

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2023 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber,
Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: ; Councillors Edwards, Albon, Ara, Austin, Bambridge, Barlow, J Bayford, Boyd, Braidwood, Bright, Bright, Britcher, Crittenden, Currie, d'Abbro, Davis, Dawson, Donaldson, Driver, Duckworth, Everitt, Farooki, Fellows, Garner, D Green, Huxley, Keen, Kup, Makinson, Manners, Matterface, Pat Moore, Munns, Nichols, Anne-Marie Nixey, Ovenden, Packman, Pope, Pressland, Pugh, Rattigan, Rogers, Rusiecki, Scobie, W Scobie, Scott, Smith, Towning, Whitehead, Wing, Worrow, Wright and Yates

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from the following Members:

Councillor Dennis;
Councillor Paul Moore;
Councillor Owen-Hughes.

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

It was proposed by the Chair, seconded by Councillor Albon and agreed that the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 12 October 2023 be approved and signed by the Chair.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements made at the meeting.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

5. **PETITIONS**

(a) **Yellow Line Petition**

It was noted that the council's response to the petition had been outlined in the agenda.

6. **QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

(a) **QUESTION NO.1 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING SOUTHERN WATER**

Ms Brown asked the Leader the following question:

“At the Overview and Scrutiny meeting with Southern Water on 14th March 2023 Mr Tim McMahon Director of Water Operations at Southern Water said that although they are not statutory consultees on housing developments, if they are invited by local councils they can attend meetings about large developments in an advisory capacity. Is TDC intending to invite Southern Water to meetings with developers and planning meetings where large developments are discussed and outline planning authorization is to be decided. With developments like the 2000 houses at Westgate and Garlinge will TDC ensure Southern Water are invited to all the individual meetings for example 150 houses as well as for outline planning for 2000 houses. Question: What steps will TDC take to mitigate the fact that Southern Water is unable to provide effective waste water disposal?”

The Leader responded:

- The Council notified Southern Water of all planning applications which required a new connection to the wastewater network. All representations received from Southern Water were available for viewing on the Council’s website, and were taken into account when the Council makes a decision on those applications.
- In addition the council consults with Southern Water, and other utilities providers during the preparation of the Thanet Local Plan to ensure that water supply and drainage issues are fully considered as part of this process.
- Southern Water were required to provide a connection to developers for foul and surface water drainage under the Water Industry Act. It should be noted that, in 2024, the “right to connect” to the sewerage network as part of new development is to be removed for surface water run-off, which is the primary component that results in flooding and sewage release. In addition, new housing development is required to implement sustainable urban drainage solutions that ensure rainwater runoff is able to soak away rather than enter the sewerage system.
- The Council would continue to engage with Southern Water to ensure that adequate drainage systems are in place to support new housing development in the district, and Southern Water would be invited to meet with officers where there are particular issues with drainage on individual developments.

(b) **QUESTION NO.2 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING THE SUNNINGDALE HOUSE DEVELOPMENTS**

Mr Woodward was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(c) **QUESTION NO.3 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Mr Lee was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(d) **QUESTION NO.4 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Mr Woodgate was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(e) **QUESTION NO.5 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Ms McCartney was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(f) **QUESTION NO.6 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Ms Palmer asked Councillor Albon the following question:

“As a result of the storm damage around 24/11 at Walpole Tidal it is now unusable due to damaged sluices.

Will council confirm that urgent attention is being given to establishing the full extent of the damage that may have occurred and that all necessary repairs are undertaken without delay.

Attendance by contractors was noted on 29/11, what was the outcome of that and what is the timetable for carrying all repairs needed.

I am part of a large local group of swimmers at the pool which is a nationally known, unique and vitally important asset both to the local and visitor community and must not be allowed to deteriorate further. As a Grade 2 listed structure there is a clear responsibility to fully maintain it. Will Council please say what plans are in place to ensure the continued maintenance of it and the surrounding physical infrastructure.”

Councillor Albon responded:

- The council understood that Walpole Bay Tidal Pool was a popular and well used facility by the community. The Council's Technical Services team undertook a survey twice a year as part of the bi-annual coastal inspections. The team undertook repairs to the facility as and when required using the coastal maintenance budget. The team also responded to storm damage straight away, to ensure that any repair required was done as quickly as possible, and the pool was reopened.
- The failed gate in one of the three penstock valves which serve the Walpole Bay tidal pool was replaced on Monday 4 December 2023.
- Further repair work to another of the three penstock valves was required before the pool is refilled. It was anticipated that the pool would be reopened on 15 December 2023.
- Other maintenance activities in the pool such as pointing and concrete repair works would be undertaken in the meantime whilst the pool was out of service.

(g) **QUESTION NO.7 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Mr Newton withdrew his question at the meeting. Councillor Albon assured Mr Newton a response would be given in writing to his question.

(h) **QUESTION NO.8 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Mr Walters was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(i) **QUESTION NO.9 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC REGARDING WALPOLE BAY**

Ms Leeman was not in attendance at the meeting to ask their respective questions. As a result this question would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

7. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(a) **QUESTION NO.1 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING THE ELECTORAL REGISTRATION**

Councillor W. Scobie asked Councillor Yates the following question:

“Would the Cabinet member please explain the annual process that the Council currently goes through for electoral registration and what is being done to improve registration rates, particularly amongst hard to reach groups and areas with higher levels of deprivation?”

Councillor Yates responded:

- The annual canvass of properties is conducted from August to the end of November each year in preparation for republishing the electoral register on 1st December. Prior to this the Council’s data is sent to the DWP to verify that the same information is held by both. Once the DWP have run their checks the data is loaded back onto the Council’s electoral management system and split into canvass routes as follows:
- Route One – This route applies where household details held by the DWP and the Council have matched. These properties are sent an email confirming what information is held by the Council and advising them that they only needed to reply to the letter if there had been a change.
- Route Two – This route applies to those properties where there has been a conflict of information held between the Council and the DWP. They are sent a canvass form asking that they either go online to update the household details or complete the form and return it to the Council. Reminder forms are sent a month later to all non responding households and the final stage is a telephone canvass to outstanding properties.
- Route Three – This route applies to Care homes, Nursing homes and houses in multiple occupations. They are sent a household form to complete. This is followed up with a telephone canvass.
- Households can update any details throughout the year any time of the day either by registering online or by contacting the Council’s electoral team to request a form be sent to them. The team’s contact details are on the Council’s website together with details of how to apply for a postal or proxy vote.
- Nationally, there was access for voters to complete online postal voter registrations, whilst maintaining the use of paper postal voter forms. It was pleasing that since the online postal voter registration process began in October, the council had received over 100 applications for postal votes via the online system.

- Unfortunately due to capacity issues within the electoral team it had not been possible to do any extra work to focus on registration rates for hard to reach groups and groups within the Council's more deprived areas. Having said this, the efforts of the team were very comprehensive.

Councillor W. Scobie followed up his question by asking for assurances from the council that those in hard to reach areas would be targeted in electoral registration moving forth.

Councillor Yates responded that this was a role for the Chief Executive to respond further to.

(b) **QUESTION NO.2 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING THE WINTER GARDENS**

Councillor Worrow asked Councillor Duckworth the following question:

“Will Margate's Winter Gardens be open for the 2024 summer season?”

Councillor Duckworth responded:

- The council had launched its marketing campaign to secure a new partner organisation to refurbish and operate the Winter Gardens for the future.
- The council had been working with specialist agents, Colliers, to identify the right partner. A partner which shared the collective vision and ambition for the Winter Gardens and was able to demonstrate a viable business plan for the future.
- Alongside the marketing launch the council had published a heritage significance statement, which highlighted the many important historical aspects of the building. The enhancement and preservation of these important heritage features was a core part of our vision. The council wanted to see a flexible performance space that both enhanced the heritage significance of the buildings and enabled an increase in the number of visitors to the building.
- The marketing campaign launched on 20 November 2023 and had already attracted a positive response. It was a two stage process, with an initial expression of interest stage, followed by the submission of detailed proposals from a shortlist of potential partner organisations. The council had been working on a timetable for the marketing and are looking for expressions of interest to be submitted by January 2024 and, following the assessment of detailed proposals, expect to be in a position to report the outcome of the marketing by April 2024.
- The timeline beyond April 2024 would depend upon the details of the council's preferred proposal and could not be confirmed at the time of the meeting.

