

Ashford Borough Council

Minutes of a Meeting of the Ashford Borough Council held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the **24th April 2014**.

Present:

His Worshipful the Mayor, Cllr. D O Smith (Chairman);

Cllrs. Adby, Adley, Apps, Bartlett, Bell, Bennett, Mrs Blanford, Britcher, Buchanan, Burgess, Chilton, Clark, Clarkson, Clokie, Davey, Davidson, Davison, Mrs Dyer, Feacey, Galpin, Heyes, Hicks, Howard, Mrs Hutchinson, Link, Marriott, Miss Martin, Mrs Martin, Michael, Mortimer, Ovenden, Robey, Shorter, Sims, Taylor, Wedgbury.

Also Present:

Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Head of Planning and Development, Member Services and Scrutiny Support Officer.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting Deputy Chaplain Anne King said prayers.

Apologies:

Cllrs. Mrs Bell, Mrs Heyes, Hodgkinson, Yeo.

408 Exempt or Confidential Information

The Mayor asked whether any items should be dealt with in private because of the likely disclosure of exempt or confidential information. There were none.

409 Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Interest	Minute No.
Bartlett	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as he lived in Sevington.	413 (b)
Davey	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as the Ward Member for Highfield.	413 (b)
Davidson	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as the Ward Member for Willesborough North.	413 (b)
Hicks	Had declared an Other Significant Interest at the Cabinet Meeting as a Council appointed representative on the Ashford Leisure Trust.	413 (a)

Councillor	Interest	Minute No.
Howard	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as some members of his family lived in Kingsford Street, Mersham.	413 (b)
Mortimer	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as the Ward Member for Willesborough North and he lived near to the proposed location for J10A.	413 (b)
Wedgbury	Made a 'Voluntary Announcement' as a Member of Kent County Council Planning Committee.	413 (b)

410 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on the 20th February 2014 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

411 Announcements

(a) His Worshipful the Mayor

His Worshipful the Mayor advised that he had sent all Councillors some tickets for his End of Term 'Spring Draw'. He hoped that Councillors would support the Draw and advised that more tickets were available should they be required.

His Worshipful the Mayor also advised that the REME Freedom March would be taking place on 10th May, which was the last Saturday of his Term of Office. REME would march through the Town with their bayonets fixed. Following on from this there would be a week of art and music at the Parish Church and a shop in the Town. Many schools were involved along with local art groups. This would run over into Councillor Link's Term of Mayor.

(b) The Leader

The Leader advised that he wished to make a statement regarding Chilmington Green and Garden Cities. Members were aware of the recent television and radio coverage about this matter. He wanted to clarify the position, last week the Government issued a prospectus seeking interest in new Garden Cities and suggested that each should be a minimum size of 15,000 new homes. This was a very different proposition to the scale of development planned for Chilmington Green. The Government prospectus would have no impact on the scale of the development proposed at Chilmington Green which remained at 5,750 homes. The proposed development area of Chilmington Green was in the original Core Strategy, adopted in 2008, in which plans for up to 7,000 new homes were being

suggested. Following the introduction of the new space standards, along with the Councils desire to achieve lower densities and a spacious masterplan, the proposed accepted development for this area was reduced to 5,750 homes. A planning application had been received for a development of this scale and a decision on this was likely later in the year. Whilst Chilmington Green would not be a Garden City in terms of its size, it would reflect some of the design principles of the successful garden cities, like tree-lined streets, spacious layout with high quality public spaces and a strong local community managing their own local facilities. It would also include major areas of open space, schools, community facilities and places to work so that it was a well-balanced community, not a housing estate.

The Leader then drew Members' attention to some recent positive developments in the Borough. At the beginning of April, it had been the 40th anniversary of the Borough, which was formed on 1 April 1974 by the merger of the borough of Tenterden with Ashford Urban District, and East Ashford, West Ashford and Tenterden Rural Districts. In size, it became the largest council area in Kent. Some four decades later Ashford Borough Council was still going strong, providing high quality services to the residents of the Borough and services which were getting national recognition.

