
Council

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Wednesday, 28 January 2026 from 7.00 pm - 11.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Andy Booth, Lloyd Bowen, Hayden Brawn, Lloyd Chapman, Alex Eyre, Charles Gibson, Tim Gibson, Kieran Golding, Alastair Gould, Angela Harrison, James Hunt, Elliott Jayes, Peter MacDonald, Peter Marchington, Ben J Martin, Charlie Miller, Kieran Mishchuk, Chris Palmer, Richard Palmer, Hannah Perkin, Carrie Pollard, Ashley Shiel, Julien Speed, Terry Thompson, Karen Watson (Mayor), Mike Whiting, Tony Winckless, Ashley Wise and Dolley Wooster.

PRESENT (VIRTUALLY): Councillors Paul Stephen, Sarah Stephen, Tara Noe, Mark Tucker, Pete Neal, Lee-Anne More .

OFFICERS PRESENT: Lisa Fillery. Robin Harris, Tim Neal. Larissa Reed,

APOLOGIES: Councillors Monique Bonney, Derek Carnell, Ann Cavanagh, Shelley Cheesman, Roger Clark, Mark Last, Rich Lehmann, Claire Martin, Lee-Anne Moore, Pete Neal, Tara Noe, Tom Nundy, Paul Stephen and Sarah Stephen.

657 **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

The Mayor outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

658 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 19 November 2025 (Minute Nos. 466 - 477) and 10 December 2025 (Minute Nos. 556 - 568) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Mayor as correct records.

659 **Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

660 **Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor reported that, together with the Deputy Mayor, over 110 engagements had been completed across the borough since the start of her term. These included a range of Christmas events such as Lights of Love at Minster Abbey and the UK Paper Mill Christmas Concert, as well as New Year engagements including a Faversham Carnival dinner, a restaurant opening in Leysdown, and a visit by Milton Regis Cubs to the Council Chamber.

The Mayor advised that an upcoming engagement would include a function with the High Sheriff of Kent to discuss the rehabilitation of people serving custodial sentences.

Congratulations were extended to Borden Grammar School's Violence Against Women and Girls Champions, who had been selected as finalists in the National Crimebeat Awards to be held in London in March 2026.

The Mayor also noted the official opening of the Master's House workshops, highlighting their importance in supporting young people in Sheerness and recognising the passion

previously shown for the project by Councillor Bonney.

Members were advised that nominations for the Mayor's Civic Awards would be opening shortly, inviting nominations for individuals recognised as "hidden heroes" for their contribution to supporting others across the borough.

661 **Questions submitted by the Public**

The Mayor advised that one question had been received from a member of the public and invited Collette Haseldine to ask her question.

Question One:

Following the recently concluded second public consultation on the proposed introduction of parking charges to raise £335,000 to balance the 2026-27 budget and leaving 17.3 million pounds in reserves under the Borough of Swale Off street parking places variation number 10 order 2026 proposal and its companion variation number nine proposal which again attracted overwhelming public opposition including over 3,500 00 petition signatures and detailed objections raising concerns about local economic, social, and um community impacts. And given that both the courts and the external auditors have consistently uphold that under sections 55 and 122 of the RO traffic regulation act 1984 both off street and on street parking charges income are restricted to traffic and parking management purposes and must not be set or used for general council services. And given that even though section 95 of the traffic management act 2004 expanded the permitted uses of any surplus once generated, it does not remove the requirement that parking charges themselves must not be set as a fiscal measure for general budget purposes. Can the leader explain what steps the council is taking to ensure that these proposals comply with the road traffic regulation act 1984 and relevant case law and on what legal basis officers consider that parking charges income may lawfully be raised for general budget purposes where that position appears to conflict with established judicial and audit findings and department for transport guidance.

Response: Leader

Thank you, Mayor and thank you Colette for your question.

The Council has undertaken the relevant consultation to the off-street parking charges proposed late last year and it is compliant with the legislation and guidance from the British Parking Association, that the majority of Councils across the country rely on. This was reported on and discussed by Members at the Environmental Services and Climate Change committee last night. At the meeting, Members discussed the matter of opposition against the charges and the principles of fairness across the Borough.

The report recognised that the modest projected income from the additional 6 car parks was proposed in order to help those car parks become self-sufficient, meaning that other Council budget (revenue or reserves) can be spent on a range of services.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for the response. With regards to the proposed transfer of assets, whether considering transferring the assets to Queenborough Town Council would save the

Borough Council the money and instead of raising charges elsewhere to make fairness, perhaps you could reduce them elsewhere to make fairness.

Supplementary Response:

Thank you, and again, a good question. Asset transfer is part of the Economy and Property committee and they will deal with that issue. Thank you.

662 Questions submitted by Members

The Mayor advised six questions had been received from members.

Question 1 - Councillor Richard Palmer

On 1 October this Council made a clear political decision to take back control of HMO development by progressing a borough-wide Immediate Article 4 Direction and by urgently producing a Supplementary Planning Document so residents could finally be consulted and poor-quality HMOs properly controlled.

Nearly four months later, nothing has changed on the ground. HMOs are still being created without planning applications, without public consultation and without this Council having any real say, precisely the democratic failure this motion was passed to end.

So, can the Chair of Planning tell Full Council—without generalities or process language—what has been done since 1 October, give a clear timetable with dates for both the Article 4 Direction and the SPD, and explain why residents are still being left unprotected while this Council's own decision remains unimplemented?

Response – Chair of Planning and Transportation Policy Working Group

Thank you Cllr Palmer, for your question. Members will be aware that no planning decision is sound without robust evidence – whether that be a planning application being decided, or whether that be planning policy being created.

With this precursor point, I am pleased to explain that a paper came to Planning and Transportation Policy Working Group last week, setting out the significant amount of research and evidence building that has taken place and laying out a programme for adoption of the SPD five months from now. As the SPD will need its pre-consultation draft approved by Policy and Resources Committee, a period of consultation, a period of reflection on that consultation and then approval by the Planning and Transportation Policy Working Group, Policy and Resources Committee and Full Council, I trust you will see that pace is being applied to this workstream.

The Article 4 direction is progressing in parallel, and the approvals route for this document is via Planning Committee. I will take the liberty of commenting on behalf of Cllr Booth, the Chair of that Committee, that this is presently anticipated at Planning Committee in March.