Councillor Worrow followed up his question by asking why the details regarding the items in the Winter Gardens for auction were not made publicly available?

Councillor Duckworth responded that as far as she was aware the auction was being advertised to the public. This would be looked into.

(c) **QUESTION NO.3 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING IMPROVEMENTS TO BOUNDARY PARK**

Councillor Huxley asked Councillor Albon the following question:

“Over three years ago, Eastcliff Ward councillors discussed updates and improvements to Ramsgate’s Boundary Park, with improvements in seating areas for young people and others enjoying the park, as well as improvements to the playground. We note that the playground swings and safety matting were replaced recently out of some of the Section 106 monies that would fund this. Please can we have an update on what Section 106 monies have been received, what Section 106 monies are still outstanding, and when we can expect this improvement work to be undertaken.”

Councillor Albon responded that:

- The Council had received £16,049.88 from planning reference F/TH/17/1508 which was to be spent on “play equipment in boundary road”. This money had yet to be spent. A total of a further £38,500 has been secured through planning permissions towards the Boundary Road Play area, and was expected to be received within the next year.
- A meeting took place with ward councillors in September 2022 to discuss some of the issues at the park and options for the improvement works using the Section 106 funding. Works could not be programmed until the remainder of the funding had been received, spending the funding in more than 1 phase would not offer the best value for money. The Head of Coastal and Public Realm had committed to arrange an update meeting with councillors from the district ward and the Town Council to discuss the proposals made in 2022 and update on the project process.
- The play equipment at the park continues to be inspected in accordance with ROSPA guidance and maintenance work will continue as and when required.

Councillor Huxley followed up her question by asking whether the council would set up a consultation exercise with residents and park users, to ensure that the improvements were in line as much as possible to what residents wanted.

Councillor Albon responded that this would be taken into consideration. However, this was difficult, as people came from far and wide to use the park. It would be challenging to notify all residents that used the park on the consultation.

(d) **QUESTION NO.4 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING ALBION GARDENS**

Councillor Crittenden asked Councillor Albon the following question:

“Ramsgate residents have been disappointed at the ongoing deterioration of so much of our heritage in Ramsgate. In particular that the waterfall in Albion Gardens has not been working again this summer. Can you please provide an update on progress on identifying the cause of the leak in the waterfall at Albion Gardens, and what is needed to see it repaired and working again in time for next summer.”

Councillor Albon responded that:

- The Technical Services team had undertaken a survey of the waterfall. They had found significant defects to the lining of the pools at the top and bottom of the waterfall.
- The team had been putting tender documents together to request quotes for the work by a specialist company. The budget estimate for the works was £30,000 but this could only be confirmed once the response to the tender documents had been received.

Councillor Crittenden followed up her question by asking if the tendering quote would seek work for preventive work? There had been two leaks which needed preventive work.

Councillor Albon responded that he would take on board the concerns raised, and talk to the directors in relation to the preventive works.

(e) **QUESTION NO.5 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING INCLUSIVITY WITHIN PARKS AND OPEN SPACES**

Councillor J. Bright asked Councillor Albon the following question:

“Recent research by ‘Make Space for Girls’ found that girls and young women use parks and open spaces much less than boys and young men because they do not feel safe and also because facilities, such as Multi-Use Games Areas, are not designed with teenage girls in mind.

Recent conversations with secondary school pupils in Broadstairs support these findings with young people frequently feeling vulnerable in our local parks and open spaces. Public places like Pierremont Park in Broadstairs have a reputation for anti-social behaviour and drug-use, which means these spaces are not enjoyed as much as they should be.

What can we do as a council to ensure our parks and open spaces, such as Pierremont Park and Jackey Bakers, are more inclusive and inviting for teenage girls, and are made safer for everyone?”