Last month the Council's recycling service, as part of the Mid Kent Partnership, received the Gold Award for Transformation in Waste and Environment, awarded by the Improvement and Efficiency Social Enterprise. It recognised the work carried out to ensure the new services worked seamlessly across Mid Kent and provided value for money to local taxpayers. This was particularly pleasing for Ashford, as residents had really embraced the new service and all were now reaping the rewards.

The Leader felt that one of Ashford's strongest selling points was its international connection and status. Hadlow College, were expected to announce the new name of their college, which he hoped would soon become a reality, the Ashford International College Campus. Hadlow was one of the top colleges in the UK, graded as 'Outstanding' by Ofsted and the Council was looking forward to working closely with them to help deliver a college that excelled in meeting the needs of students; needs that fed into the start of a vibrant working and life experience. It was hoped that the Council would be on the Board of the College to influence the curriculum in that way. Following on the international theme, over the last few years Jasmin Vardimon Company, whilst being based in Ashford, had toured their work to many international destinations including America, Italy, Korea and France. Dancers came to the Stour Centre from all over the world to audition and work with the company, and they had even managed to franchise out some of their work created in Ashford to Belgrade in Serbia. The Council was proud of Jasmin's growing international status, and were pleased that they actively told the world, through their brochures and media interviews, of their home in Ashford.

The annual Create Music Festival continued to attract big name national and local talent to the town every year, and was probably the biggest festival in Kent. This year he was delighted to have a brand new supporter for this excellent family event. Canterbury College would be supporting the event on Sunday 27th July in Victoria Park. It was a pleasure to be working with this educational college, one of the best regarded in the South East. He then congratulated the Arts and Cultural Industries

Manager for all of the work that he undertook for the Create Festival and on the birth of his daughter earlier that week.

In the summer of 2012 Ashford was named one of 27 national Portas Pilot towns, and was allocated £100,000 of funding to help revitalise its town centre. The Council matched this funding but did not rush to spend these funds, instead had carefully planned for the longer term future. So far the Council had seen the opening of PopUp Ashford in one of the empty shops in Park Mall encouraging small businesses to test out their new ventures and products and a PopUp Art Gallery in the town centre (funded by a grant from the Arts Council). A new monthly farmer's market would be launched in the summer to help attract more people into the high street. Defunct telephone boxes had been removed and the out of date town centre fingerpost signage will be replaced later this year. The Town Centre Action Team was helping to create a new cleaner and invigorated environment for residents to enjoy. In addition a new 'Love Ashford' website and mobile app for town centre shoppers would be launched. This would inform shoppers of what was going on and what bargains were available, with shoppers able to order online and then collect in store. It would also allow smaller and independent shops to offer a similar convenient service as the bigger stores. This was a first in the country and had recently received a ringing endorsement from High Streets Minister Brandon Lewis, who said this was 'an excellent example of how digital technology can be used to promote the high street and he would encourage all businesses in Ashford to sign up and be part of this excellent opportunity to boost their trade in the town centre'. High praise indeed and something the Leader fully endorsed. He hoped that colleagues were proud of the excellent work that was taking place to make the town centre a more attractive and a place recognised as the heartbeat of this Borough.

In conclusion, the Leader advised that Ashford had another 40 to celebrate as the Office of National Statistics recently reported that people in Ashford could expect to live around 20 years longer at the age of 65 – one of the longest life expectancies in Kent and the 40th longest in England and Wales (out of 348 districts). Proving Ashford really was best placed to live.

(c) Deputy Leader

The Deputy Leader advised that with an ageing population and an increasing prevalence of dementia expected over the forthcoming years the Council had recently submitted its action plan to become a more dementia friendly organisation to the Dementia Action Alliance. This was duly accepted and now, aligned with the Kent Dementia Action Alliance, one of the Council's first actions was to increase awareness of dementia and understanding of how to help those suffering from this most debilitating of illnesses. One way to achieve this was for a small number of Members and Staff to become dementia friendly champions, who could then work together to roll out information and training to others across the organisation, ensuring the Council developed a dementia friendly culture and became a more dementia friendly organisation. Dementia Friends Champions could lead the Dementia Friends initiative, helping others to better understand what it was like to live with dementia and the things that could make a difference to those with dementia living within their communities. Sometimes this might only make a small difference, but it could be no less significant and the outcomes could be both

worthwhile and rewarding. If any Members were interested then they could get further information from the Council's Housing Strategy Manager.

