That given the consultation responses, the following draft recommendations be agreed for further consultation:**

**(a) that a new parish area is created for Sheerness (this is to be the same areas as the Borough Ward of Sheerness);**

**(b) that the new parish area should have a parish council;**

**(c) that the new parish council should be an alternative style and be known as Sheerness Town Council;**

**(d) that Sheerness Town Council comprises of 9 Members, with the first elections to take place in May 2019.**

**(3) That in making draft recommendations, the Council considers that the establishment of the Town Council would meet the criteria in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, in that it will be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area, and effective and convenient, and will have a positive impact on community cohesion.**

**556 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT - RESULTS OF CONSULTATION**

Councillor Gerry Lewin introduced the report which had been considered by the Local Development Framework Panel and Cabinet prior to coming forward to Council, and proposed the recommendations in the report.

This was seconded by the Leader, who reserved his right to speak.

The Leader of The Swale Group drew attention to the low number of consultation responses and asked that the exercise was repeated so that there was proper engagement with communities.

The Leader of the Independent Group considered that the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) said the right things, but the level of response to the consultation was 'miserable' and further work was needed to make the consultation successful. Whilst he could support the SCI, he could not support the Council responses to the consultation. He proposed that the two recommendations in the report were taken separately.

This was seconded by Councillor Monique Bonney. In seconding the amendment, Councillor Monique Bonney referred to the low number of responses and that many had been dismissed by officers, and considered the SCI should be looked at again.

During the discussion a Member clarified that the SCI was a consultation about a consultation and that Members could have responded to the consultation.

The Leader advised that he did not see how the two recommendations could be voted on separately, and the Leader of the Independent Group clarified that he was not objecting to the responses, but the Council's response to the responses.

The amendment to take the recommendations separately was put to the vote but was lost.

The original proposal was then put to the vote and agreed.

**Resolved:**

***(1) That the Council's draft responses to the consultation in Appendix I be agreed.***

***(2) That the Statement of Community Involvement be adopted.***

**557 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The Mayor adjourned the meeting for five minutes at 9.45pm, following consideration of the Statement of Community Involvement report.

**558 CONSTITUTION REVIEW**

The Council was asked to agree changes to the Constitution, which had been considered by the General Purposes Committee. The Mayor drew attention to the working papers and the index sheet which set out where the appropriate working papers could be located for each recommendation.

The Leader drew attention to an amendment to the wording on page 149 of the agenda, to reflect the recommendation of the General Purposes Committee, and another Member advised of some minor amendments to the Standards Committee Procedure Rules.

**Resolved:**

***(1) That the revised scheme of officer delegation, as set out in the revised working paper be agreed.***

***(2) That the proposed amendments to the procedure rules for the Standards Committee as set out in the revised working paper be agreed.***

***(3) That the proposed clarification of the arrangements relating to exempt reports in exceptional circumstances, as set out in the revised working paper, subject to an amendment to change the words 'but not limited to' to 'and limited to', be agreed.***

***(4) That the proposed revisions to Contract Standing Orders be adopted.***

***(5) That the Local Development Framework Panel be renamed the Local Plan Panel.***

***(6) That the revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the working paper, be adopted.***

***(7) That the Officer Employment Procedure Rules, as set out in the working paper, be adopted.***

***(8) That the Code of Conduct complaint assessment criteria, as set out in the working paper, be adopted.***

#### **559 PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

The Council was asked to agree an updated Pay Policy Statement. Key changes to the document compared with that published in 2017 were set out in paragraph 3.3 of the report.

***Resolved:***

***(1) That the Pay Policy Statement be agreed for publication on the Council's website.***

***(2) That the information within the Pay Policy Statement is updated with actual year-end figures before final publication.***

#### **560 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NOTING**

The Council was asked to note recommendations, as separate reports on the items had been considered earlier in the meeting.

***Resolved:***

***(1) That recommendations in Minute No. 525 of the Cabinet held on 7 March 2018 be noted.***

***(2) That recommendations in Minute Nos. 532 - 536 of the General Purposes Committee held on 8 and 14 March 2018 be noted.***

Mayor

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel