

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

TUESDAY, 22 JULY 2014

Councillors Present: David Allen, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeff Beck (Chairman), Brian Bedwell, Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Hilary Cole, Roger Croft, Billy Drummond, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, Manohar Gopal, Paul Hewer, John Horton, Roger Hunneman, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones (Vice-Chairman), Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Royce Longton, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Gwen Mason, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe, Irene Neill, Graham Pask, James Podger, David Rendel, Andrew Rowles, Garth Simpson, Anthony Stansfeld, Julian Swift-Hook, Ieuan Tuck, Tony Vickers, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster, Keith Woodhams and Laszlo Zverko

Also Present: John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), David Holling (Head of Legal Services), Stephen Chard (Policy Officer), Moira Fraser (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager) and Robin Steel (Group Executive (Cons))

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Peter Argyle, Councillor David Betts, Councillor George Chandler, Councillor Richard Crumly, Councillor Adrian Edwards, Councillor Sheila Ellison, Honorary Alderman Geoff Findlay, Councillor Joe Mooney and Honorary Alderman Alan Thorpe

PART I

22. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman welcomed those present and then asked that a minutes silence be observed to remember Bernard Gardner who had sadly passed away. The Chairman explained that Mr Gardner had been a Newbury District and West Berkshire Councillor from 1995 to 2000. The Chairman stated that the Council's thoughts were with Bernard's wife Jean and their family during this difficult time.

The Chairman reported that since the May Council meeting, he, the Vice Chairman and former Chairman Councillor Keith Chopping had attended 40 events. He stated that it was important for the Council to be represented at the wide ranging events to show support for the organisations hosting them. Attendance also helped to highlight the good work they were doing and that they welcomed the recognition.

23. Presentations

The Chairman was pleased to announce that Long Service Awards would be made to long serving elected Councillors for ten and twenty years service.

The following Member received an award for 10 years of service:

- Roger Hunneman

The following Members received an award for 20 years of service:

- Jeff Brooks
- Royce Longton

The Chairman commended the Members on their outstanding efforts.

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

24. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2014 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the inclusion of the title Honorary Alderman next to the names of Alan Thorpe and Geoff Findlay in the apologies.

At the request of the Chairman the Monitoring Officer explained he had looked into the "legality of the amendment", referred to in Paragraphs 6 and 7 on Page 12 of the agenda. 'Petitions for Debate' which was the area discussed at the previous meeting was an area which was the responsibility of the Council as a body based upon the provisions for schemes made under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. Section 11(5) of the Act provided that the Council could revise a petition scheme at any time provided it was approved at a meeting of the authority and published on the Council's website.

Section 15 the Act set out the statutory requirements for 'petitions requiring debate' which included the requirement for the petition to be signed by the specified number of persons who lived, worked or studied in the local authority area. Section 15 also required that the petition did not fall within section 16 (which related to calling persons to account).

Finally Section 18 provided the Council with a discretionary power to include such provisions 'as the authority making it (the scheme) considers appropriate'. This would enable the Council to introduce the amendment put forward at the previous meeting.

The Monitoring Officer had therefore concluded that the proposed amendments to the petition scheme were legitimate in his view. The amendments would therefore be made to the Constitution following which it would be published in accordance with the 2009 Act.

25. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Roger Hunneman, Alan Macro, Graham Jones, Gordon Lundie, Ieuan Tuck and Pamela Bale declared an interest in Agenda Item 18, but reported that, provided the discussion did not focus on specific sites, their interests were personal and not prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests, and they therefore determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter. The Councillors stated however that if specific sites were considered they would need to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest and they would then leave the chamber, not take part in any further debate or vote on the matter.

26. Petitions

There were no petitions presented to the meeting.

27. Public Questions

- a) A question standing in the name of Mr David Peacock on the subject of Marsh Lane, Newbury was answered by the Leader of the Council.

The following questions pertaining to items included on the agenda were submitted after the agenda was published.