Councillor Keen responded that:

- At a recent Members Briefing, Member’s heard from the Community Team about the unique work they are undertaking to tackle the issue of violence against women and girls and learnt about how unsafe women and girls feel (1 in 2 feel unsafe at night time and 1 in 3 during the day).
- Work undertaken by the partnership was extensive and included proactive campaigns and interventions. This included the introduction of safe spaces where people could attend if they felt scared or vulnerable, ask Angela/Andrew which focused on licenced establishments allowed people to ask for help without drawing attention to themselves, drink spiking campaign to alert people to the dangers and how to protect themselves, walk and talks where the team walk the neighbourhoods meeting people and talking about safety, safety webpage where you can plan your night out with safety in mind, hotel watch, knife amnesty bins and education, self defence classes, ladder of risk to help people understand behaviour that may be risky and environmental visual audits on how to improve areas.
- Environmental visual audits had been taking place and included our parks and open spaces, The audits identified issues such as unlit and overgrown areas which were then rectified. Pierremont Park had previously had an audit and the team continues to work with Kent Police and within TDC to tackle the issues raised and identify those who are causing these areas of concern. The proposed improvements at Jackey Bakers provides an opportunity to consider and apply the findings and conclusions from the January 2023 ‘Make Space for Girls’ report along with the experience gained through the work of the Community Safety team.

- It was not acceptable that women and girls feel unsafe and the council would continue to tackle this. Officers would continue to address concerns reactively as well as proactively looking at ways to make open spaces feel more inclusive and accessible to women and girls, and would be providing more detail next year as the project progresses.

Councillor J. Bright followed up her question by asking whether the council would make an effort to work more closely with Town and Parish Councils, schools and businesses about what support there was to make women and girls feel safer?

Councillor Keen responded that communication was a key part in letting women and girls know what is available to keep them feeling safe.

(f) **QUESTION NO.6 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Councillor Wing asked the Leader the following question:

“I understand that for a planning application to be considered by a Full Planning Committee, there needs to be either a significant number of objections or a call in by an individual councillor, can you confirm this and are there any other circumstances when an application, perhaps because of its size, scope and therefore potential negative impact, should automatically be called in?”

The Leader responded that:

- Applications for planning permission were primarily determined under delegated authority by the Planning Department. In the following circumstances, applications for planning permission would be determined by the Planning Committee:
- If it is an application which Council Members have specifically requested to be referred to the Planning Committee in accordance with the requirements of any Member’s Call in Procedure (which is set out in the Protocol for the Guidance of Planning Committee Members and Officers, contained in the Council’s constitution).
- If it is an application which the Head of Housing and Planning or Planning Applications Manager in consultation with the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee, considers to be of significant public interest;
- If the application has been submitted by or on behalf of a Member or an Officer of the Council;
- If it is an application by or on behalf of Thanet District Council or on Land owned by TDC or by a company which TDC is a party;
- If it is an application where the officer is recommending the approval not in accordance to the local plan.

Councillor Wing followed up her question by asking about a grid stability plant in Richborough not being called in.

The Monitoring Officer and the Leader responded that it was not possible to answer this supplementary question as it was in relation to a specific planning application.

(g) **QUESTION NO.7 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING EVENTS AND OPEN SPACES**

Councillor K. Bright asked Councillor Keen the following question:

“Thanet’s heritage is more than our many wonderful buildings and spaces. My question is about the many much-loved events we have in Broadstairs and beyond.

The Broadstairs Folk Week, Dickens Festival and Food Festivals bring vital visitor numbers and income to Broadstairs. They are not-for-profit and are run by armies of volunteers.

Yet TDC costs and red-tape have increased this year, placing real pressure on the ongoing survival of these events.

Land hire charges for Broadstairs Food Festival, increased by between 223% – 340% y-o-y this Autumn.

Broadstairs Folk Week has been hit with a 185% year-on-year increase in TDC costs.

Events like these across Thanet are treasured by our residents and must be protected. By increasing costs and bureaucracy, however, TDC puts their ongoing survival in doubt.