Question 2 - Councillor Kieran Mischuk

Can the Leader confirm whether Swale Borough Council has been approached by Government or the Home Office about refurbishing existing homes or building new

housing in Swale for use as asylum-seeker accommodation, as part of the national pilot scheme now being pursued by other councils?

Response – Leader

Swale Borough Council has not received any approach from the Home Office or any other Government department regarding the pilot programme announced in the summer statement that it intends to bring an end to the use of hotels as asylum accommodation. Should the Government initiate discussions with us in future, we will engage constructively and ensure that Members are informed, and a report brought to the relevant committee.

Question 3 – Councillor Peter MacDonald

My question is to the Leader: Given the ongoing erosion of the Sheppey Cliffs caused by climate change, shifting tectonic plates, and rising sea levels, will Swale Council urge the Government to replace its current 'No Intervention' coastal policy for the Sheppey frontage with a policy of active protection, in order to safeguard the area's social, economic, and community interests for current and future generations?

Response – Leader

Following the motion presented by Cllr MacDonald in November 2020, the Council lobbied MPs and Government Ministers and attended officer level meetings with the key national agencies in order to pursue this change in coastal policy.

The Environmental Services and Climate Change committee (ESCCC) received an update report on 18 March 2025, where the full detail of actions was recorded. At that committee evidence was shown to suggest the motion was not able to be delivered and Members resolved to cease any further work on changing the Shoreline Management Plan and instead focus resource on engaging with the affected communities.

A further report is scheduled to go to ESCCC in March to present a draft engagement plan for Members to adopt which will then determine what level of continued support we offer those residents affected.

Supplementary Question

I hope that we have the opportunity to actually present some evidence. Can we please be tough with these organisations? Thank you

Supplementary Response:

Thank you, Council MacDonald. You have my assurance that we'll be as strong as we possibly can.

Question 4 – Councillor Charles Gibson

This question was withdrawn.

Question 5 – Councillor Mark Last

As Councillor Last was not in attendance a written response would be provided.

Question 6 – Councillor Charlie Miller

Will the Chair for the Economy and Property Committee outline how the council is engaging with the owners of empty buildings that are in growing states of disrepair in Sittingbourne town centre namely the old cinema building, Bell House, the Bell Centre and the former Wheatsheaf pub?

Response – Councillor Wise on behalf of Councillor Bonney

The Council shares residents' frustration about the deteriorating condition and prolonged vacancy of several key buildings in Sittingbourne town centre, including the old cinema, Bell House, the Bell Centre and the former Wheatsheaf pub.

Officers from the Regeneration, Property and Planning services are engaging with owners and their agents to develop future plans for these sites. Officers are also promoting appropriate maintenance and security and issuing notices for urgent works where necessary. Furthermore, they're exploring opportunities to bring the buildings back into productive use where the Council's limited resources permit.

Regarding the former cinema, introductions have been made to interested parties but these have yet to progress further.

The Swale Community Safety Unit holds regular multi-agency discussions about hotspot locations, including insecure and dilapidated buildings like Bell House and the old Barclays building. Through joint working between the Police and Environmental Response Team and more recently monthly meetings with KFRS, these locations are being addressed by engaging with and enforcing against the landlords/owners. Proactively, officers contact owners when properties pose a risk or access is gained and ASB incidents occur. They also issue communications to property owners before school holiday periods, encouraging additional patrols.

Officers are simultaneously preparing a report for the Economy and Property Committee. This report will detail various potential options for the Council to support town centre regeneration and tackle long-term vacancy, aligning with its town centre policy. It will consider new powers like High Street Rental Auctions (HSRA) alongside existing tools such as enforcement action acquisition options partnership working and funding opportunities.

The Council has already invested in public realm improvements in Sittingbourne town centre to enhance the environment. However, it's a challenging time for town centre businesses. Since the buildings are privately owned the Council's direct ability to compel redevelopment or investment is limited. Securing change is difficult unless statutory thresholds for enforcement or acquisition are met.

For wider support, government assistance for town centres like Sittingbourne includes the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF). The working group is exploring how the UKSPF can be used to support regeneration improvements to the built environment and "pride in place" initiatives in Swale.

663 **Leader's Statement**

The Leader said:

"This evening I want to reflect on the council's continued focus on regeneration, community wellbeing, planning and partnership working.

I will begin in Sheerness, where we have reached an important milestone in the Sheerness Revival project with the opening of the new Makers Studios at Masters House. This marks the completion of the first of three major regeneration schemes being delivered as part of the council's £20 million investment into the Isle of Sheppey. It was a privilege to be involved in last weeks ribbon cutting ceremony which saw a happy and welcome return to the borough of former leader Roger Truelove who has retained a keen interest in the wider sheerness revival project.

The studios are modern, sustainably built, and provide affordable, professional spaces, operated by the national enterprise charity Launch It. The studios offer mentoring and business support alongside workspace, helping young entrepreneurs turn creativity into sustainable livelihoods. This builds on the earlier £1.5 million refurbishment of Masters House, which now hosts a thriving community of small businesses.

Madam mayor, regeneration is not just about buildings, it's about people and how communities function from day to day.

That is why the council is giving equal emphasis to tackling loneliness and social isolation across Swale. This work is informed by feedback from residents and organisations, who highlighted barriers such as rural isolation, transport challenges, digital exclusion and lack of confidence.

Working with the Swale Voluntary Alliance and Swale CVS, and funded through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, the council is supporting a coordinated programme of practical action. This includes a Swale Activities Directory, a telephone befriending service for younger residents, loneliness champion training, for volunteers and frontline staff, and work to support residents who are digitally excluded to get online and stay connected. The aim is simple but vital, to help people feel seen, supported and able to belong, and to ensure that no resident in Swale feels they have to face loneliness alone.

Supporting residents through the cost of living also remains a priority. The council will continue to deliver One Swale Roadshows across the borough between January and March, bringing together charities and partner organisations to offer advice and practical help with bills, food and fuel, employment, health and wellbeing. The first event of the year will take place in Sheerness on 29 January.

Madam mayor I also want to briefly highlight the launch of the Regulation 18 consultation for the council's next Local Plan, which sets out our early vision for how development should take place across Swale.