- b) A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Norman on the subject of the number of Members who had been able to read all the supporting information for this agenda was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport (Policy), Culture, Customer Services and Countryside.
- c) A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Norman on the subject of vehicular access to the proposed Sandleford Development off the A339 was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport (Policy), Culture, Customer Services and Countryside.

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

- d) A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Norman on the subject of education provision data for the Sandeford development was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport (Policy), Culture, Customer Services and Countryside.
- e) A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Norman on the subject of vehicular access from Warren Road onto the proposed Sandeford development was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport (Policy), Culture, Customer Services and Countryside.
- f) A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Norman on the subject of the sustainability of the proposed Sandeford development was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Transport (Policy), Culture, Customer Services and Countryside.

28. Membership of Committees

There had been no changes to the membership of Committees since the previous Council meeting.

29. Licensing Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 03 June 2014.

30. Personnel Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Personnel Committee had met on 28 May 2014.

31. Governance and Audit Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Governance and Audit Committee had not met.

32. District Planning Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the District Planning Committee had not met.

33. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had met on 20 May 2014, 01 July 2014 and 21 July 2014.

34. Standards Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Standards Committee had met on 16 June 2014.

35. Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/14 (C2864)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 15) which sought to inform Members of the Scrutiny activity undertaken during the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Brian Bedwell and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

That the Council:

“notes the content of the report”.

In proposing the report, Councillor Bedwell noted that the work undertaken by the Commission over the past twelve months had been varied. He encouraged Members to

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

raise potential discussion items by completing the necessary paperwork so that the Commission could consider their proposals.

Councillor Jeff Brooks thanked Councillor Bedwell for the work that he had done during the previous year and concurred that the Commission had considered a wide body of work. He thanked Councillor Bedwell for being a gracious Chairman who had been willing to consider the proposals placed before the Commission for inclusion on the work programme.

Councillor Alan Macro queried paragraph 3.13 of the report which stated that the A4 Calcot widening improvement scheme would be reviewed two years after its implementation. His recollection was that the review would take place a year after implementation. It was agreed that Officers would provide clarification outside of the meeting.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

(Post meeting note: The minutes of the OSMC meeting on the 07 January 2014 were checked and it was confirmed that the OSMC had agreed that 'The Executive should consider a review of the traffic along the A4 takes place 24 months after completion of the project to assess the need for the central reservation as space for a dual carriageway further eastbound side.')

36. **Response to s106 and CIL Council Motion submitted on 12th December 2013 (C2820)**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 16) concerning a response to the Motion agreed at Council on the 12th December 2013 concerning s106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy ("CIL").

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Keith Chopping:

That the Council:

"approves the report".

Councillor Hilary Cole in introducing the item explained that the report had been drafted in order to provide a response to the motion submitted by Councillor Royce Longton at the December 2013 Council meeting. The report detailed the work undertaken by Members and Officers to 'press for the retention of the S106 system'. Councillor Cole reported that on the 13 May 2014 Members (Councillors Keith Chopping, Tony Vickers and Hilary Cole) and Officers met with the officials from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) where a robust discussion took place. Officials from the DCLG had been invited to visit the Council in September 2014 to see how the s106 scheme worked for themselves. Councillor Roger Croft had also raised the issue with the Secretary of State who had agreed to re-examine this issue.

Councillor Cole stated that the report also set out Members involvement in the process (paragraph 3), the role of town and parish councils in the process (paragraph 4) and the procedures for collecting CIL (paragraph 5).

Councillor Alan Macro welcomed the efforts that had been made to retain the s106 scheme. He was however concerned about the level of involvement of both Ward Members and the town and parish councils in both the CIL and s106 processes. He explained that many of the parish councils would not have sufficient resources to monitor the trigger points nor did they necessarily have the professional expertise to do so. He was concerned that the s106 report was only issued to the town and parish councils on

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

an annual basis and cited some examples of cases where the s106 funding had been wrongly assigned.

Councillor Gordon Lundie thanked all those involved in trying to retain the s106 scheme and especially Councillor Tony Vickers for the cross party support and subsequent involvement in the visits.

