

# BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR

**MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL** held at the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Farnborough on Thursday, 4th December, 2025 at 7.00 pm.

The Worshipful The Mayor (Cllr Calum Stewart (Chairman))  
The Deputy Mayor (Cllr P.J. Cullum (Vice-Chair))

Cllr A. Adeola  
Cllr Gaynor Austin  
Cllr Leola Card  
Cllr Jules Crossley  
Cllr Keith Dibble  
Cllr C.P. Grattan  
Cllr Christine Guinness  
Cllr Steve Harden  
Cllr Halleh Koohestani  
Cllr Nadia Martin  
Cllr S.J. Masterson  
Cllr Bill O'Donovan  
Cllr M.J. Roberts  
Cllr M.D. Smith  
Cllr P.G. Taylor  
Cllr S. Trussler  
Cllr Becky Williams

Cllr Abe Allen  
Cllr C.W. Card  
Cllr Sue Carter  
Cllr Thomas Day  
Cllr A.H. Gani  
Cllr Lisa Greenway  
Cllr Julie Hall  
Cllr Rhian Jones  
Cllr G.B. Lyon  
Cllr Mara Makunura  
Cllr T.W. Mitchell  
Cllr Sophie Porter  
Cllr Dhan Sarki  
Cllr Sarah Spall  
Cllr M.J. Tennant  
Cllr Jacqui Vosper

Honorary Alderman Tony Gardiner

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr A.H. Crawford, Cllr Peace Essien Igodifo, Cllr Ivan Whitmee and Cllr Gareth Williams.

## 28. **MINUTES**

It was **MOVED** by Cllr Sophie Porter; **SECONDED** by Cllr Gaynor Austin and

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council on 16th October 2025 (copies having been circulated previously), be taken as read, approved and signed as a correct record.

## 29. **MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor placed on record the Council's condolences following the passing of former Councillor John Card who had passed away in late October. John had served on both Farnborough Urban District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council until his retirement in 1979.

The Mayor reported upcoming fundraising activities, which included the Alderwood Charity Calendar which was now available at the Council Offices, Princes Hall, and the Dressing Up Shop in Aldershot. The Mayor was also supporting the Farnborough

Rotary Christmas collection on 11th December; all funds from which would be donated to the Mayor's Charity. A quiz night was planned for 6th February, 2026, and Members were asked to contact the Mayor's office should they wish to enter a team.

### 30. **QUESTIONS**

#### (1) Standing Order 8 – Questions

The Mayor reported that no urgent questions had been submitted under Standing Order 8 (3).

#### (2) Public Questions

Further to the new scheme for public questions at full Council meetings, the questions that had been accepted had been circulated to Members in advance. Each question was received as set out below, and the Mayor invited a response to each in turn:

- (1) Peter Crerar – Manor Park Ward – **Council Tax Rise** - In 2023, Keir Starmer said: "If there was a Labour government, you could take that council tax rise you just got and rip it up..." "Yes, you heard it right, not a penny more on your council tax"

The Labour government has allowed councils to raise council tax by up to 5% without a local referendum for the 2025-2026 financial year, including Rushmoor.

Does the Leader of the Council believe that Keir Starmer was making empty promises and is the leader of the council happy for the residents of Rushmoor to rip up their council tax bills as Keir Starmer suggested?

Cllr Gaynor Austin, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources advised that Council tax was important for providing the essential services on which residents rely, and although Rushmoor was responsible for collecting the Council Tax, the Council only kept around 12% of it.

The context of the quote from 2023 was about how a windfall tax on energy firms would have been used in that year to support people through cost-of-living pressures and not a commitment to scrap council tax forever. This was not a policy that was implemented by the government at that time. Local council taxation increased as a response to austerity.

In the latest announcement for local council funding, there was a longer-term funding commitment from government. However, Rushmoor Borough Council had only been allowed a 3% increase in its rate (not 5%) and would be limited to this again in 2026. The 5% increase was applicable to County Councils – 3% + 2% specifically for Adult Social Services. Rushmoor Borough Council's allowable Council Tax increase for the 2025/26 financial year was 2% without referendum.

