



Windlesham Parish Council

Sarah Walker
Clerk to the Council
Tel: 01276 471675
Email: sarah.walker@windleshampc.gov.uk
Website: www.windleshampc.gov.uk

The Council Offices
The Avenue
Lightwater
Surrey
GU18 5RG

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF WINDLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL Held on Tuesday 21st August 2019, at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber

Bagshot Cllrs		Lightwater Cllrs		Windlesham Cllrs	
Bakar	-	Barnett	A	Goodman	P
Chambers	A	Galliford	P	Hansen-Hjul	P
Gordon	P	Halovsky-Yu	P	Stacey	P
Kay	P	Harris	P		
Manley	P	Hartshorn	P		
Trentham	P	Jennings-Evans	P		
Willgoss	P	Malcaus Cooper	P		
White	P				

In attendance: Sarah Walker – Clerk
Jo Whitfield – Assistant Clerk
Victoria Wheeler – Windlesham & Chobham Borough Councillor
Mr Russell-Lowe – Windlesham Resident
Cllr Mansfield – Surrey County Councillor
Tony Murphy – Windlesham Resident
Sarah Riddick – Windlesham Resident
Conrad Sturt – Windlesham Resident
Chris Richards –
Mr James – Windlesham Resident
3 Members of the public

P – present A – apologies PA – part of the meeting - no information

Cllr White was in the Chair

.....
Prior to the meeting Cllr White addressed those present to clarify the purpose of the meeting. She stated that the meeting was for the council to discuss distribution of an information leaflet regarding the Governance Review, consider costs associated with this and to consider whether to hold public meetings for the residents in relation to the Community Governance Review. Cllr White also emphasised that the CGR is a statutory process over which the Parish Council has no jurisdiction. It is entirely in the hands of the principle authority as legislation provides. The Parish Council cannot amend or change any part of the consultation and is as much a consultee as any resident in the Parish. However, the Parish Council can provide residents with factual information and this meeting is therefore to discuss such information that has been provided solely by the Clerk.

C/19/81 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr Barnett & Chambers.

Cllr Bakar was not in attendance and no apologies were received.

C/19/82 Declarations of interest

Cllrs Jennings-Evans, White, Kay and Galliford declared a non-pecuniary interest due to their positions as Borough Councillors and therefore they are involved in the consultation process at SHBC.

C/19/83 Public question time

Q: Tony Murphy asked if this Council recognise the efforts made by a small group of residents to raise and gain support, for the petition to SHBC which in turn triggered the Community Governance Review.

A: Cllr White informed Mr Murphy that it was not for this Council to individually recognise such actions, because it has already been recognised by SHBC and a CGR has been triggered.

Q: Mr Murphy also noted that the Parish Council would be considering expenditure to provide information to the Parish residents and asked if the Council would also consider funding a similar amount to those with an alternative view.

A: Cllr White informed Mr Murphy that as yet, no decisions had been made by Council regarding potential expenditure and therefore Council were unable to comment on funds that would be available to any other groups.

C/19/84 Exclusion of the press and public.

Agreed that the following items be dealt with after the public, including the press, have been excluded under S1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960:

None

C/19/85 Community Governance Review

a) To review and agree the contents of an information leaflet to be distributed to residents regarding the current community governance review

Members were asked to discuss an information leaflet, produced solely by the Clerk, as Responsible Financial Officer. The leaflet contains the operational and financial facts based on current operational costs and services of the Council and how these might translate to any new Councils that may be established as a result of the CGR.

Cllr Stacey felt that the leaflet was slightly unbalanced and did not promote enough benefits of dividing the current Parish Council. In addition to this Cllr Hansen-Hujl raised concerns that the predicted costs were just estimations. In response to their concerns the Clerk informed Members that all costs were based on the current costs to run WPC in its current format and had been used to inform the operational costs and services of any new Councils. In addition, the costs such as staffing hours had been, compared with smaller local Parish Councils to ensure that the stated required hours were in line with a smaller Council. Estimated salaries were again based on a comparison of another Parish Council staffing costs to ensure a fair estimation.

Cllr Stacey felt that it was unnecessary to point out that Windlesham residents may no longer be able use the allotments situated in Lightwater. However, the Clerk informed Members that this was a possibility, if Lightwater and Windlesham were governed by two separate Parish Councils. It would be for any new Lightwater Council to decide if residents outside of the Parish were eligible to access their allotments.

Proposed amendments

Cllr Hansen-Hujl requested that the word ‘predicted’ be inserted on the expenditure totals. **Agreed**

Cllr Galliford requested that at the end of the first paragraph on the first page of the leaflet the following wording be added ‘which covers the three villages of Windlesham, Bagshot and Lightwater’. **Agreed.**

Cllr Kay requested that the leaflet clearly stated what will not change as a result of the CGR, for example the Borough boundaries and the fact that Windlesham will not be one ward. **It was agreed that the leaflet will refer residents to the Terms of Reference that state this information.**

Cllr Galliford requested that hard copies of the Terms of Reference are available at both SHBC and the Parish Council Offices and Bagshot and Lightwater Library and that this information is added to the leaflet. **Agreed.**

Cllr Malcaus Cooper proposed, and Cllr Halovsky-Yu seconded to share the full factual information with all residents of the Parish, as prepared by the Clerk, based on current operational and financial information, with amendments as agreed above.

A recorded vote was taken.

F=In Favour, A=Against, Ab=Abstention and NP= Not Present

Bagshot Cllrs		Lightwater Cllrs		Windlesham Cllrs	
Bakar	NP	Barnett	NP	Goodman	F
Chambers	NP	Galliford	F	Hansen-Hjul	A
Gordon	F	Halovsky-Yu	F	Stacey	A
Kay	F	Harris	F		
Manley	F	Hartshorn	F		
Trentham	F	Jennings-Evans	F		
Willgoss	F	Malcaus Cooper	F		
White	F				

The motion was carried with 13 in Favour and 2 Against

b) To agree costs to print and deliver information leaflet

Members were asked to consider the costs of printing and sending CGR information leaflets to all households in the Parish. The quotes presented were as follows:

Option 1

Cost to print 7,000 full colour leaflets, print and stuff envelopes and send second class post

£2,575 ex. VAT

Option 2

Cost to print 7,000 full colour leaflets, print and stuff envelopes
£1,777 ex. VAT

Postage cost – the cheapest bulk second class postage cost that has been obtained is £2,666 + VAT.

Total £4,443 + VAT

In addition to this Members were asked to agree that a proposal for a new budget line and the amount of funding to be allocated is discussed by the Finance and General Purposes Committee, with recommendations to be made to Full Council in September.

Cllr Stacey asked for a breakdown of Option 1 pricing. The Clerk explained that a written quote had been received with an inclusive price for printing the leaflets and the envelopes, stuffing the envelopes and sending on behalf of the Council. A breakdown was not available and the favourable pricing was likely to be as a result of the size of the company and the economies of scale that they are able to offer.

Cllr Hartshorn proposed, and Cllr Halovsky-Yu seconded and it was agreed that Council would proceed with Option 1.

It was also resolved that a proposal for a new budget line and the amount of funding to be allocated is discussed by the Finance and General Purposes Committee, with recommendations to be made to Full Council in September.

c) To consider whether to hold public drop in meetings for residents in relation to the governance review

Members discussed the option of holding public drop in meetings for residents in relation to the governance review.

Council felt it would be beneficial to provide a forum for each village to have an opportunity to ask questions and it was **resolved that the Clerk will organise a public meeting in each village and invite SHBC Democratic Services to attend. It was also agreed that the upcoming meetings should be highlighted in the information leaflet.**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19:10