Councillor Royce Longton also expressed appreciation for the efforts that had been made to retain the scheme. He noted that where a town or parish council had adopted a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) the percentage of CIL funding they would receive would increase from 15% to 25%. He therefore sought assurance that the Council would endeavour to support town and parish councils in the preparation of NDPs.

Councillor Tony Vickers acknowledged the thanks from Councillor Lundie and stated that he felt that cross party involvement in the lobbying had been useful and he asked that the September DCLG visit include involvement from both parties too. While he accepted that local authorities seeking to retain s106 schemes were in the minority he asked Officers to continue to try to identify any other like minded councils.

Councillor Jeff Brooks stated that he would be happy to discuss ways the Council could support the town and parish councils wanting to produce NDPs outside of this meeting. While he too welcomed the efforts that had been made to retain the s106 scheme he was concerned about the level of involvement of Ward Members and town and parish councils in the process which he felt could be improved upon.

Councillor Hilary Cole proposed that the issue of involvement could be taken back to the Planning Policy Task Group (PPTG) for further consideration and that a report could be brought back to full Council in due course. Members agreed this approach.

Councillor Keith Chopping noted that the s106 scheme was a superb process that achieved considerable income for the residents of the district at no extra cost for rate payers. He welcomed the suggestion that the PPTG could revisit the input from Ward Members and the town and parish councils.

Councillor Hilary Cole noted Councillor Macro's comments about s106 monies being wrongly assigned and invited Members to alert the relevant Portfolio Holder to these occurrences. She reassured Members that she closely monitored this area of work.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

37. **North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-19 (C2847)**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 17) concerning the adoption of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Plan for 2014-2019.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Paul Bryant:

That the Council:

“adopts the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan for 2014-2019 as a partnership document prepared by the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners”.

Councillor Hilary Cole in introducing the item reported that the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) required local authorities to produce management plans for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within their areas. The North Wessex Downs AONB Partnership (Council of Partners) discharged this obligation on behalf of its nine local authority partners that had a presence in the North Wessex Downs. A Management Plan had to be produced and reviewed at least every five years which would support and complement the West Berkshire Local Plan, setting out a spatial policy framework that

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

reflected national and local issues to ensure the AONB's natural heritage, landscape and built character were conserved, the local economy was supported and the use of the AONB for recreation was encouraged.

The revised Management Plan for the next five years (2014-2019) had been formally approved by the AONB Council of Partners and each of the constituent local authorities was being recommended to formally adopt the Management Plan prior to submission to the Secretary of State at the end of July 2014. The delivery of the Plan would be monitored by the AONB Partnership through an annual review of the delivery of the AONB Business Plan, and achievements would be reported through the AONB's Annual Report.

Councillor Cole noted that this constituted a light touch review of the 2009 plan and the majority of changes related to changes to local, regional and national policies such as the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that the document remained fit for purpose.

Councillor Tony Vickers, the Council's representative on the Local Access Forum (LAF), stated that the report was an improvement on previous iterations. He explained that the LAF would be meeting the Council of Partners in the near future to look at opportunities for promoting the area as a short break destination and to consider a co-ordinated marketing plan for the area.

Councillor Royce Longton agreed that this was an excellent document. He did however have concerns about the constraints on wind turbines in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Councillor Alan Law disagreed with Councillor Longton on the need for wind turbines which he felt would blight the countryside. Councillor Anthony Stansfeld concurred with Councillor Law and stated that he did not wish to see the industrial and inefficient structures being erected in the AONB. Councillor Roger Hunneman stated that there were areas in the AONB such as Membury Services where the erection of wind turbines should be acceptable. Councillor Gordon Lundie felt that the Council's existing policy was flexible enough to permit wind turbines where it was appropriate to do so.

(Councillor Tony Linden left the meeting at 8.15pm and returned at 8.17pm).