(d) Councillor Hicks, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Customer Services

Councillor Hicks wanted to highlight the signing of the Armed Forces Community Covenant. On the 10th May, after the Mayor had taken the salute from REME who would be exercising their right under the Freedom of the Borough, the signing of the covenant would take place. The signing would be held in the Mayors Parlour and the Mayor, the Chief Executive and the Leader would sign on behalf of the Council and three representatives of the Armed Forces would also sign. The covenant was a voluntary pledge of mutual support between a civilian community and its local Armed Forces community. It was intended to complement, at a local level, the national Armed Forces Covenant which outlined the national obligations between the Nation, the Government and the Armed Forces. It was intended to be a living document which she, as Portfolio Holder, would review every six months. Ashford Borough Council was committed to working with partners to make sure that no serving or retired armed forces service man or woman were disadvantaged as a result of serving their country. After the signing of the covenant a website would be launched to enable individuals to make their own pledges and she fully expected there to be a large take up from the many veterans living and working in the Ashford Borough area.

412 Questions from Members of the Public

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Relf advised that he wanted to ask three questions. He asked how the Council was ensuring that the Jasmin Vardimon project provided best value for money to the Council Tax payer, given the Council's contributions, including up to £3 million projected capital funding. He further questioned how the Council was ensuring that the redevelopment of the facilities met local needs. Finally, he asked if the Council could explain how the Jasmin Vardimon project was 'critical to the future economic growth and prosperity of the Borough' as stated on its website.

Councillor Mrs Blanford, Portfolio Holder for the Environment and Culture, thanked Mr Relf for his questions. The Council was very proud that this International Dance Company had volunteered to make its headquarters at Ashford. She felt that the word "critical" with reference to the Jasmin Vardimon project should not be used. The project was significant but not critical to the Borough's overall growth and prosperity any more than any one of the other projects that the Council was working on to develop the economy and well-being of the Borough. It is very important, however, to the development of our cultural activities. In respect of the effect of Jasmin Vardimon on the Borough the members of the Company were working with a number of schools in Kent, several in Ashford and developing dancing ambitions with a wide range of young people. They were boosting the local economy by bringing people to work at Ashford and providing job opportunities. In addition, of course, there were the performances which were created at Ashford and showcased on the international stage. When the funding came through from the Arts Council and others, it would give the Council a chance to refurbish and modernise the older parts of the Stour Centre so that a dance academy, training many young people, could be

developed. A Members' Working Group to mastermind the regeneration of the Stour Centre and to control the costs and funding had been set up. Councillor Mrs Blanford said whilst it was not critical to the economy, it was very welcome and the Council was delighted to have the Jasmin Vardimon Dance Company based at Ashford.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Goodman advised that he wished to ask a question relating to the proposed Sevington warehouse development. He had been a resident of Willesborough for over 40 years and had seen Hythe Road change from a peaceful street to an urban freeway. Many people were concerned about the massive increase in traffic that the Sevington warehouse development would generate and that it would impact dramatically on Junction 10 in spite of the planned mini Junction 10A and that the resulting gridlock would spread back down Hythe Road into Willesborough as it often did. He was recently stupefied to hear an official from the Highways Agency declare that Junction 10 was operating well below capacity. No-one who had had to use the appallingly designed junction and had wasted hours in stationary traffic watching emergency ambulances struggling to reach the Hospital could believe that. With regard to the planned road alterations to facilitate the Sevington development, he understood that London bound heavy goods traffic emerging from it would join the A2070 at a signal controlled junction approximately 300 metres from Junction 10. Already traffic queued at peak hours along the A2070 northbound up to and beyond the junction with Barrey Road. The extra traffic from the development would have great difficulty joining the northbound carriageway of the A2070, and this would make the consequent gridlock at Junction 10 even worse than it already was. He questioned how Ashford could support a scheme that would generate worse gridlock on Junction 10 at peak hours as a matter of routine.