- (2) Vince Bramley – Rowhill Ward - **Location of Howitzer** - Could the Council update on plans for the Howitzer that was outside Aldershot train station roundabout. It was donated by the army many years ago but removed for much-needed restoration. I was informed last year that a possible new position was the roundabout by Burger King. But funds are not available, and HCC would have to take over the works as it would be on the highway. May I suggest that a fitting and visible location for it would be next to the WW2 memorial beside the Princes Hall steps – where is the Howitzer and how much longer will it be missing?

Cllr Julie Hall, Portfolio Holder for Economy, Skills and Growth advised that the Council finished refurbishment of the Howitzer earlier this year and it was currently stored at one of the Council's depots. The intention was to site the howitzer at Gun Hill. Unfortunately, Hampshire County Council were concerned that this may prejudice future improvements identified in the Local Cycling and Walking Strategy. Further work was required to try and resolve the issue, and it was intended to pursue the matter in January, and alternative locations would be considered. A location close to the WW2 memorial would be included in that exercise.

- (3) A resident of Cove and Southwood – **Councillors Social Media** - Should councillors be using their council social media accounts to promote their own businesses?

Cllr Sophie Porter, Deputy Leader of the Council, advised that councillors were subject to the Code of Conduct when using social media accounts which identified them as members, and promoting a business via such an account may be a breach of the Code. Where members needed guidance on the use of social media the advice of the Monitoring Officer should be sought. Where members or residents consider councillors may be breaching the Code, they should contact the Monitoring Officer.

- (4) Dean Llewellyn, St Marks Ward - **Grounds Maintenance - Lynchford Rd and Napier Gardens** - Can you arrange better up-keep and maintenance of Lynchford Road verges, roundabouts and Napier Gardens car park?

Cllr Christine Guinness, Portfolio Holder for Pride in Place and Neighbourhood Services, advised that these areas were contractually maintained in accordance with standards of maintenance applied across the entire borough of Rushmoor, therefore, it was not feasible, practical or affordable to permanently enhance maintenance in one specific area. However, the Council did recently coordinate the Community Payback Team visiting the area for a general clear-up and some leaf removal.

- (5) Craig Sinclair – Cherrywood Ward - **Elections 2026** - Will Rushmoor council be holding democratic elections in May 2026?

Cllr Sophie Porter, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Healthy Communities and Active Lives, advised that the Council were currently planning for local Rushmoor Borough Elections and Hampshire County Council Elections to take place on Thursday 7th May 2026.

However, it was announced today that the planned inaugural Mayoral Election for the Combined County Authority of Hampshire and the Solent, that was also to take place in the coming May, would now not take place until 2028.

- (6) Andrew McLeod – Cove and Southwood Ward - **Grounds Maintenance - Condition of Road/Footpath Arrow Rd** - When will attention be given to Arrow Road area of Farnborough? North from the Costco roundabout is breaking up. 5 oak trees on the left side are dead or dying, flooding makes the foot path/cycle path impassable when heavy rainfall. Fly tipping takes place, hedge row out of control, previously, reported to local councillors and HCC Councillor, dead branches fall on verge and foot path.

Cllr Christine Guinness, Portfolio Holder for Pride in Place and Neighbourhood Services, advised that a number of the points raised in this question fell outside of the responsibility of this Council. The carriageway and footpath or cycle path surface and any highway flooding was the responsibility of Hampshire County Council (HCC). The trees along Arrow Road were all owned by the Ministry of Defence. Rushmoor's Tree Officer had previously raised concerns about these trees to HCC, due to the risk of limbs/debris falling onto the adopted highway (which is their responsibility). Rushmoor cut the grass along the west side of Arrow Road, which is in accordance with the agency agreement with the County Council. The hedgerow along the east side of Arrow Road was situated within the adopted public highway and was therefore also the responsibility of the County Council, who were responsible for ensuring it did not encroach the public highway. Fly tips that occur along the highway could be reported to Rushmoor for investigation and removal.

- (7) Sally McGuinness – Cherrywood Ward - **Prospect Estate Graffiti** - The graffiti is increasing too much on the Prospect Estate. Can something be done about it other than cleaning it up, which is not being done? Something like a campaign to put posters up saying there is a greater penalty for anyone who is doing graffiti and that council tax is increasing to pay for the cleaning up, so that's less money to spend on the pens and paint.