What steps can be taken to ensure we have a fair approach to charging these events for the use of our open spaces?”

Councillor Keen responded that:

- The importance of well run events on the tourism and local economy was recognised by the council. The council had an events policy, suitability of events document and a range of suitable sites for events across the District.
- The fees and charges for events are based on their category and size (number of visitors), the categories include Enthusiast (specialist interest subjects such as re-enactments), Charity (regional or National), Commercial (provides a commercial benefit to profit making businesses such as food festivals, concerts), Community (directly benefits residents and visitors such as social groups, village fetes), Active Recreation (running etc), Armed Forces. The categories are not based on the status of those organising them but the event itself.
- The categories and fees could be found on the council’s website.
- In some cases as events became more popular and attracted more visitors then these would move up the fee structure. In 2023 the council had undertaken an audit of the councils event applications to ensure that they were correctly applying the councils fees and charges, in some cases events have previously been under-charged which would explain an increase or the number of attendees had increased.
- The events policy and suitability of events were formally adopted by the council in 2021 for 3 years when they will be reviewed. The charges were revised yearly as part of the fees and charges process and then agreed by Council.
- The council’s charges were higher than Dover but comparable to Canterbury, when they were set a number of years ago the council was one of the first in Kent to charge.
- There had been no increase in the requirements for the completion of paperwork, these have been in place for a number of years and are used across the country.

- The number of attendees are declared by the applicant on their paperwork and the council cross referenced if they thought they were being kept low to avoid moving into a new payment bracket. Officers also attend events for food and licensing inspections so they knew how popular they are.

Councillor K. Bright followed up his question by asking whether it would be possible to discuss solution to help further, through cultural or heritage events. The administrative burden was considered excessive.

Councillor Keen responded that in 2024 it was up for renewal. There was a duty to keep the public safe whilst organising the events.

(h) **QUESTION NO.8 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING RIVEROAK AND MANSTON AIRPORT**

Councillor Fellows Asked the Leader the following question:

“Can the Leader confirm that he has now received an invite from Riveroak and he has a date booked in his diary to meet with the owners of Manston to hear their plans for the Airport and the biggest investment that Thanet has ever seen?”

The Leader responded that there would be a meeting with Riveroak to hear about their plans to invest in the airport.

Councillor Fellows followed up his question by asking if this would happen in the February Full Council Meeting?

The Leader responded that this was unnecessary, and communications could happen in the meantime before February 2024.

(i) **QUESTION NO.9 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING THE RECRUITMENT OF A CASEWORK OFFICER**

As a result of timings of questions for Members over-running, the question from Councillor Rogers would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(j) **QUESTION NO.10 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING WESTGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

As a result of timings of questions for Members over-running, the question from Councillor Braidwood would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(k) **QUESTION NO.11 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING STRATFORD AND WEYMOUTH HOUSE**

As a result of timings of questions for Members over-running, the question from Councillor Davis would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(l) **QUESTION NO.12 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING THE DAMAGED SEA SLUICE AT WALPOLE TIDAL POOL**

As a result of timings of questions for Members over-running, the question from Councillor Manners would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

(m) **QUESTION NO.13 FROM A MEMBER REGARDING SEASONAL PARKING**

As a result of timings of questions for Members over-running, the question from Councillor Munns would be responded to in writing after the meeting.

8. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

The Chair proposed, Councillor Albon seconded and Members agreed that the Council considered the Notice of Motion 8C before 8B under Council Procedure Rule 3.3.

(a) **Manston Airport Motion**

It was proposed by Councillor Worrow and seconded by Councillor Braidwood that:

“As the democratically elected representatives of the people of Thanet, we recognise that the time has come for us to put our political differences aside, and to acknowledge that we are duty bound to welcome with open arms, the inward investment that is so crucial to the economic growth necessary in order to create the jobs needed for our children and grandchildren. Manston Airport is of vital concern to local residents, therefore, it is in the interests of everyone living in Thanet to hear the current proposals of RiverOak Strategic Partners, and for us as their district councillors, to put our words into action, and as previously mentioned, to invite Tony Freudmann and the RiverOak Team to make a presentation to the Full Council, which is to be an extraordinary meeting no later than the 1st March 2024.”