Councillor Robey, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Development, advised that there were two questions being asked in relation to Junction 10 under the Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting on the 10th April 2014 and he would respond then.

413 Cabinet – 13th March 2014 and 10th April 2014

(a) 13th March 2014

Resolved:

That (i) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Cabinet held on 13th March 2014 be received and noted with the exception of Minute No. 361.

(ii) Minute No. 361 be approved and adopted.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5 Councillor Davison requested that it be recorded that he voted against the minutes.

(b) 10th April 2014

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Ross advised that he wished to ask three questions. He lived in Mersham and advised that the village would be significantly

affected by the impacts arising from Junction 10A. The current design of the proposed interim Junction 10A provided for slip roads only in the direction of to and from Folkestone. This would not seem to offer any alleviation of the current congestion on the north going A2070 and the existing Junction 10 let alone meet the increased traffic volumes that would result from current and planned developments to the south east of Ashford. It seemed reasonable to assume that a substantial proportion of the increased traffic that would be generated by the aforementioned developments would be directed towards London or the railway station and that any increase in traffic in the direction of Folkestone would be minimal. He questioned whether Ashford Borough Council was willing to share with Council Tax payers the outcomes of any traffic modelling studies undertaken to date, that they had effectively funded, and to consider re-visiting this modelling to re-validate the current design and if necessary modify same. If the contention in Question 1 proved to be correct and the design of interim Junction 10A was not modified did the Ashford Borough Council have any contingency plan to address the likely congestion that would arise? The current plans for an interim Junction 10A indicated Highfield Lane would no longer connect to the A20, but would be aligned with the single track, narrow Kingsford Street, directing traffic to the centre of Mersham. Under the AXA/DMI proposed plans for U19, Highfield Lane would be upgraded to a two-lane highway. There was a petition of over 230 residents who are totally opposed to the proposal, primarily on the grounds of the safety of residents in Kingsford Street and Mersham. Should a decision be taken to proceed with Junction 10A he asked if the Council would acknowledge these concerns by closing off access between Kingsford Street and Highfield Lane effectively making Kingsford Street a cul de sac.

Councillor Wedgbury apologised for interrupting, he felt it was important for all present to understand that it would be Kent County Council that would make the final decision on this issue not Ashford Borough Council. Therefore the questions being put forward should be put to Kent County Council rather than this Authority.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Murphy from Mersham and Sevington Parish Council advised that he wished to ask a question. He was representing the residents of Sevington and Mersham to raise their concerns about Minute 397 considered under item 8 of the agenda. When the Parish representatives attended a meeting on 20 January at the Council Offices, they heard disturbing conclusions being drawn that did not reflect the facts presented. The message on 20th January was that the interim scheme would fail. If it were assumed that a reduction of 15% in traffic volumes from "green" measures was achieved, would such failure be avoided. The 15% reduction was stated as the maximum that could be credibly hoped for. He questioned why the Council was supporting a scheme that would trigger significant additional building in the Ashford Borough with associated incremental traffic and congestion when the analysis to date predicted failure.

Councillor Robey, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Development advised that the three questions each raised issues regarding the design and likely operational effectiveness of the proposed interim Junction 10A. To avoid repetition the following position statement was designed to address all the points raised. The proposed interim Junction 10A had been subject to traffic modelling by the specialist consultants advising the Highways Agency, which was the Agency of Government responsible for improvements to the national motorway network. This work had

concluded to the Highways Agency's satisfaction that the interim scheme will help divert sufficient traffic movements away from the existing Junction 10 and that the overall impact will be to create sufficient capacity for the new arrangement to last well into the 2020s. The assessment of when the scheme would come under pressure was based on the year 2030 not on the date of opening. This assessment took account of the extra traffic further planned development in the area would generate in that time. On this basis the scheme was put forward for funding from the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) by Kent County Council and the LEP had provisionally identified substantial funding towards this project. It remained the position that the Council wished to see the full, all movements Junction 10A scheme opened as soon as it was needed. But in the absence of any specifically identified government funding to deliver that scheme, the interim Junction 10A proposed was an important step forward if the growing congestion problems at the existing junction were to be addressed which would otherwise only get worse. The interim scheme has been designed to be easily converted into the full scheme when funds allowed. Against this background the Borough Council's Cabinet considered the interim scheme at its last meeting and decided to support the project in principle at this stage. Kent County Council was now responsible for taking forward the project by testing it in detail and working up detailed designs, including the way local roads such as Kingsford Street and Highfield Lane were dealt with. This work would take several months and would provide the detailed information required for all parties to fully assess the proposals. Full information would need to be submitted by the County Council when a planning application was made for the new Junction 10A and related road improvements and this would, as normal, be available to the public to enable them to comment. When a planning application was made the Borough Council, as a key consultee, would need to consider the detailed evidence and full assessment of the project before concluding whether or not the scheme delivered the anticipated benefits, would work effectively and should be supported.