Cllr Christine Guinness, Portfolio Holder for Pride in Place and Neighbourhood Services, advised that the Council was seeing an increase in graffiti across the Borough and had been redirecting resources in order to manage the issue. This week Council workers had removed a large quantity of graffiti in Moor Road and the surrounding area. The Council encouraged anyone with information about those graffitiing communities to make contact with the Place Protection Team.

- (8) A resident of North Town Ward - **Residents of Potters International** - By now, many inhabitants of Potter's hotel on the Farnborough Rd will have been granted leave to remain and released into the community. Can the council provide a breakdown of how many people this has been to date, their ethnicities, where they have been actually housed and by which authority and / or organisation? Can the council also provide any information also on the tents that have popped up opposite Potters, who's inside them and what they are going to do about them?

Cllr Keith Dibble, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning, advised that the question raised a number of points that would be addressed in turn:

**Asylum and immigration decisions** - Decisions about asylum and immigration, including the granting of leave to remain, were made by the Home Office. The Council did not hold information about individuals' immigration status, personal data or where they go when they leave the hotel.

**Housing after leave to remain** - When people were granted leave to remain, they were free to move to any part of the country. The Council had received only a small number of approaches to the housing team. Most people leaving Potters were moving to areas where they had relatives, friends, or established communities.

**Tents opposite Potters** – The Council's teams were aware that there had been tents opposite Potters and had visited the site on many occasions and were engaging with any occupants. Where individuals were found to be homeless, advice and support was offered through outreach services. The Council's teams would also refer to other agencies in appropriate cases. At this stage, the Council were aware that there was one tent remaining. Officers continue to monitor the situation carefully to safeguard individuals and maintain community safety.

- (9) Daz Brady – Rowhill Ward - **Assurance on responsibly installed Flags** - Given the positive relationship between Rushmoor Borough Council and local residents regarding the Union Jack flags displayed on lampposts—particularly those maintained by members of Rushmoor People First—can the Council confirm that this cooperative approach will continue? Specifically, can we be assured that where flags are responsibly installed and maintained by volunteers, and where they cause no safety issues, obstructions, or interference with road signs, the Council will continue allowing them to remain unchallenged? This arrangement has worked well for the community, and we would appreciate confirmation that it will be upheld.

Cllr Sophie Porter, Deputy Leader of the Council, advised that the Council realised that this was a very sensitive issue. Many residents had made strong representations to the Council both in support of flags and in opposition to flags. The Council had contacted the County Council, which owned lampposts on public highways, for a view and they had confirmed that as long as flags were not dangerous or obscuring signage then they would not be taking immediate steps to remove them. Since that time, the Council had not taken any further action on this matter. However, this matter was subject to a debate later on this evening's agenda.

- (10) Leo Mellet - Rushmoor People First - **Military Sites for Housing Migrants** - Has there been any enquiries or discussions from or with any party regarding the use of any of Rushmoor/Aldershot's military sites for the housing of migrants? If so, and even if not, what is the council's position on these sites being used in this way?

Cllr Keith Dibble, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning, advised that the Council were not aware of any enquiries or discussions on the use of military sites in

Rushmoor to house migrants. The Council would need to consider the situation if and when it arose.

## 31. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

Further to Standing Order 6(2)(a) the Mayor used his discretion to change the order in which the Notices of Motion would be considered as follows, 4(2) Flags, 4(1) Cabinet Champions and 4(3) Unattached Land.

### **(1) Flags**

With the consent of the Council under Standing Order 14(9), Cllr Craig Card presented an altered Notice of Motion on the topic of flags, as set out below:

“Within Rushmoor the Union flag is currently being used for a political purpose, that is not consistent with nationally understood values associated with the Union Flag.

This borough is the home of the British Army, the very values the flag represents are here in our borough of Rushmoor. Many residents are distressed that the Union Flag is being used in a manner which betrays these values.

Therefore, this Council will recommend to Hampshire County Council to take action to remove the Union Flags from the public highways as soon as possible. This would be a sign of respect to all those who have and currently serve in uniform.”