This stage focuses on development management policies, the rules used to assess planning applications and places a clear emphasis on infrastructure, design quality and environmental protection.

The council has chosen to bring forward these essential policies now, with a further consultation on potential development sites to follow later this year. This ensures we are in a strong position to demand quality design, appropriate infrastructure, affordable housing and high environmental standards when sites are considered.

The consultation is open until 23 February, and I encourage all residents and stakeholders to take part.

Staying with consultations our Community Governance Review stage 1 consultation is live and will close on 9 February and I would ask you all to promote engagement from all of your residents.

Moving on I wanted to acknowledge that this new year didn't start well for everyone. In

fact I can't imagine how awful it must have been for the residents of Faversham witnessing the sickening fire at The Alexander Centre on New Year's Eve. I would like to thank Kent Fire and Rescue Service, other emergency responders and the local community for their swift and professional response. Thankfully, no one was injured, and the council is working closely with the Centre's management team and partners to support assessments and repairs. I visited the centre and met with Graham Setterfield Director and chair of the CIC to witness the aftermath. I have to say I have nothing but admiration for him, his fellow directors and staff in their dedication and tenacity in ensuring as much as possible that it is business as usual although some events have had to be inevitably cancelled.

Finally, I would like to reflect on the importance of partnerships in keeping our communities safe. Recently, I visited the Kent, Surrey and Sussex Air Ambulance alongside leaders from across the county. Informative and enlightening presentations from the charity's Chief Executive and Clinical Director provided a clear insight into the complexity and importance of the life-saving services that they deliver across our region. However one particularly take away from the session for me is the need for each and everyone of us to have an awareness of CPR. Given that for every minute CPR is not commenced the patients chances of survival reduce by 10% .Early this week an elderly resident who had collapsed by a major road in my ward was successfully resuscitated by people passing by, and whilst offering my congratulations to those kind individuals it highlights that if they hadn't been aware of how to implement CPR the outcome could have been very different.

Madam mayor on that truly positive note I will sign off, thank you."

In response, the Leader of the Conservative group, endorsed the Leader's comments on the importance of CPR, drawing on personal experience to highlight both the physical and emotional challenges involved, while stressing that it remained a vital and potentially life-saving intervention. He expressed support for the One Swale Roadshows and looked forward to the event scheduled for 29 January, hoping it would mark the start of a successful and worthwhile programme.

Referring to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation and the Community Governance Review (CGR), the Leader of the Conservative Group emphasised their importance in shaping the future of the borough, but stressed the need to encourage residents to engage through the formal consultation process rather than commenting on social media, which could not be taken into account.

He expressed sadness but relief that nobody was injured in the fire at the Alexander Centre, and acknowledged the strength of the community response.

In concluding, the Leader of the Conservative Group referred to a recent incident involving the theft and subsequent recovery of a therapy dog from a local school, highlighting both the significant emotional impact on the school community and the positive role that social media could play in mobilising public support and achieving a good outcome.

The Leader of the Swale Independents Alliance (SIA) welcomed progress on the Sheerness Revival project, particularly the restoration of Master's House, noting its importance as a heritage asset previously at risk and the value of bringing it back into use for the benefit of Sheerness. He referred to the involvement and commitment of former Councillor Knight and emphasised the importance of continuing to protect

buildings at risk, highlighting ongoing concerns regarding the water tower.

The Leader of the SIA group welcomed the progress being made in tackling loneliness and social isolation, noting this had been a long-standing priority for the SIA group. He referred to existing initiatives within Swale West, including the Bobbing Loneliness Café and other local events, and advised that, in his capacity as Chair of the Swale Area Committee, relevant organisations would be invited to a future meeting to discuss how loneliness and social isolation could be addressed further. He expressed hope that parish councils could play a role in helping to address what he described as a serious social issue.

Finally, the Leader of the SIA group welcomed progress on CGR, expressing concern about the future of local representation across Kent. He described the Review as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to establish a town council for Sittingbourne, in order to ensure that local voices were not lost under potential future unitary arrangements, and welcomed any progress made.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group welcomed the positive impact of the regeneration scheme on the Isle of Sheppey, particularly its benefits for young people, which she considered an impressive project that supported them in building their futures. She suggested that it would be beneficial to see similar schemes extended to other areas of the borough, and potentially within any future unitary authority.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group emphasised the importance of reducing loneliness and social isolation, noting that the One Swale Roadshows had been highly effective in supporting vulnerable residents, particularly during the cost of living crisis, by helping to put money back into people's pockets when it was most needed.

Referring to the Local Plan, she welcomed progress on the development management policies currently out for consultation and described them as ambitious. However, she expressed concern about whether Faversham could accommodate a proposed additional 4,000 homes.

The Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group went on to thank Kent Fire and Rescue Service for their rapid and professional response to the fire at the Alexander Centre, also paying tribute to the dedication of the Centre's staff and volunteers. She noted the strong community response in Faversham, with support being offered from across the local area.

Finally, she echoed comments made regarding CGR, expressing concern that future unitary arrangements could distance councillors from the residents they represented. She stressed that local government functioned best when it was closest to communities and welcomed any efforts aimed at reducing that gap.

The Leader of the Reform UK Group welcomed the regeneration taking place on the Isle of Sheppey and the progress of initiatives aimed at reducing loneliness, noting that these projects demonstrated what could be achieved when Members worked collaboratively towards shared objectives.

While acknowledging its importance in sustaining life, he highlighted the critical role of automated external defibrillators (AEDs) in improving survival rates, noting that delays in defibrillation significantly reduced the chances of survival. He referred to the Council's

role in supporting the provision of AEDs across rural communities, town centres and other locations, and stressed the importance of increasing public awareness and training.

He concluded by reiterating the value of collective effort and thanked Members for their contributions.

The Leader of the Green Group focused on the comments made regarding CPR, suggesting that the most effective way of improving survival rates from heart attacks was through prevention rather than intervention alone. He highlighted that several elements within the Leader's statement—such as promoting economic activity, community integration and tackling loneliness—were proven to have positive impacts on public health and in reducing the likelihood of heart disease.