Councillor Paul Bryant stated that he would prefer to see zero energy housing being developed which would not spoil the countryside. Councillor Bryant welcomed the document which covered a complicated subject. He noted that this plan complemented the Local Plan and he was pleased to note that it would inform decisions on planning applications. He stated that this was a comprehensive plan that contained a lot of comprehensive guidance and which would help to conserve this valuable asset.

Councillor Hilary Cole thanked Councillor Tony Vickers for his comments but stated that she did not concur with the comments made in support of wind turbines which were inefficient in her opinion. She noted that the plan did however mention a number of other renewable energy sources.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

(Councillors Roger Hunneman and Royce Longton voted against the recommendation).

38. **West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD): Preferred Options for Consultation (C2844)**

(Councillor Roger Hunneman declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that he lived adjacent to the Sandleford site. As his interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

matter. Councillor Hunneman stated that if the Sandleford site became a topic of discussion he would declare a disclosable pecuniary interest, leave the chamber and not take part in the vote).

(Councillor Alan Macro declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that he lived close to one of the preferred site options in the document. As his interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter. Councillor Macro stated that if this site became a topic of discussion he would declare a disclosable pecuniary interest, leave the chamber and not take part in the vote).

(Councillor Graham Jones declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that he owned a property in Lambourn from which he ran his business. As his interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter. Councillor Jones stated that if this site became a topic of discussion he would declare a disclosable pecuniary interest, leave the chamber and not take part in the vote).

(Councillor Gordon Lundie declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that he lived close to a site that had not been included as a preferred site in the document. As his interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

(Councillor Ieuan Tuck declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that he lived close to the Sandleford site. As his interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

(Councillor Pamela Bale declared a personal interest in Agenda item 18 by virtue of the fact that that she lived opposite one of the sites in Pangbourne that had not been selected as a preferred site. As her interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest she determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

(Councillor Emma Webster noted that although she had previously declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in these matters there had been a change in circumstances and she no longer had a disclosable pecuniary interest and that she would like that to be recorded in the minutes.)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 18) concerning the preferred options version of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Prior to the discussion on this item commencing the Chairman reminded those present that Members were being asked about the principle of consulting on this document and that it was not an opportunity to discuss the merits of individual sites.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Gordon Lundie:

That the Council:

1. "approves for public consultation the preferred options version of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations DPD
2. delegates authority to the Head of Planning and Countryside to agree any minor typographical and presentational changes to the preferred options version of the DPD and supporting documentation before publication".

Councillor Hilary Cole introduced the report which considered the preferred options version of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Members were being asked to approve the document for consultation as stated

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

by the Chairman. The Council was preparing the Housing Site Allocations DPD to allocate non-strategic housing sites across the District and to allocate sites for Gypsies and Travellers. All sites had been assessed in a consistent manner and more sites had been shortlisted than were required.

The report also sought to update a number of the Council's existing policies including:

- two specific elements of CS3 (the policy on Sandleford Park) relating to highways access and education provision;
- parking standards for residential developments;

The report also highlighted changes required to policies guiding development in the countryside which would be brought to the September 2014 Council meeting and if approved would be followed by a period of public consultation.

Councillor Cole also noted that it had been necessary to issue an addendum to this report. One of the preferred options CHI007 had been withdrawn by the owner after the paperwork had been issued. The final landscape assessment had also been received in respect of EUA003 which meant that the site could no longer be ruled out.

If Council was minded to approve the draft Housing Site Allocations DPD for consultation, this would take place for a seven week period from 25 July 2014 to 12 September 2014. Councillor Cole noted that the Council might be criticised about the timing of the consultation but the parish councils had already been consulted in January 2014 and their feedback had helped to identify a number of potential sites. The consultation would be promoted through a media campaign, would be available in libraries (including two in Reading), all the Council Offices and would also be highlighted in parish and community newsletters.

The process, once finalised, would result in an allocation of around 1500 homes which would contribute to the 10,500 dwellings identified in the Core Strategy. The timing of this process was in line with a requirement of the Planning Inspectorate for the Council to review its housing numbers in the Core Strategy three years following its adoption in July 2012. The final document would be submitted to Council in December 2014 for approval.