In PROPOSING the Motion Cllr Craig Card advised that he had spoken to residents who had expressed their shame about how the flags were being displayed at “half-mast” on lampposts across the borough. He respected people’s wishes to display the flags but felt it would be more appropriate for individuals to fly flags on their own properties to show their patriotism and pride. In SECONDING the Motion, Cllr Leola Card stated the importance of speaking up on behalf of residents and raising the concerns of those who didn’t want or were unable to themselves.

During debate, it was confirmed that the Council had previously written to Hampshire County Council (HCC) regarding the flags and that HCC had advised that they would remain in place unless they were blocking any road signs. Therefore, it was felt that writing again would not have the desired effect of the Motion. Members discussed national pride in the flag and the reasons behind why they had been put up across the borough. Some challenged if those involved with putting up the flags had been asked why they had done so, and suggested it was unfair to assume intentions. Others asked for respect to be given to the flag by flying it appropriately, with permission, at full mast and to those that chose not to fly it. It was suggested that the impact of the flag is lost when displayed constantly and it was important to achieve a balance between pride and national symbolism. The point was made that the flag should be used to bring the nation together, not to divide it and it was important that it not be used to stoke division within the community. Residents should be working together to nurture cohesion with the support of their council.

In addition, it was noted that many events were held in the Borough at which the flag was raised officially, and members of the public were encouraged to attend these events to show their national pride.

The Motion was put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 6; AGAINST: 19; ABSTAINED: 5 and the Motion was **DECLARED LOST**.

## **(2) Champion Roles**

The Council considered a Notice of Motion submitted by Cllr Nadia Martin under Standing Order 10 (1) on Cabinet Champions:

“This council notes that Cabinet Champion roles exist to support and promote key areas of importance to the Borough, and that these roles should operate in a way that best serves residents across the community.

This council further notes that the current arrangements for appointing Cabinet Champions are set out in the Constitution, and that these arrangements place the responsibility for appointments with the Leader of the Council. Council recognises that there is a desire among members for these roles to operate on a non-party-political basis, with transparent and cross-party appointment processes.

This council will therefore:

- (1) Commit to the principle that Cabinet Champion roles should be non-executive, non-political positions, open to all councillors, with appointments made by Full Council or the appropriate committee rather than by the Leader, and that the Constitution should be amended to reflect this.
- (2) Request that the Licensing and Corporate Business Committee urgently prepare the necessary constitutional amendments, including role descriptions and accountability arrangements, and bring these proposals to the next available meeting of Full Council.
- (3) Enable Full Council to vote on the revised arrangements for Cabinet Champion roles at the earliest opportunity.”

In PROPOSING the Motion Cllr Martin expressed the view that it should be open to any Member to be a Champion for the Council regardless of political affiliation and that the roles should not be used for political gain. In SECONDING the Motion, Cllr Tennant referred to both the success of the process to select the Mayor based on seniority, and the appointment of opposition vice chairs on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which allowed for good cross party working. He advocated for the positions to be given to the “best person for the job”.

In discussing the Motion, the following points were made:

- Only the Cabinet should be subject to appointment by the Leader, all other roles should be appointed by the Council

- Careful consideration would be needed to determine how this would work, including limits on the number of Champions, how they would support the priorities of the Council and the process for accountability and governance for the roles
- The Champion roles should be non-executive, open to all and provide practical resident focused work
- Utilisation of the Licensing and Corporate Business Committee to determine the roles on an annual basis

The Motion was put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 19; AGAINST: 0; ABSTAIN: 15 and the Motion was **DECLARED CARRIED**.

### **(3) Unattached Land**

The Council considered a Notice of Motion submitted by Cllr Steve Harden under Standing Order 10 (1) on the topic of unattached land:

“This Council resolves to write to the local Member of Parliament and to the Chancellor to raise concerns regarding the management and maintenance of unattached land, and to request appropriate support and guidance.

This Council also resolves that the Policy and Project Advisory Board be requested to consider, and report to Cabinet on:

- the feasibility and associated costs of undertaking an urgent review of all parcels of unattached or unregistered land within the Borough, in order to confirm the appropriate owners and clarify responsibility for their maintenance
- the extent of emergency works needed to address neglected areas, and the funding requirements for this
- the projected costs, resource implications, and legal considerations of the Council assuming ongoing responsibility for maintaining such areas on a permanent basis
- proposals for the establishment of a formal working partnership with Crown land authorities, Hampshire County Council, and other relevant bodies including, where appropriate, Rushmoor agencies to coordinate land management and ensure clarity of ownership and responsibility.”