Councillor Bartlett drew attention to the minutes of the report on Junction 10A. He felt that whilst the minutes referred to a number of pros and cons there was also reference to one Portfolio Holders view that the report dwelt too heavily on the pros. He agreed with this statement. He wanted to set out some additional cons that were not set out in the report that went before Cabinet. Therefore he felt that the Cabinet may have misled themselves by supporting a scheme that was bad for Ashford. He referred to a meeting at International House on 23rd March 2011 at which he said the Council was told that the link road from the A2070 to the Junction 10A at Highfield Bridge may not be attractive to road users and would not remove trips using Junction 10. Because of that users, could expect the same level of traffic to use Junction 10 once Junction 10A was built. At a meeting at the Civic Centre on 30th May 2012 he said the Council was told that modelling accuracy would be lower for this privately funded scheme than one that involved public money. As this scheme would be privately funded the traffic modelling would be less reliable and less accurate, that was what the Highways Agency had advised. At the Highways Agency meeting on the 20th January 2014, the Highways Agency would not and indeed could not change the way in which traffic joined the M20 at Junction 10 other than altering the timing of the traffic lights on Hythe Road which fed the M20 entry. With the additional building in Willesborough, Sevington and Mersham that was intended, by the Cabinet, to follow the construction of Junction 10A, it meant that traffic leaving Willesborough seeking to join the M20 either to reach Tesco or the William Harvey Hospital would

have no choice but to be held at the traffic lights for much longer than they were at the present time. It was also advised at the meeting on 20th January that the interim scheme was designed to ensure that traffic did not queue on the M20 and it was not a concern to the Highways Agency that there would be queues on the existing Junction 10 roundabout. The new design would fail every evening rush hour, not might, not maybe, but would fail. The result of this scheme according to the Highways Agency would be twice daily traffic chaos. Highfield Lane traffic would be directed through the village centre of Mersham, through Kingsford Street and Mersham would therefore become a rat-run for traffic from Bilsington, Kingsnorth and Aldington heading towards the A20. He felt that the most disturbing aspect of the report was contained at paragraph 22 where it stated that 'the scheme would assist the Borough to deliver its future housing targets of 700 houses per year'. Without the scheme the report stated that these houses would need to be built in, what the report author described, 'unsuitable parts of the Borough'. He felt this set out the mindset of the Cabinet very clearly, that the 700 houses being built, would be built in Kingsnorth, Mersham and Stubbs Cross. This scheme would have the wholly undesirable effect of building yet more in a very congested part of the Borough. In short, he felt that it was a poor show that the paper to Cabinet did not cover these points. Colleagues from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee may wish to consider these further. In fact, they did, the paperwork had been delivered to Officers that evening to enable a more formal debate of these issues.

Councillor Robey, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Development, requested that Councillor Bartlett submitted his comments in writing.

Councillor Bartlett advised that the comments had been submitted as part of the Overview & Scrutiny Call-In, and he was certain that Council Officers would be able to provide copies of all of the questions that he had asked that evening. He was happy to send the minutes of the meetings with the Highways Agency, to the Portfolio Holder, which seemed to have not been properly considered in drafting the Cabinet report.