Referring to the Regulation 18 Local Plan, he welcomed the inclusion of policies promoting active travel and physical activity, which he considered central to creating healthier communities. He commented that CPR represented a final line of defence, whereas community wellbeing and preventative measures needed to be embedded much earlier. He also welcomed the emphasis within the Regulation 18 consultation on net zero design for both residential and employment buildings, describing this as one of the most significant elements of the emerging policies.

Other Members were invited to speak and made points which included:

- thanked the Leader for highlighting the CGR consultation and reassured the public that all comments received would be read carefully and taken seriously by the Working Group;
- suggested there was work to be done to rebuild public trust in Council consultations, following previous decisions where residents felt their views had not been fully reflected;
- welcomed the opening of the Master's House garages and praised the quality of the restoration work, noting both the aesthetic improvements and benefits to the Isle of Sheppey community;
- congratulated officers, including the Communications Team on improved engagement and updates relating to the Sheerness Revival project;
- welcomed progress on regeneration on the Isle of Sheppey and expressed hope that conservation areas and historic buildings elsewhere in the borough, including Milton Regis, would be considered in future regeneration plans;
- raised concern that awareness of the CGR remained limited among residents and welcomed explanatory videos produced to support understanding of the Review;
- reflected on the importance of long-term vision and consistency in regeneration projects to ensure the Council was well-placed to respond to future funding opportunities;
- welcomed progress on further education provision on the Isle of Sheppey, including the college extension, and the potential benefits for young people both on the island and the mainland;
- encouraged cross-party working and long-term thinking when developing policies and regeneration schemes; and
- expressed concern that some children on the Isle of Sheppey were currently without appropriate school places, and noted that this issue should not be overlooked.

In response, the Leader reflected on comments made by Members, beginning with the incident involving a therapy dog and highlighting the important role animals could play in supporting wellbeing, particularly for children who required additional support in educational settings.

He emphasised that encouraging engagement with consultations was a key issue for all Members, stressing that elected Members needed to lead by example by responding themselves, while also recognising the ongoing challenges in raising awareness among residents despite best efforts at ward level.

The Leader welcomed comments regarding the Council's work on protecting heritage assets, acknowledging the importance of having a dedicated focus on buildings at risk. He also referred positively to initiatives addressing loneliness and social isolation, including local café-based schemes, noting their apparent success and positive feedback.

Responding to comments from Group Leaders, he acknowledged the work undertaken to support residents facing cost-of-living pressures and welcomed the cross-party support for regeneration on the Isle of Sheppey. He commented on the discussion around CPR and automated external defibrillators, agreeing that AEDs represented best practice while recognising that availability remained limited and that Members and residents must continue to do what they could in the circumstances.

He agreed that promoting healthier communities and addressing wider social determinants of health would, in the longer term, reduce the need for emergency interventions such as CPR, while acknowledging that further progress was required to achieve this.

The Leader:

- acknowledged the difficulties in encouraging residents to respond to consultations, particularly where issues were not widely understood or did not generate strong public interest;
- expressed appreciation for the work of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CGR Working Group and reaffirmed the Council's commitment to supporting efforts to increase public engagement;
- aligned himself with comments praising the work of officers, noting that their contribution to regeneration projects was often unseen but had been exceptional;
- formally recognised the dedication and effort of officers involved in delivering the Sheerness Revival and related projects;
- reflected on the importance of maintaining a long-term, forward-looking vision for regeneration and policy development;
- noted that lessons had been learned from past experience and that consistency and perseverance had contributed to recent successes; and
- emphasised that where approaches were working well, there was value in continuing them rather than changing direction unnecessarily.

664 **Motion - Border Emergency**

In proposing the border emergency motion, as set out on the Agenda, Councillor Richard Palmer cited immigration pressures and the downstream impacts on the Council and residents of Swale. He emphasised the motion was not anti-worker or anti-agriculture, acknowledging the importance of seasonal farm workers to the local

economy and the role that properly managed, lawful and time-limited migration played in supporting food production and local businesses.

Councillor Palmer explained that the motion focused on the scale, control and consequences of current immigration levels. He highlighted the Council's statutory responsibilities, including housing, homelessness prevention, temporary accommodation, planning control, environmental health and community cohesion, and noted that while immigration policy was set nationally, the impacts were felt locally through increased pressure on housing availability, GP provision, school places and council-funded services.

Referring to briefing information, he stated that population growth of between 1,200 and 1,600 additional residents per year was placing further demand on local services. He linked this pressure to concerns raised by Members regarding large-scale housing developments, including proposed garden village schemes, and argued that declining birth rates meant that natural population growth alone did not justify development at this scale. He suggested that mass immigration, combined with weak or unenforced national policies, was a significant driver of housing demand.

In concluding, Councillor Palmer stated that it was inconsistent to oppose overdevelopment locally without challenging the national policies that contributed to it. He said the motion sought to set out the reality of the situation and called on central government to take responsibility for the consequences of its decisions, or lack thereof, and commended the motion to the Council.

In seconding the motion, Councill Mishchuk reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor then advised an amendment to the motion had been received and circulated to all members.

Councillor Richard Palmer made a Point of Order relating to 3.1.16.4 of the constitution that amendments should not seek to negate the intent of the motion. Councillor Palmer argued that the proposed amendment was procedurally flawed, as it went beyond an amendment and effectively negated the original motion. He contended that the amendment substituted the policy narrative by removing reference to legal and illegal immigration pressures and replacing it with alternative explanations for population change, thereby fundamentally altering the intent of the motion. He further argued that elements of the amendment introduced assertions about the economic and social benefits of migration without supporting evidence and included statements on national immigration law that fell outside the Council's remit, and were unnecessary for determining the motion. Councillor Palmer expressed concern that accepting the amendment would set a precedent allowing motions to be wholly rewritten through amendment, contrary to the Constitution, which he stated permitted the substitution of words but not the wholesale replacement of paragraphs or the reversal of a motion's purpose.

The Mayor invited input from the Monitoring Officer.

In responding, the Monitoring Officer advised that the initial point raised constituted a valid point of order, as it related directly to the constitutional definition of an amendment to a motion. He explained that amendments were permitted to omit, insert or substitute wording, and that their purpose was inherently to change a motion. While acknowledging

that an amendment should not negate a motion, he advised that determining whether an amendment amounted to negation was a matter of judgement, particularly where both the motion and the amendment were broad in scope. He stated that the remaining points raised were matters of debate rather than points of order.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Mayor had considered the amendment and determined that it did not negate the original motion, and he reminded Members that the Mayor's ruling on the admissibility of amendments was final.