In PROPOSING the Motion Cllr Harden advised that the borough was plagued by unattached land, which in some cases was unsightly and dangerous due to landowners refusing to take responsibility for its upkeep. Through the proposed Working Group, members would be able to draw attention to unattached land in their areas, and the Group could liaise with landowners to determine ways forward for each area to protect residents from harm due to lack of responsibility. In SECONDING the Motion, Cllr Allen advised that the inconsistent and piecemeal approach wasn't working effectively, and this Motion could enable a better route for dealing with the issue.

In discussing the Motion, Members spoke of the complaints that they received regarding damage caused by trees on unattached land that weren't maintained properly, and the overgrown nature of the sites which caused an eyesore in their

communities. Potential outcomes for the pockets of land going forward were discussed: these included creating areas to encourage biodiversity, making areas into community assets and selling pockets to residents who live adjacent to unattached land for a nominal fee. However, it was noted that, financially, there was little the Council could do to maintain these areas going forward, but the Council could act as a facilitator between residents and landowners.

The Motion was put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 32; AGAINST: 0; ABSTAIN: 2 and the Motion was **DECLARED CARRIED**.

## 32. **QUESTIONS FOR THE CABINET**

- (1) Cllr Leola Card had submitted a question for response by the Pride in Place and Neighbourhood Services Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Christine Guinness) on the maintenance of the green space to the demolished Leisure Centre in Farnborough.

Cllr Guinness advised that £12,000 had been spent on maintenance in this area in 2025/26. Works had included improvements to the skate park, tree maintenance, grass cutting, clearing of the shrub beds and removal of graffiti. It was noted that the Council also responds to fly-tips and reports of trolleys found in the pond.

- (2) Cllr Steve Harden had submitted a question for response by the Pride in Place and Neighbourhood Services Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Christine Guinness) on play parks in Fernhill Ward.

Cllr Guinness advised that there was no budget in place for play parks. However, the Council were in the process of bidding for funding from a £18 million Government grant aimed at addressing significant inequalities in children's access to play, particularly in deprived areas.

It was noted that there were three play parks in Fernhill:

- Pinewood Park – identified for refurbishment on the Council's working Action Plan, as a medium priority site, there were no plans to close it,
- Curly Bridge – discussions underway with Thames Valley Housing regarding decommissioning or renewing the play area, and
- Irvine Drive – discussion underway on the size and location of the site

If the bidding process is successful and funding secured, further discussions would be had on where the money could be invested.

- (3) Cllr Sarah Spall had submitted a question for response by the Housing and Planning Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Keith Dibble) on the My North Town project.

Cllr Dibble advised that, he was very pleased to report that the final phase of the project was very near to completion with the last fourteen new shared ownership homes soon to be ready for occupation. It was noted that for many years, North Town had an underserved reputation, due to the perception of the run-down Denmark Square and Pegasus Avenue estate. The original estate, which was built in

the 1950's, had been a magnet for mould and damp, three-bedroom flats on the top floor without gardens, long dark corridors, and a lack of security.

Therefore, in 2009, First Wessex, with the support of the Council and ward councillors, agreed a programme to demolish the existing estate and replace it with quality homes with gardens and open spaces. The then North Town councillors, Sue Dibble, Frank Rust, and Cllr Keith Dibble, had only given their support to the housing association if they put "people before bricks and mortar", and he was pleased to confirm they had delivered on this pledge.

The new development, which has changed the landscape of North Town, now offered 406 homes to rent, 83 for outright ownership, 182 in shared ownership, and a new fit for purpose North Town Community Base.

- (4) Cllr Jules Crossley had submitted a question for response by the Housing and Planning Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Keith Dibble) on conditions in the Local Plan relating to air traffic movements.

Cllr Dibble advised that, any conflict between the local plan and the content of an application is for the Development Management Committee to determine as part of their ordinary business, not Council. It was not unusual for applications to be received which, on the face of them, may appear to be contrary to a local plan. Rushmoor's constitution reserves decisions in which such a conflict arises to the Development Management Committee to ensure that the decision is made by elected representatives.