In accordance with council procedure rule 3.7, Councillor Everitt provided a response to the motion.

Members voted not to debate the motion; therefore the motion fell as the council did not wish to debate the motion.

(b) **Abuse of Councillors and Officers Motion**

As a result of timings for the Notice of Motions over-running, the Abuse of Councillors and Officers Motion would be deferred to the full council meeting of 22 February 2024.

(c) **Notice Of Motion Regarding National Grid’s Sealink Project**

Councillor Everitt proposed and Councillor Albon seconded that:

"Council acknowledges the considerable public concern over the impacts of National Grid’s Sealink project, which is currently the subject of a statutory consultation process. We share this concern, and wish to reassure residents that their views are heard and understood.

We recognise the need to adapt the electricity transmission network in order to respond to rising demand and the move to sustainable generation methods in new locations.

We welcome the extensive engagement by National Grid with both elected members and the communities in Thanet most affected.

Council agrees that it does have major concerns regarding the proposed location on Minster Marshes; the scale of the converter building, as well as the effects of the associated infrastructure; the significant impact on protected wildlife and species habitat both during construction and afterwards; and the potential change to the character of the landscape.

While this council is not a decision-maker in respect of this development, we commit to making and publishing a formal response to the current consultation that highlights these issues and our concerns about them."

It was agreed that the opposition Leader in accordance with council procedure rule 3.7 would provide a response to the motion. Councillor Pugh provided a response to the motion.

It was proposed by Councillor Everitt, seconded by Councillor Manners and Members agreed to debate the motion.

During the debate Members made the following comments:

- The National Grid Sealink Project was one of the biggest issues that the community had faced in the a long time.
- There was a need for a more robust green system.
- It was of importance to try and force the national grid to find another solution.
- There was cross party support, this was considered an important issue.
- It was important to protect the last wild sector of Thanet.
- Individual members were urged to respond to the consultation. This would provide more weight and a sense of urgency if more members responded.

Members debated the motion, Members agreed and the motion was carried.

(d) **Fair Tax Declaration Motion**

As a result of timings for the Notice of Motions over-running, the Fair Tax Declaration Motion would be deferred to the full council meeting of 22 February 2024.

9. **LEADERS REPORT**

The Leader, Councillor Everitt, presented his report to Council, covering the following key points:

- The Leader gave a summarized response to the questions which Members put to him under the agenda item 'Questions from Members.' These would also be responded to in writing.
- There were approximately 500 job losses through Pfizer. This would have further impact on other businesses. Additional meetings regarding this with Canterbury and Dover councils were anticipated.
- There was positive news regarding finding an operator for the Winter Gardens. The council would not allow the building to be used as housing.
- The council was able to make a £3.2 million bid to the National Lottery Heritage fund for the Theatre Royale.
- The council had taken possession of the Clock House in Ramsgates following the surrender of the previous lease.
- Severe weather emergency protocol had been activated, thanks were given to the RISE team for their efforts.
- Cabinet would be considering the acquisition of a further 24 section 106 affordable homes in Tothill Street.
- Works regarding Jackey Bakers were moving forth following the previous council meeting.

- Works on public toilets were planned, with significant repairs taking place in the winter months ahead of the 2024 tourist season.

Councillor Pugh, as Leader of the Conservative Group, made the following points:

- It was positive news regarding the Winter Gardens and the Clock House.
- The new proposals for Jackey Bakers were welcomed, however there would be less football pitches on the ground. This was hoped not to be the case.
- The announcement of the improvements on public toilets was positive, and was long awaited.
- It was noted that community groups and voluntary groups did immeasurable work in the community.

The Leader responded to Councillor Pugh's comments with the following points:

- Ideas were welcome regarding the Winter Gardens, regarding what may happen if the council did not get the marketing exercise.
- It was agreed that community groups did immeasurable work and should work more closely together with the council. The council would look into ways whereby this could be encouraged.
- There was no plan to reduce the amount of football pitches in Jackey Bakers.