He advised that Members retained the opportunity to speak against the amendment during debate, and that it was ultimately for Council to determine, through a vote, whether the amendment was appropriate.

The Mayor then invited Councillor Perkin as the proposer of the amendment to speak.

In proposing the amendment, Councillor Perkin highlighted the anxiety experienced by many residents regarding housing pressures, noting that behind statistical data were real human circumstances, including relationship breakdowns, the loss of private rented accommodation and people fleeing unsafe situations. She emphasised that these concerns were genuine and should be treated seriously. She stated that the amendment did not deny the pressures facing Swale, but sought to ensure that those pressures were explained accurately, proportionately and responsibly.

Referring to housing and homelessness data, she argued that evidence demonstrated that housing demand was not driven by any single group and highlighted the importance of acknowledging common causes of homelessness, including family exclusion, the end of private tenancies and domestic abuse. She stressed that Members had a responsibility to act in line with the Nolan Principles of Public Life by relying on evidence, correcting inaccuracies and using language that reassured communities.

Councillor Perkin acknowledged the scale of housing need in the borough, including the high number of households on the housing register and the continued use of temporary accommodation, and she welcomed the work of officers to reduce reliance on costly bed and breakfast provision.

She concluded that the amendment sought a balanced and evidence-led approach to discussing migration, recognised the contribution of migrant residents to the local economy, and called on government to provide the support needed to address housing supply, funding for temporary accommodation, workforce stability and improved data, in order to strengthen public confidence and enable effective long-term planning. In seconding the amendment, Councillor Charles Gibson reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Richard Palmer was then given the opportunity, as proposer of the motion, to reply to the debate on the amendment.

In responding, Councillor Palmer reiterated that the motion sought to highlight what he described as a failure of national government to secure the UK's borders and the resulting pressures on residents and services in Swale. He referred to pressures on GP provision in the borough and wider strain on local infrastructure and facilities, which he considered to be impacting residents. He expressed concern that such pressures were being downplayed and stated that residents' anxieties should be taken seriously.

Councillor Palmer criticised the amendment, arguing that it fundamentally altered and undermined the purpose of the original motion. He warned that accepting the amendment would, in his view, be contrary to the Council's Constitution and risked setting a precedent whereby motions could be substantially rewritten, and he urged Members to consider the implications of supporting it.

The Mayor then opened the floor to debate on the amendment from members.

Points raised included:

- concerned that immigration control was a national responsibility and that local authorities had no direct powers over border policy or asylum arrangements;
- the amendment did not negate the motion, instead it changed the explanatory text that was primarily being amended;
- debating the motion risked creating a misleading impression that the Council could influence national migration policy;
- the Council's role was to focus on delivering outcomes within its remit, rather than debating politically motivated motions;
- referenced significant local priorities already within the Council's control, including budget setting and the allocation of government funding for high streets, assets and open spaces;
- supported the amendment on the basis that it clarified the motion and provided a more accurate, evidence-led account of the impacts of migration;
- concerned that the original motion conflated different forms of migration, including legal migration, internal migration and irregular routes, and that the amendment addressed this confusion;
- referenced data indicating that housing demand and service pressures were not disproportionately attributable to any single group;
- acknowledged the contribution of migrant workers to local services, including healthcare and the wider economy;
- concerned that language used in the debate could contribute to fear or division if not handled carefully; and
- the view that residents' genuine concerns should be addressed through balanced, factual and responsible discussion.

It was then requested that the amendment be moved to a vote, before doing so the Mayor invited Councillor Mishchuk as the seconder to the motion and Councillor Gibson as seconder of the amendment to speak.

Councillor Mishchuk responded to the amendment by stating that young people, including himself were struggling to access housing and employment. He commented that some residents felt new businesses were not locally run and believed that local people were not always being employed.

He said that many residents were concerned about migration and felt unable to openly debate the issue without it becoming controversial. Councillor Mishchuk added that, in his view, these concerns were widely shared across the borough and the country.

He continued by arguing that the amendment did not reflect or respond to the concerns raised by residents. They expressed views about population change, national identity, and prioritising local people for opportunities. They also referred to concerns raised with them by residents regarding the perceived impact of demographic changes.

The Mayor invited Councillor Charles Gibson to speak.

Councillor Gibson stated that he had listened carefully to the debate and, while agreeing with colleagues that the motion in its current form was unacceptable, he felt it was important to engage with it in good faith. He explained that the purpose of the amendment was to refocus the motion on addressing the declared housing emergency, to which the Council remains committed. Councillor Gibson emphasised the importance of basing decisions on factual evidence rather than assumptions or bias. He noted that approximately 8% of Swale residents were not born in the UK, and that fewer than 4% of those on the housing register fell into this category. He argued that these residents did not represent the cause of the housing crisis and that attributing blame to them was both inaccurate and harmful.

Councillor Gibson concluded that the amendment sought to return the motion to a balanced, housing-focused position.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was not carried.

The Mayor then invited debate on the substantive motion. Member comments included:

- acknowledged that housing pressures, rising temporary accommodation costs and increasing strain on council services were real and ongoing issues locally and nationally;
- concerns about migration were shared by many residents, but that debate should be based on facts, evidence and accurate distinctions rather than generalisation or assumption;
- the motion attributed housing and service pressures to legal and illegal migration without sufficient Swale-specific evidence;
- referenced briefing information provided to Members which indicated that non-UK nationals on the housing register, in homelessness applications and in temporary accommodation were broadly proportionate to the borough's population profile;
- dominant causes of housing pressure were a shortage of genuinely affordable housing, rising private sector rents, historic loss of social housing, welfare constraints and long-term underfunding;
- council housing allocation policies, including historic residency requirements, had contributed to local pressures and should be reviewed as part of addressing housing need;
- the motion conflated legal migration, asylum seekers, refugees and illegal migration without recognising important legal and policy distinctions;
- asylum seekers were generally not eligible for mainstream housing or benefits and that local authority discretion over asylum dispersal was limited;
- referenced previous council decisions on Houses in Multiple Occupation, which were based on housing quality, landlord behaviour, planning control and environmental health considerations rather than migration;
- examples from other parts of the country demonstrated that sudden or poorly funded migration pressures could affect housing and services, but that no evidence had been presented to show Swale was experiencing such impacts to a materially different extent;
- the wording of the motion risked undermining community cohesion and could negatively affect council staff and residents with migrant backgrounds;
- spoke of the contribution made by migrant residents and staff to council services, the local economy and the wider community;

- referenced the Holocaust Memorial Day and the importance of challenging intolerance and ensuring public debate was responsible and evidence-based;
- writing to central government should be based on clear, evidenced local impacts and that doing so without such evidence risked undermining public confidence;
- suggested that the issues raised would be more appropriately considered by the relevant committee, supported by detailed officer reports and robust data; and
- the motion, as drafted, did not propose practical measures to increase housing supply, regulate the private rented sector or secure additional funding, and therefore could not be supported.