The law makes clear that decisions on planning applications would be in line with the local plan, save where there are planning reasons or where material considerations so indicate. This was also reflected in the Members' Planning Code of Good Practice which states that, Members should comply with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and make decisions in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

As to whether Council would be involved post any decision of the Development Management Committee, the answer is no. That would be a matter for the Planning Inspectorate or the Judiciary, depending on the nature of a challenge to any decision.

- (5) Cllr Rhain Jones had submitted a question for response by the Housing and Planning Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Keith Dibble) on a recent meeting with Vivid Housing.

Cllr Dibble advised that, a theme of the Labour Administration delivery programme was Homes for All: Quality Living, affordable housing, with a priority to improve social housing performance through more active engagement with providers.

Working with the Leader and Senior Officers a programme of meetings to meet face to face with the leading registered providers in Aldershot and Farnborough has been agreed. Recently, a meeting was held with the largest social landlord in the Borough, Vivid Homes, at which topics discussed included the near completion of the North

Town development, Awaab's Law, dealing with mould and dampness, the Wellesley development in Aldershot, Farnborough Civic Quarter, a strategy for adopting roads on new developments, a potential downsizing scheme and performance monitoring.

To deliver the Council's priorities, it was considered important to have a strong partnership with the borough's largest housing provider and this was the first of a schedule of regular meetings, at senior level, with Vivid Homes. The Council were also committed to working closely with all social housing providers to support them to achieve high quality homes and services for residents.

Therefore, it was especially important for elected members to feed into the Housing Team and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Housing Oversight Group, any concerns, feedback, and any escalations, so these can be presented at future meetings.

- (6) Cllr Gareth Lyon had submitted a question for response by the Finance and Resources Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Gaynor Austin) on the impacts of business rates on local businesses.

Cllr Austin advised that all small to medium sized businesses impacted by the revaluation were being identified, and letters were being sent out advising of the support available if needed. The Council were also looking at the effects on Council owned buildings to determine the impacts and letters were also being sent out to those tenants to advise on any implications.

Cllr Lyon asked a supplementary question regarding being kept updated on the situation with hospitality, pubs and bed and breakfast establishments, Cllr Austin agreed to keep Members updated.

- (7) Cllr Martin Tennant had submitted a question for response by the Economy, Skills and Growth Portfolio Holder, (Cllr Julie Hall) on best value for the disposal of Union Yard sites.

Cllr Hall advised that achieving best values was a priority for the Council in relation to the disposal of assets. External agents were involved in the pricing and negotiation stages, and all options were set out and considered by the Cabinet. Statutory Officers from governance, legal and finance also had an input into any reports considered by the Cabinet. Members were also reminded of the Overview and Scrutiny call-in process.

It was noted that the Cabinet report on disposals at Union Yard would be issued the following day and the Cabinet would carry out its due diligence on 15th December, 2025. Prior to the Cabinet meeting, The Audit and Governance Committee would be holding a special meeting on 11th December, 2025, to review the governance arrangements relating to the disposal of Blocks C and D.

- (8) Cllr Gareth Lyon had submitted a question for response by the Deputy Leader of the Council, (Cllr Sophie Porter) on the costs for KPMG in relation to Local Government Reorganisation.

Cllr Porter advised that £34,000 had been contributed to KPMG and a further £2,000 towards a shared data hub. It could not be confirmed how much other councils had contributed. It was noted that further costs may be incurred to an estimated value of £25,000, however this was dependent on the Governments decision on the way forward.

Cllr Lyon asked a supplementary question regarding the value for money of the costs to KPMG, Cllr Porter advised that the costs had included some upskilling for staff and would ask the Leader to provide a written response on the value for money.

**33. REPORTS OF CABINET AND COMMITTEES**

**RESOLVED:** that the Reports of the following meetings be received:

**Cabinet** 14th October 2025

**Committees**

Development Management	8th October 2025
Licensing and Corporate Business	21st October 2025
Development Management	19th November 2025

**34. REPORTS OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AND POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD**

**RESOLVED:** that the Reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 23rd October and the Policy and Project Advisory Board meeting held on 18th November, 2025 be noted.

The meeting closed at 10.27 pm.

-----