Councillor Garner, as Leader of the Green Group, made the following points:

- It was a positive that the search for an operator in the Winter Gardens had begun.
- There was concerns shared regarding the home office plans in terms of the Manston detention facility centre.
- The Broadstairs college had developed a conservation school, this was noted as excellent.
- Commitments regarding the public toilets were welcomed.
- The Greens were supportive of the council housing stock.
- It was noted that many residents had friends and family in Israel and Gaza. It was vital to lobby national leaders, to ask for ceasefire and diplomatic efforts.

The Leader responded to Councillor Garner's comments with the following points:

- The current climate in Israel and Gaza was not disregarded.
- The conservation school was impressive.

Councillor Worrow, as Leader of Thanet Independents, made the following points:

- It was concerning to hear about the job losses in Pfizer.
- There was overall sympathy for the migrant centre in Manston.

The Leader responded with thanks to Councillor Worrow's comments.

10. REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Councillor Fellows, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, circulated the full report prior to the meeting and asked if members had any questions on the report.

Members noted the report.

11. ADOPTION OF THE BIRCHINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

It was proposed by the Leader, seconded by Councillor Albon and Members agreed that the recommendation set out in the report be agreed, namely:

“That Thanet District Council make the Birchington Neighbourhood Plan.”

12. ADOPTION OF THE BROADSTAIRS & ST PETERS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW

It was proposed by the Leader, seconded by Councillor K.Bright and Members agreed that the recommendation set out in the report be agreed, namely:

“That Thanet District Council make the Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan Review.”

13. THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND REVIEW OF THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL - COUNCIL SIZE

It was proposed by Councillor Yates, seconded by Councillor Everitt and Members agreed the recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for England Review of Thanet District Council – Council Size, namely:

“To consider the recommendation from the Boundary & Electoral Arrangements Working Party namely:

“that a proposed figure of forty two (42) councillors be the total number of TDC councillors to be forwarded to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).”

14. MID YEAR REVIEW 2023/24: TREASURY MANAGEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Councillor Yates proposed, Councillor Albon seconded and Members agreed:

“That Council:

1. Makes comments on this report and annexes as appropriate;
2. Approves this report and annexes, including the prudential and treasury indicators that are shown and the proposed changes to the 2023/24 Treasury Management Strategy Statement.”

15. KEY DECISION DEFINITION

The Chair proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Members agreed the recommendations as set out in the report be adopted namely:

“Members are being asked to agree the proposed changes to the Key Decision definition as recommended by the Standards Committee in paragraph 5.1 of the report.”

16. REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Chair proposed, Councillor Yates seconded and Members agreed the recommendations as set out in the report be adopted namely:

“Members are being asked to agree the proposed changes to the Policy Framework as recommended by the Standards Committee in paragraph 2.4 of the report.

Members are asked to consider the recommendation from the Standards Committee regarding content of the Council’s Policy Framework.”

17. AMENDMENTS COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES REGARDING FREQUENCY OF QUESTIONS

The Chair proposed, Councillor Everitt seconded that the recommendations in the report be adopted, namely:

“To amend Part 4, Rules of Procedure, paragraph 13.5 of the Council’s constitution to read:

“The Chief Executive will reject a question if it:.....

- is substantially the same as a question which has been validly received or put at a meeting of the Council in the past six months by either a Councillor or a member of the public;

To amend Part 4, Rules of Procedure, paragraph 14.6 of the Council’s constitution to read:

“A question shall not be:.....

- substantially the same as a question which has been validly received or put at a meeting of the Council in the past six months by either a Councillor or a member of the public;”

Members during debate made the following comments:

- Questioning was raised whether there be a composite of the questions, and then one answered could be provided.
- There was a potential risks in amending the rules.
- Six months was a long time, three months seemed more reasonable.

Councillor Green proposed, Councillor W. Scobie seconded and Members agreed that the Amendments to Council Procedure Rules Regarding Frequency of Questions would be referred back to the Constitutional Review Working Party for further discussion.

Meeting concluded : 9.27 pm