The Mayor then invited Councillor Mishchuk to speak.

Councillor Mishchuk stated that the motion was concerned not only with current conditions in the borough but with the potential long-term impact of migration in future years. He expressed the view that central government had a responsibility to prioritise the needs of the existing population and ensure that the country's borders were secure.

Councillor Mishchuk commented that, while statistics and data were often referenced, many residents were influenced by what they observed and experienced locally. He emphasised that the motion was not intended to be personal or to propose deportations, but to seek recognition that future migration could place additional pressures on the borough over time.

He concluded by urging Members to consider how decisions taken now would be viewed in the future.

Councillor Palmer, with support from four other Members then requested a recorded vote.

Councillor Bowen requested a point of clarification regarding harassment and vilification following a recent motion on a similar matter and concern a recorded vote could potentially put members at further risk.

The Monitoring Officer advised that the Constitution provided that, where five Members requested it, a recorded vote must be taken and that this provision was explicit. He further explained that individual Members were also entitled to have their vote recorded after a vote had been taken, and that this rule could not be suspended.

It was noted that, while some constitutional rules were capable of being suspended by a vote of the Council, others were not, and that Members who were dissatisfied with the wording of the Constitution should consider proposing a formal change to it.

The Monitoring Officer explained that a proposal could be made for the Council to vote on whether the requirement for a recorded vote should be suspended, and that such a proposal could be seconded and put to the Council, with the Mayor then taking the view of the Council before making a final decision.

Councillor Bowen moved to suspend standing orders for the remainder of this motion. Councillor Harrison seconded this motion and on being put to the vote, Members agreed.

The Mayor then advised that a recorded vote would not be held. .

In summing up, Councillor Richard Palmer stated that the motion did not suggest that all housing and service pressures were caused solely by legal or illegal migration, but that migration was identified as one contributing factor. He acknowledged that migration could make positive contributions, but argued that concerns related to overall numbers, scale, and the consequences of insufficient control.

Councillor Palmer expressed the view that current and previous governments had failed to manage migration effectively and that public confidence was being lost as a result. He commented that, while there were genuine cases of people in need of protection, he believed a significant number of migrants were economic migrants and that this raised concerns about long-term impacts.

He also raised concerns about the tone of the debate, stating that, in his opinion, constitutional processes had not been properly followed.

A Member raised a point of order relating to pausing the live streaming to protect the identity of those voting, which was challenged by Councillor Richard Palmer and declined by the Mayor.

Members of the Reform UK group requested their votes be recorded.

Votes for: Councillors Richard Palmer, Kieran Mischuk, Chris Palmer, Peter MacDonald, Lloyd Chapman.

On being put to the vote, the Mayor announced the motion had fallen.

665 **Climate and Ecological Emergency - Annual Report**

In introducing the report, Councillor Wooster, Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee, drew attention to the significant work ongoing around the borough and she offered her thanks to the members of the committee and officers for their hard work.

The report was seconded by the Vice-Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee, Councillor Jayes.

Members made comments including:

- welcomed the report and recognised the benefits delivered through climate action measures, including LED lighting, solar panels, and energy efficiency improvements which reduced costs and improved quality of life;
- disappointed that some Members were not present for the debate, particularly given the constitutional and environmental significance of the report;
- effective climate action also delivered social benefits, including warmer homes, reduced fuel poverty, improved air quality, better health outcomes, and stronger community wellbeing;
- acknowledged that climate change disproportionately affected those already under pressure, including people on low incomes, older residents, young families, and those with existing health conditions;
- investing in climate and energy efficiency measures reduced long-term financial, social and health costs, including pressures on the NHS, emergency services and housing repairs;

- supported measures promoting active travel, public transport, and protection of green spaces, with associated benefits for physical health, mental wellbeing and community pride;
- recognised that the report did not underestimate the financial pressures facing councils but highlighted that delaying action would increase future costs;
- referenced the importance of leading by example within the Council, particularly in relation to recycling practices and waste management within council buildings;
- concern about the absence of clear cost information within the report, with Members stating that understanding expenditure and value for money was important for budget planning;
- suggested that future reports should include clearer financial data to support scrutiny and decision-making;
- referenced the role of planning policy, including the Regulation 18 consultation, in reducing environmental impact through development management;
- supported the report while raising specific queries about technical claims, including building standards, energy installations and emissions reduction data;
- concerns raised about fuel poverty affecting working households who did not qualify for existing support schemes, and the need to explore how such residents could be better assisted;
- referenced differences in how fuel poverty was defined nationally, and the implications this had for eligibility and support;
- acknowledged that forthcoming national schemes which may assist households who were “just about managing” to transition to more energy-efficient heating systems;
- recycling contamination increased costs to the Council and required further education and engagement with residents;
- supported further work through area committees and officer-led workshops to address recycling and waste issues;
- concerns raised about the lack of food waste recycling provision for blocks of flats, with calls for early rollout and appropriate resident education;
- recognised that climate action initiatives were delivering savings to the Council, including reduced electricity costs and long-term financial benefits;
- expressed thanks to officers and committees for their work on the report and the progress made since the Council declared a climate and ecological emergency; and
- emphasised the value of cross-party working through steering groups and encouraging full participation by all political groups.

Resolved:

(1) The Climate and Ecological Emergency Annual Progress Report be noted.

666 Constitution Amendment

In proposing the recommendation, Councillor Bowen, Chair of the Constitution Working Group, explained that Members were being asked to consider the amendments set out in Appendix One and determine which should be approved for incorporation into the Constitution.

He advised that a number of the proposed changes were largely procedural in nature and described them as sensible and straightforward improvements and he referred to

amendments relating to the Member Protocol on pre-decision engagement, changes to the budget amendment deadline, and revisions concerning area committees.

In relation to the budget amendment deadline, Councillor Bowen explained that the change would provide officers with additional time to properly review amendments ahead of the budget meeting, reducing last-minute pressure and avoiding the need for weekend working.

Councillor Bowen also highlighted the proposal to introduce the use of an electronic Council seal. He stated that this reflected the Council modernising its processes while retaining the traditional seal for appropriate documents, and that the electronic seal would make the handling of documents more efficient.

Councillor Wise, seconded the recommendation and reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor then invited comments from members.

Councillor Baldock expressed significant reservations about the proposed Member protocol for pre-application and pre-decision developer engagement, stating that it did not provide opportunities for parish councils, town councils or residents' groups to engage with Members. He raised concern that the protocol could be perceived as allowing one-sided engagement with developers and warned that this could attract external criticism. He stated that, in his view, the proposal required further consideration and refinement.

Councillor Baldock also raised objections to the proposed change to the naming of Area Committees, arguing that the term "Councillors and Residents Forum" was misleading and inconsistent with the Council's Constitution. Councillor Baldock stated that forums and committees were distinct entities and that Area Committees were intended to consider future policy impacts on local areas, rather than act as engagement forums. Councillor Baldock referred to consultation feedback indicating public support for the existing "Area Committee" title and questioned the rationale for changing it. He expressed concern that the proposed change would create confusion for the public and asked that the renaming proposal be removed.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Baldock and seconded by Councillor Jayes.

Motion: That Appendix 1, Item C, point one be removed.

The Mayor then invited members to debate the amendment..

A Member commented that this committee was not the correct forum for such a change and there had been numerous opportunities for input and changes during the working groups.

Councillor Baldock stated that he did not consider there to be sufficient justification for the proposed change as set out in the report. He referred to the consultation results, noting that a majority of respondents supported retaining the existing name, and questioned why this feedback was not being reflected in the proposal. He expressed concern that changing the terminology would require substantial amendments to the Constitution to define what a "forum" was, including whether such a body would have decision-making powers.

Councillor Baldock warned that this could unintentionally weaken the role of Area Committees and described the proposal as unwise. He concluded that the current arrangements should remain unchanged.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

In summing up, Councillor Bowen stated that the proposals had already been considered through the Council's agreed governance processes, including the Constitutional Working Group, the Policy and Resources Committee, and now Full Council. He noted that Members, including those raising concerns, had opportunities at each stage to propose amendments or changes.

Councillor Bowen emphasised the importance of respecting the agreed decision-making process and using Council time efficiently, cautioning against repeatedly revisiting the same issues once they had progressed through the appropriate stages. While acknowledging Members' democratic rights, he urged the Council to proceed in accordance with its established processes and make better use of its time.

On moving to the vote, Councillor Baldock requested that his vote against Appendix 1, Item A be recorded.

Resolved:

- (1) That the updates to the Protocol for Pre-application and Pre-decision Developer Engagement as set out in the report be agreed and the constitution be updated.***
- (2) That the changes to procedure rule 3.1.16.4 to bring forward the deadline to 4.30pm on the Thursday preceding the Council meeting, as set out in the report be agreed and the constitution be updated.***
- (3) That the name of the Committee and other changes as set out in the report be agreed and the constitution be updated***
- (4) That the use of the electronic Council seal, as set out in the report, be agreed and the constitution updated.***

667 Area Committee Review

The Deputy Leader, Councillor Ashley Wise, introduced the report and proposed the recommendations.

Councillor Wise spoke in support of the proposed name change and wider recommendations relating to Area Committees. He explained that the proposals formed part of a package of 14 recommendations which had been considered by Area Committee Chairs over a number of meetings, and took into account feedback from both the public and Members.

He stated that the feedback indicated some uncertainty about whether the current name clearly reflected the role and purpose of Area Committees, and that respondents to the consultation were largely those who already engaged with the committees. Councillor Wise explained that the recommendations therefore sought to look beyond existing

attendees and consider how engagement, attendance and participation could be improved more broadly.

Councillor Wise outlined that the proposals aimed to strengthen public involvement in policy development at a local level, including practical measures such as improving access through hybrid meetings to enable fuller participation by those attending online. He confirmed with Member their awareness of the decision made by the Western Area Committee, and formally put forward the relevant recommendations for consideration by the Council.

In seconding the recommendations, Councillor Ben Martin reserved his right to speak.

The Mayor invited comments from members.

Members were invited to make comments and these included:

- questioned whether Area Committees were fulfilling their intended purpose, with the view expressed that a more fundamental review was required to determine whether they remained effective or necessary;
- concerned that procedural or naming changes would not address underlying issues if Area Committees were not operating as intended;
- acknowledged that the proposals had been subject to review through working groups and committees, with differing views on whether further reconsideration was appropriate;
- Area Committees operated differently across the borough and a “one size fits all” approach risked undermining their effectiveness;
- opposed to reducing the number of meetings, particularly where committees were intended to consider future policy impacts at a local level;
- Area Committees should be better used to feed local and parish views into policy development, rather than limiting their role;
- restrictions on meeting venues could reduce local engagement, with the view that committees should retain flexibility to meet in locations appropriate to their area;
- the scheduling and format of public participation could be improved, including consideration of holding public forum sessions separately from formal committee business;
- supported the work of the review group while opposing specific recommendations, with some Members indicating a preference to vote against individual proposals rather than seek amendments;
- practical challenges existed around venue availability and logistics when meetings were held in different locations;
- concerned about accessibility of venues, including issues relating to hearing, mobility, sight impairment and acoustics;
- supported online or hybrid meetings as a way of improving accessibility and increasing public engagement;
- online meetings during the pandemic had attracted higher attendance than in-person meetings;
- highlighted the importance of ensuring sound quality for both in-person and remote attendees;
- concerned around the safety of Members and officers when meetings were held in remote or unfamiliar locations; and
- clarification that some council-owned venues were not available for evening meetings, limiting their suitability for Area Committees.