Resolved:

That subject to the expiry of the period by which decisions arising from the meeting of the Cabinet held on the 10th April 2014 may be called in, i.e. 24th April 2014

- (i) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Cabinet held on 10th April 2014 be received and noted with the exception of Minute Nos. 392 and 393.**
- (ii) Minute Nos. 392 and 393 be approved and adopted.**

414 Selection and Constitutional Review Committee – 16th January 2014

Councillor Davison advised that he would be voting against the approval of the minutes as he objected to the appointment of the Chairman of Ashford KALC as the Vice-Chairman of the Parish Forum. He felt that the gentleman spoke as KALC not

as a Parish Councillor and he felt that this was not the correct Forum for him and he was not an elected Member.

The Leader of the Council advised that Forum was as suggested, a Forum where the Council met with Parish Councils. They were KALC members and the gentleman in question was the Chairman of that organisation it seemed wholly right that the Chair should be shared with them in the spirit of inclusiveness and cooperation.

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Selection and Constitutional Review Committee held on 16th January 2014 be approved and adopted.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.5 Councillor Davison requested that it be recorded that he voted against the minutes.

415 Appeals Committee – 10th March 2014

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Appeals Committee held on the 10th March 2014 be received and noted.

416 Audit Committee – 18th March 2014

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Relf advised that he wanted to ask a question. He felt that the minutes misrepresented what he said at that meeting, and requested that the Council explained why some figures provided by him and statements made by him, relating to protecting the public purse, were not shown in the Minutes?

Councillor Clokie, Chairman of the Audit Committee, thanked Mr Relf for his question which he believed related to Minute No. 372 – Presentation of Financial Statements. He advised that Mr Relf had already raised these issues by letter to the Chief Executive and he was sent a full reply on 3rd April. As advised in the letter Councillor Clokie, and others at the Audit Committee meeting were consulted on the comments raised in Mr Relf's letter and all had confirmed that they considered the Minutes were a correct record. It was explained that Committee Minutes were not a verbatim record of everything said at the meeting. They were a summary of the proceedings and of the decision reached, including where appropriate reference to the main threads of discussion that led to the decision. He was satisfied that the Minutes meet these criteria although it would be a matter for the Audit Committee at its next Meeting to approve the Minutes or otherwise, and of course Mr Relf would have an opportunity to address that Meeting.

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Appeals Committee held on the 18th March 2014 be received and noted.

417 Questions by Members of which Notice had been given

(a) Question from Councillor Clark to Councillor Clarkson, Leader of the Council

“Will the Leader join me in condemning the illegal practice of blacklisting within the construction industry?”

Reply by Councillor Clarkson

“Mr Mayor, I am pleased to join Councillor Clark in condemning the illegal practice of blacklisting. This Council will not condone any illegal practice which is contrary to the statutory regulations which we are obliged to observe. Nor those that are contrary to our own set of standards. The Parliamentary Scottish Affairs Committee has been investigating blacklisting and noted that no contractor has been found guilty of blacklisting since the practice was made illegal in 2010. Thank you Mr Mayor.”

Supplementary Question by Councillor Clark

“Thank you Leader for that very thoughtful answer. I have a supplementary question. At the next Full Council Meeting I intend to submit a motion stating ‘Ashford Borough Council deplores the illegal practice of blacklisting within the construction industry and will ensure that any company known to have been involved in blacklisting practices and not to have indemnified their victims will not be invited to tender contracts by Ashford Borough Council’. A very similar motion has been passed with cross party support by other Councils in the South East of England. So my question to the Leader is this, do you hope, as I do, that this motion will receive cross party support at this Council?”

Reply by Councillor Clarkson

“Mr Mayor, I am very hopeful that it will not receive cross party support because I do not think it is a very intelligent and thoughtful motion. And I say that because we have to have due regard to a whole range of issues here and that is how long ago the, all these questions about time limitations that will be advised by our Legal Representative come in to play. So I can’t suggest, or go along with you that we are likely to support that. I’ve made a statement here very firmly, very clearly, that we will not support any illegal action or anyone involved in practices that are illegal. We, when we are tendering will always look and scrutinise those that we are tendering with or seeking to tender with and I think that is as far as I would go. Thank you Mr Mayor.”

(KL)

Queries concerning these Minutes? Please contact Kirsty Liddell:
Telephone: 01233 33499 Email: keith.fearon@ashford.gov.uk
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.gov.uk/committees