Councillor Cole thanked the Planning Policy Team for the time, effort and attention to detail they had put in to producing these documents.

Councillor Mollie Lock, while recognising the need to build more houses, was concerned about the impact this could have on some schools. She noted that some schools were landlocked and it would therefore be very difficult to extend them and she hoped that this would be taken into consideration in determining where new houses would be built.

Councillor Alan Macro also thanked the Planning Policy Team for their efforts. He noted that the Core Strategy had stated that Theale needed to undergo a period of consolidation and he felt that this document did not seem to be taking that into consideration. He felt that the number of houses proposed for Theale would overstretch the services in the village including the school. He did however welcome the changes to the parking standards.

Councillor Macro also noted that it was both local and national policy to protect the countryside and he therefore felt that it was important to utilise as much brownfield land as possible. He noted that there were a lot of empty office blocks in the district that could be converted to housing.

(Councillor Virginia von Celsing left the meeting at 8.31 and returned at 8.35pm).

In addition he noted that around 300 new homes were being proposed as part of the London Road Industrial Estate development which were not allowed for in this document.

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

He stated that there appeared to not be the level of demand for office space as had previously been thought and there was therefore scope to reallocate some of this space.

Councillor Tony Linden stated that he had concerns about the proposed development at Pincents Lane and he would be urging his residents to respond to the consultation. Councillor James Podger stated that while he supported the consultation he would be making his views about the proposed development in Hungerford known during the consultation.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook stated that he remained opposed to the development at Sandleford which was in his opinion an unsuitable and unsustainable site. He was however pleased to note that two schools and four accesses were now being proposed for the site.

(Due to his disclosable pecuniary interest in the Sandleford site, Councillor Roger Hunneman left the meeting during the discussion as the Sandleford development was being discussed. He left the chamber at 8.35pm, took no further part in the debate and did not vote on the matter).

Councillor Emma Webster was pleased to note the extent to which the consultation would be promoted as she felt that it was important that the public got the opportunity to state their views.

Councillor Royce Longton stated that his ward had already suffered over development and he was concerned that two large sites were being proposed for Burghfield when only one was needed.

Councillor Alan Law welcomed the revised parking policies. He also thanked the Portfolio Holder and the Planning Policy Team for the document which had been thoroughly researched and the papers had been very well prepared. He noted that the town and parish councils had already been consulted.

Councillor David Rendel queried what reassurance would be given to residents that sites that had been discounted would not become preferred sites later in the process.

Councillor Paul Bryant congratulated Officers, and especially Liz Alexander, on the work that they had done in sifting through the evidence. He stated that Officers had done a good job of minimising the impact on the district and that it was important to reach a consensus.

Councillor Garth Simpson stated that he would also be supporting his parish through the consultation process.

Councillor Jeff Brooks stated that residents would be puzzled why more development was being proposed when so many office blocks were standing empty. He would therefore not be voting in favour of the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Tony Vickers noted that Officers had unfortunately not had sufficient resources to assess the employment land requirements as yet. He stated that it was evident that more housing and less employment land was required. Developers could build office spaces and then convert them into houses thereby avoiding making any s106 payments. Although he accepted that there would be an increase in Council Tax and income from the New Homes Bonus. This would still result in less funding for infrastructure such as schools. He stated that all the housing need in Thatcham and Newbury could be built on brownfield sites.

Councillor Irene Neill acknowledged the point made by Councillor Lock about the inability for some schools to be extended. She stated that these were the types of issues that should be raised through the consultation so that an informed decision could be made.

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

The Council would work with developers of the selected sites to come up with innovative ways of addressing these types of issues.

Councillor Graham Pask reminded Members that they were only determining whether or not to go out to consultation and that some of the detailed issues raised should be debated at the December Council meeting. He noted that about a third more houses were contained in the preferred options sites precisely so that genuine consultation could be undertaken. He noted that although the recession had not been as evident in West Berkshire as some other areas many businesses had opted not to expand and therefore the need for employment land would have reduced for a period of time. He stated that these were the types of issues that should be raised through the consultation.

