Windlesham Parish Council

Joanna Whitfield
Clerk to the Council
Tel: 01276 471675
Email: clerk@windleshampc.gov.uk
Website: www.windleshampc.gov.uk

The Council Offices
The Avenue
Lightwater
Surrey
GU18 5RG

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF WINDLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL Held on Thursday 18th September 2025, at 6:00pm held at the Briars Centre, Briar Avenue, Lightwater

Bagshot Cllrs		Lightwater Cllrs		Windlesham Cllrs	
Bakar	P	Harris	A	Hardless	P
Du Cann	P	Hartshorn	PA	Lewis	P
Gordon	-	R Jennings-Evans	P	Marr	P
Wilson	A	Malcaus Cooper	P	Richardson	P
Willgoss	A	Turner	P	Wheeler	P
White	P	Stevens	P		
		D Jennings-Evans	P		

In attendance: Sarah Wakefield- Assistant Clerk

Mr & Mrs Burlinson- Windlesham Residents
Tony Murphy- Windlesham Resident

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

Cllr White was in the Chair

……..

		Action
C/25/88	**Apologies for absence** **Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs Harris, Willgoss and Wilson.**	
C/25/89	**Declarations of interest** **There were no declarations of interest.**	
C/25/90	**Public Questions** Tony Murphy, Windlesham Resident posed the following question: Mr Murphy reminded Council that the current stage of the Community Governance Review (CGR) is the *Initial Consultation* phase, which is intended to gather early views from the public and stakeholders. It is not a referendum and is not determined solely by numerical responses. Rather, it forms part of a broader evidential base considered under the Gunning Principles. He expressed concern about how potential inaccuracies or omissions in public communications may influence consultation responses. Mr Murphy also advised caution in how misrepresentation—either through content or omission—might skew public understanding, particularly around emotive	

	issues such as Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds. Additionally, he stressed that current infrastructure projects in Windlesham have long-standing roots and are being progressed in collaboration with the county council. Concerns were raised about the language used in some discussions, which was described as potentially inflammatory and unhelpful. Mr Murphy called for a broader, more balanced view, noting that Council discussion had sometimes defended the status quo while preparing for alternative future structures without detailing implications or financial impact. Mr Murphy's representation suggested that some community members favour the continuation of smaller parish councils over more centralised governance, citing better local engagement and delivery outcomes. The speaker also challenged the apparent ideological contradiction in advocating centralisation under a traditionally conservative authority, suggesting that localism and subsidiarity are more in line with conservative principles. In conclusion, Mr Murphy urged Council to recognise the likely future need for collaborative working between smaller councils—regardless of the CGR outcome—and to adopt a more measured tone moving forward. *Cllr Hartshorn arrived at 18:04*	
C/25/91	**Exclusion of the press and public.** **There were no items to be dealt with after the public, including the press, had been excluded under S1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960:** **No exclusions to the press and public.**	
C/25/92	**Community Governance Review:** consideration of external consultation communications and council response. Members were asked to review external consultation communications and decide whether: 1. These external communications may contain inaccuracies or misrepresentations that may affect how residents respond to the consultation. and if so, did they wish to 2. Approve the submission of a formal representation to Surrey Heath Borough Council regarding the Community Governance Review. 3. Authorise the Communications Officer, in conjunction with the Clerk, to update the fact-check page as and when required to ensure factual information is published. 4. Approve any further actions arising from discussion at this meeting.	

Standing Orders were suspended to allow a member of the public to speak.

A Windlesham resident, asked how decisions or discussions from the meeting would be communicated to residents, noting that the consultation was due to close the following day. He sought clarification on whether the outcomes would be shared publicly in time to inform responses.

In response to the question, Cllr R Jenning-Evans noted that one option under consideration was updating the Council's Fact-Check page. If agreed, updates would be published the following day.

Members discussed concerns about potential inaccuracies in recent letters and social media posts relating to the CGR. While some felt the communications were misleading and damaging to the Council's reputation, others expressed differing views. The importance of ensuring residents receive accurate and factual information was emphasised.

Cllr Malcaus Cooper proposed, and Cllr Stevens seconded a motion to change the wording in item 1 to: "*These external communications contain inaccuracies and misrepresentations that may affect how residents respond to the consultation."* A recorded vote was requested.

Cllr Malcaus Cooper	**In Favour**
Cllr Wheeler	**In Favour**
Cllr Lewis	**Against**
Cllr Marr	**In Favour**
Cllr Hardless	**In Favour**
Cllr Richardson	**In Favour**
Cllr Hartshorn	**In Favour**
Cllr D Jenning-Evans	**In Favour**
Cllr R Jenning-Evans	**In Favour**
Cllr Turner	**In Favour**
Cllr Du Cann	**In Favour**
Cllr Bakar	**In Favour**
Cllr Stevens	**In Favour**
Cllr White	**In Favour**

The motion was carried with 13 in favour and 1 against. Accordingly, it was resolved the wording of item 1 would be updated to: "*These external communications contain inaccuracies and misrepresentations that may affect how residents respond to the consultation."*

A brief debate took place, where Cllr Wheeler asked if it would be prudent to understand which items contained inaccuracies. This was not agreed.

Cllr Stevens stated that he saw no value in reviewing the items point by point, as members either considered the communications to be misleading propaganda or not.

	Cllr Stevens proposed, and Cllr Du Cann seconded, a motion to vote on all four items collectively. The motion considered whether external communications, including distributed letters and social media posts, contained inaccuracies and misrepresentations which may affect how residents respond to the consultation; whether the Council wished to submit a formal representation to ensure the Community Governance Review is conducted impartially and fairly; and to affirm that consultation responses should be based on accurate and reliable information, as required by the statutory framework governing Community Governance Reviews. It was also proposed that the Council's fact-checking statement on the website and associated social media pages be reviewed and updated accordingly. **A recorded vote was requested.** **Cllr Malcaus Cooper — In favour** **Cllr Wheeler — Against** **Cllr Marr — Against** **Cllr Lewis — Against** **Cllr Hardless — Against** **Cllr Richardson — Against** **Cllr Hartshorn — In favour** **Cllr D Jenning-Evans — In favour** **Cllr R Jenning-Evans — In favour** **Cllr Turner — In favour** **Cllr Du Cann — In favour** **Cllr Bakar — In favour** **Cllr Stevens — In favour** **Cllr White — In favour** **The motion was carried with 9 in favour and 5 against delegating authority to the Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Vice Chair, to write and submit a formal representation to Surrey Heath Borough Council regarding the Community Governance Review and to update the council's Fact-Check page accordingly.**	
	There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19:04	