Councillor Baldock proposed, and Councillor Jayes seconded the following amendment:

A clause be included that area committees be able to set the dates, locations and frequency of meetings to suit their local areas.

Members were invited to debate the amendment. Comments made included:

- questioned whether Area Committees had the authority to make decisions, with the view expressed that any extension of decision-making powers would require a formal change to the Constitution;
- sought clarification that the proposal related to allowing Area Committees greater flexibility in setting meeting frequency, rather than conferring decision-making powers;
- concerned that allowing meetings to be arranged on an ad-hoc basis would create significant practical difficulties for officers, including venue booking, accessibility, availability of facilities, and reliable Wi-Fi;
- venues were often booked well in advance for regular events, limiting the feasibility of one-off bookings, and that past experience had highlighted issues with accessibility, equipment and facilities;
- a Member survey on Area Committees had received a low response rate, and the recommendations had been developed by a working group which had met on multiple occasions;
- it was unreasonable to seek to overturn the outcome of that work at a late stage when opportunities to contribute had previously been available;
- confirmation provided that, under the Constitution, extraordinary meetings could be called by the Mayor or relevant Chair, or by a proportion of Members;
- the discussion highlighted continuing uncertainty about the status of Area Committees or forums and the implications of any change in terminology;
- the proposals had been through the appropriate working group process and that repeated reconsideration risked inefficiency;
- attendance and engagement at Area Committee meetings had been higher when meetings were held online; and
- greater use of online meetings could improve accessibility, engagement and value for money, though noting that this would require a separate constitutional change.

In summing up, Councillor Baldock clarified that the amendment was not intended to allow ad-hoc or unstructured changes to Area Committee arrangements, but to provide committees with greater flexibility within the Council's established processes. He explained that committees would continue to work within an agreed schedule, with any changes to the number of meetings subject to a formal vote and programmed in advance, rather than being decided on a meeting-by-meeting basis.

Councillor Baldock stated that the intention was to allow each Area Committee to determine, through a vote, what meeting frequency and format worked best for its individual area, including the option to reduce the number of meetings or to hold meetings online where appropriate. He emphasised that this flexibility would be exercised collectively by the committee and not as a "free-for-all".

Councillor Baldock concluded that the purpose of the amendment was to empower Area Committees to adopt arrangements suited to their local circumstances, rather than applying a single approach across all areas

The Monitoring Officer advised that Area Committees had a much more limited role than service committees and did not currently have decision-making or budgetary powers. He explained that decisions with budgetary implications fell outside the existing scope of Area Committees.

The Monitoring Officer then stated that, as the committees were presently constituted, the proposed amendment could not practically be made at this stage. He advised that any change of this nature would require a more fundamental review of the role and powers of Area Committees and would go beyond the scope of the work undertaken by the working group, which had focused on clarifying existing arrangements rather than expanding committee functions. He concluded that the proposal was therefore not considered practicable to implement at the present time.

On being put to the vote the amendment was not carried.

The seconder of the motion, Councillor Ben Martin, stated that, while the consultation response rate had been limited, the review process had involved several weeks of work, extensive public engagement and consideration through multiple stages. He emphasised that the proposals had been through the appropriate processes and argued that it was now time for the Council to proceed with the full set of 14 recommendations.

Councillor Martin also noted that, under the current constitutional arrangements, Area Committees operating solely online would not have decision-making powers. He concluded by urging the Council to support and approve the recommendations as presented.

In summing up, Councillor Wise, the proposer, explained that the recommendations brought forward by the working group had been agreed by consensus rather than by a majority vote. He stated that this included the participation and agreement of the Chair of the Western Area Committee, and that no decisions had been made without the involvement of those affected.

He advised that the issues raised during the debate had already been discussed in detail by the working group and subsequently presented to other committees before coming to Full Council. Councillor Wise commented that, while Members were entitled to hold differing views, repeatedly revisiting matters that had already been examined through agreed processes risked undermining the purpose of working groups.

He reiterated that the recommendations were informed by practical experience, particularly concerns previously raised about venue availability, accessibility, Wi-Fi reliability and ensuring that appropriate equipment was in place for meetings. Councillor Wise concluded that these issues had directly shaped the proposals now before the Council.

Resolved:

(1) That, following consideration of the vote at Western Area Committee on 27 November 2025 requesting that for recommendation 4, Western Area Committee meetings should take place in community venues in the Western Area and not in Swale House.

(2) That the 14 recommendations (as amended by recommendation 1) proposed by the Area Committees Review Member Working Group and recommended by Policy & Resources Committee be agreed

668 Reduction in Number of Service Committees

In proposing the recommendations in the report, the Leader explained that it was proposed not to implement the decision taken on 2 April 2025 to further reduce the number of committees in the 2026/27 municipal year. He advised that the second recommendation was to retain the existing committee structure, comprising the Policy and Resources Committee, the Environment, Services and Climate Change Committee, the Housing, Health and Communities Committee, and the Property and Economy Committee.

This was seconded by Councillor Bowen who reserved his right to speak.

Resolved:

(1) That Council does not implement the part of the decision taken on 2 April 2025 to reduce the committees by a further reduction of one in the municipal year 26/27.

(2) To keep the committee structure as the following Committees

- Policy and Resources***
- Environmental Services and Climate Change***
- Housing, Health and Communities***
- Property and Economy***

669 Appointment of Local Independent Member for the Independent Members' Remuneration Panel

The Leader introduced and proposed the recommendation to appoint Keith Hills, Linda Howard and Dave Crompton as independent members to the Members Remuneration Panel.

This was seconded by Councillor Bowen.

Resolved:

(1) That the appointment of Keith Hills, Linda Howard and Dave Crompton to the Members Remuneration Panel be agreed.

670 Exclusion of Press and Public

As there was no discussion on the exempt appendix, it was not necessary to pass the resolution to exclude press and public.

671 Exempt Appendix - Appointment to the Independent Remuneration Panel

There was no discussion on the exempt appendix

672 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned between 8.20pm and 8:40pm and 9:25 and 9:40pm.

673 Standing Orders

The Mayor extended Standing Orders from 10 pm to 10.30 pm and 10.30pm to 11pm in order that Council could complete its business.

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