Councillor Gordon Lundie thanked Councillor Cole and Officers for the work they had done in producing the document. He stated that the consultation would give residents the opportunity to tell the Council what they thought and the Council would take the consultation seriously. He reiterated that there was still opportunity to influence the decision and he did not want residents to think that this was a 'done deal'.

(Councillor Manohar Gopal left the meeting at 9.00pm and returned at 9.02pm).

Councillor Lundie noted that the Council needed to ensure provision of employment land and had to strike a balance between land supply for houses and jobs. Councillor Lundie stated that he was disappointed that the Opposition did not feel that they could support the consultation.

Councillor Hilary Cole stated that employment land needs would be assessed through a separate process. Councillor Cole explained that only 1,426 houses were required in order to meet the 10,500 requirement. The preferred options exercise had identified 2,088 an excess of 622. She urged Members to consider the process holistically and not to focus only on their own wards and make a decision on what was best for the District as a whole.

(Councillor Keith Chopping left the meeting at 9.07pm and returned at 9.10pm).

Councillor Cole stated that she was disappointed that Opposition Members of the Planning Policy Task Group were not supporting the consultation. The Group had worked well together and that it was therefore disappointing that Councillors Longton, Macro and Vickers and previously Councillor Woodhams (when he was a member of the Group) who had participated in the production of the documents were no longer supporting it. She noted that they had voted in favour of the consultation at the Task Group meetings.

Councillor Keith Woodhams sought clarification as to whether the disclosure of information from the Task Group (which was a confidential meeting) could constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct. The Monitoring Officer explained that if Councillor Woodhams felt that there had been a breach he should make a complaint to the Standards Committee in writing. A determination could then be made.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 4.17.3 it was requisitioned that the voting on the Motion be recorded. The names of those Members voting for, against and abstaining were read to the Council as follows:

FOR the Motion:

Councillors Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Jeff Beck, Brian Bedwell, Dominic Boeck, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Hilary Cole, Roger Croft, Marcus Franks, Dave Goff, Manohar Gopal, Paul Hewer, John Horton, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Irene Neill, Graham Pask, James Podger, Andrew Rowles, Garth Simpson, Anthony Stansfeld, Ieuan Tuck, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster, Laszlo Zverko (32)

COUNCIL - 22 JULY 2014 - MINUTES

AGAINST the Motion:

Councillors David Allen, Jeff Brooks, Billy Drummond, Mollie Lock, Royce Longton, Alan Macro, Gwen Mason, Geoff Mayes, David Rendel, Julian Swift-Hook, Tony Vickers, Keith Woodhams (12)

ABSTAINED:

None

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

39. Notices of Motion

There were no Motions submitted.

40. Members' Questions

- (a) A question standing in the name of Councillor Keith Woodhams on the subject of the timescales for converting the left hand exit lane from the West Berkshire Community Hospital was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Councillor Keith Woodhams on the subject of the estimated efficiency savings that have been sought from the highways contractor was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Councillor Keith Woodhams on the subject of his request to paint 20 mph roundels on the surface of the road on the approach to the mini roundabout outside the Council offices in Market Street to improve road safety was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Councillor Keith Woodhams on the subject of when the potential to share Highways and Transport services with another Council would be investigated was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Councillor David Rendel on the subject of the interest lost by the Council in the current financial year as a result of the decision made by the Executive on 8 May 2014 to take £522,000 from balances to pay for flood repairs was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economic Development, Health and Safety, Human Resources, Pensions, Property.
- (f) A question standing in the name of Councillor David Rendel on the subject of the interest lost by the Council for the full 2014/15 financial year as a result of the decision made by the Executive on 8 May 2014 to take £522,000 from balances to pay for flood repairs was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Economic Development, Health and Safety, Human Resources, Pensions, Property.

(The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and closed at 9.20pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature