

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

THURSDAY, 8 JULY 2021

Councillors Present: Adrian Abbs, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Carlyne Culver, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Rick Jones (Vice-Chairman), Tony Linden, Ross Mackinnon, Erik Pattenden, Claire Rowles and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter, Councillor Peter Argyle, Councillor Phil Barnett, Councillor Jeff Beck, Councillor Dennis Benneyworth, Councillor Dominic Boeck, Councillor Jeff Cant, Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Stephen Chard (Democratic Services Manager), Councillor Hilary Cole, Councillor James Cole, Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Councillor Billy Drummond, Joseph Holmes (Executive Director - Resources), Councillor Nassar Hunt, Councillor Owen Jeffery, Councillor Alan Law, Honorary Alderwoman Mollie Lock, Councillor Royce Longton, Councillor Alan Macro, Councillor Thomas Marino, Councillor David Marsh, Councillor Steve Masters, Councillor Geoff Mayes, Councillor Andy Moore, Councillor Graham Pask, Shiraz Sheikh (Service Lead - Legal and Democratic), Councillor Richard Somner, Councillor Joanne Stewart, Councillor Martha Vickers, Councillor Tony Vickers, Honorary Alderman Quentin Webb, Councillor Andrew Williamson and Councillor Keith Woodhams

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Gareth Hurley, Honorary Alderman Graham Jones and Councillor Garth Simpson

PART I

22. Chairman's Remarks

The Council praised Mr Nick Carter on his retirement from West Berkshire Council after 23 years of service, including 15 as Chief Executive. The Chairman noted his long and successful career, and thanked him for his commitment and leadership in that time. Councillor Lynne Doherty noted that Mr Carter had been an exemplary Chief Executive, and commended his openness, fairness and transparency in the role, particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic. Councillor Lee Dillon praised Mr Carter's openness to opposition Members.

The Chairman reported that he had attended six events since the last Council meeting.

- The Chairman attended a HandyBus photocall to celebrate 35 years of partnership, and to meet volunteers the Volunteer Centre of West Berkshire.
- The Chairman visited the South East Reserve Forces and Cadet Association for the Royal County of Berkshire and Surrey Armed Forces and learned about what the Reserve Forces were doing around the world.
- The Chairman visited Kiln Gardens in Kintbury to open up an Allocated Site, where a housing development has now been completed.
- The Chairman visited Waterside to see the housing development in progress.
- The Chairman attended the Newbury Town Council Mayor-making Ceremony, where Councillor Billy Drummond was made Mayor of Newbury. The Chairman congratulated Councillor Drummond.
- The Chairman open the Edu-café, which aims to help the diverse ethnic communities and vulnerable young people in the area.
- The Chairman additionally recorded two videos, for the Armed Forces and first National Thank You Day.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Procedural Motion

Councillor Graham Bridgman raised a non-notice procedural motion, seconded by the Chairman, to suspend standing orders in order to permit members present remotely to speak and for all members present to render a decision through an indicative vote process.

Councillor Jeff Brooks asked for clarification that this motion was a contingency due to the current situation. The Chairman and Councillor Bridgman reiterated that it was.

The Motion was put to the meeting and carried.

23. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

24. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

25. Petitions

There were no petitions presented.

26. Public Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: [Transcription of Q&As](#).

- (a) A question standing in the name of John Gotelee on the subject of LRIE was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (b) It was agreed that a question standing in the name of Alison May on the subject of the Climate & Economy Emergency Bill would receive a written response, given that she was unable to attend the meeting.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Alan Pearce on the subject of the proposed sports ground on Monks Lane was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Paul Morgan on the subject of the proposed sports ground development was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Lee McDougall on the subject of the proposed sports ground was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (f) It was agreed that a question standing in the name of Vaughan Miller on the subject of Faraday Road Football Ground would receive a written response, given that he was unable to attend the meeting.
- (g) A question standing in the name of Jason Braidwood was withdrawn.
- (h) A question standing in the name of Paul Morgan on the subject of the Local Plan Review was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (i) A question standing in the name of Lee McDougall on the subject of Faraday Road Football Ground was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (j) It was agreed that a question standing in the name of Vaughan Miller on the subject of Faraday Road Football Ground would receive a written response, given that he was unable to attend the meeting.
- (k) A question standing in the name of Lee McDougall on the subject of Faraday Road Football Ground was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Development. It was agreed that the supplementary question would receive a written response.

27. Membership of Committees

The Monitoring Officer advised of the following changes to the membership of Committees since the previous Council meeting:

Councillor Carolyn Culver is to stand down as a Substitute Member on the Governance and Ethics Committee. Councillor Steve Masters remains as the Green Party Substitute Member for this Committee.

28. Motions from Previous Meetings

The Council was asked to note a response to one motion:

The Proposed Firework Motion had received a response, which was set out within Agenda Item 16 and would be discussed during the meeting.

29. Licensing Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 21 June 2021.

30. Personnel Committee

The Council noted that the Personnel Committee had not met since the last meeting.

31. Governance and Ethics Committee

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

32. District Planning Committee

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

33. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had met on 6 July 2021.

34. Joint Public Protection Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Joint Public Protection Committee had met on 14 June 2021.

35. Appointment of Chief Executive and Amendment of Pay Policy (C4086)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 15), concerning the appointment of the Chief Executive and amendment of the Pay Policy. The report sought approval for the appointment of a new Chief Executive and approval for the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive. The report additionally sought Council approval for a revised salary range for the role of Chief Executive.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Howard Woollaston and seconded by Councillor Lynne Doherty:

That the Council:

“Approve the appointment of the candidate for the role of Chief Executive proposed by the Member Appointment Panel detailed in Appendix E, who will be designated as the head of paid service when they commence their employment with the Council.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Approve the extension of the salary range for Chief Executive to £165,000.

Approve the appointment of the candidate for the role of Interim Chief Executive, as detailed in Appendix F, following the retirement of Nick Carter until the new Chief Executive referenced in paragraph 2.1(a) commences their employment with the Council.”

The Chairman asked the Council to note that Appendix E, which detailed the proposed Chief Executive, was restricted, and asked Councillors to refrain from referring to the name of the individual or any other details from that Appendix during the debate.

Councillor Howard Woollaston introduced the report, stating that the panel appointed to find the new Chief Executive was very successful in finding a good, experienced and dynamic candidate. Councillor Woollaston additionally noted the appointment of Susan Halliwell as Interim Chief Executive, and endorsed the changes in the pay structure.

Councillor Lynne Doherty, seconding the motion, noted that this decision was one of the most important that the Councillors present would have to consider, as it would have wide-ranging impacts on all aspects of policy. Councillor Doherty commended the work of the panel in Shaw House in testing, interviewing, and talking with potential candidates, and considering the job description and salary of the role. Councillor Doherty expressed regret at the identity of the new Chief Executive being restricted information, but endorsed them to Council, and additionally endorsed Susan Halliwell for agreeing to be Chief Executive in the interim.

Councillor Lee Dillon endorsed the speech from Councillor Doherty, and noted that the panel agreed that they wanted to see energy and innovation from the new Chief Executive. Asking the candidates for presentations on putting customers and residents first, Councillor Dillon stated that the nominee gave an excellent presentation, and endorsed them to the Council.

Councillor Adrian Abbs gave specific praise to Susan Halliwell, and noted that she would be an excellent Interim Chief Executive.

Councillor David Marsh noted that it was not a cross-party process, expressing regret that the Leader of the Green Party, Councillor Carolyne Culver, was not invited to take part. Nevertheless, Councillor Marsh endorsed the motion on behalf of the Green Group.

Councillor Tony Vickers congratulated Susan Halliwell on her nomination as Interim Chief Executive. Noting that she was by far the best candidate at interview stage, Councillor Vickers reassured residents of West Berkshire that the Council was in very safe hands for the next few months.

Councillor Jeff Brooks stated that the interview process was extremely robust. Citing his 37 years of experience in recruitment, Councillor Brooks noted the excellent executive search organisation, the candidates undertaking media exercises and psychometric testing, and the intense interviewing process with internal and external stakeholder consultation. Councillor Brooks noted that recruitment was never certain, but he believed that a very capable individual had been selected, and that he looked forward to working with them.

Councillor Graham Bridgman disagreed with Councillor Marsh and the Green Group that the interview panel had been unfair, noting that it would have needed to have been larger than was feasible to reasonably accommodate them. Councillor Bridgman endorsed the other points raised during the debate, and commended the search organisation, noting that they had found seven or eight candidates who were good enough to interview. Councillor Bridgman stated that the salary changes were necessary due to the exceptionally strong field, of which the best was selected.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Alan Law stressed that there was close cooperation between the administrative and opposition party, and that they had worked with complete unanimity on the issues before them.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and remotely approved the Motion.

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

36. **Response to the proposed Firework Motion (C3972)**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 16) concerning how West Berkshire Council could support any aspects of the motion first proposed to Council in September 2020 (set out in Appendix A). The report updated on the position which was originally presented to Licensing Committee on 8 February 2021 and which had been due to be considered by the Council meeting on 2 March 2021. The report outlined the reasoning for a different approach in July 2021 compared to the recommendations previously proposed, and sought agreement of the operational approach that would be taken in respect of the management of fireworks.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Graham Bridgman and seconded by Councillor Rick Jones.

That the Council:

“NOTE the report which was taken to Licensing Committee on 8th February 2021 which considered the PPP Response to the proposed motion.

APPROVE the recommendations of the Licensing Committee with respect to the amended motion.

RECOMMEND a West Berkshire Operational Approach to Fireworks and not a Fireworks Policy be presented to the next Licensing Committee (November 2021) for their approval.”

Councillor Graham Bridgman in introducing the report noted that he was only doing so because Councillor Hilary Cole was present remotely, and that she would present the report.

Councillor Hilary Cole noted that the matter had been referred to the Licensing Committee, and that officers had looked into the matter and composed a response which had engendered significant debate. While there was a lot of sympathy for animal owners, with the RSPCA's role noted, Councillor Cole stated that the wording of the motion went beyond the areas of responsibility of the Council. Work had been undertaken to see where the Council could add value and, in three areas around safety, that could be found. The Council viewed it more important to set out and consolidate its policy on fireworks, which it had done in a single document.

Councillor Richard Somner, as the motion's original author, thanked Councillors and officers who had taken part in the process to adopt the motion and respond to it. He endorsed the response, and supported the motion.

Councillor Graham Bridgman proposed a minor typographical amendment to a spelling error on Page 69, where “act” had been rendered as “ac”, which was accepted. Councillor Bridgman noted the process had been a successful negotiation, and endorsed the motion.

Councillor Rick Jones noted that the recommendations were pragmatic and positive, and noted the RSPCA's change of policy which were more in line with the recommendations, and endorsed the motion to the Council.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Council Chamber and remotely approved the Motion.

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

37. **Fees and Charges for Fit and Proper Tests for Mobile Home Site Owners/Managers**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 16a) concerning fees and charges for fit and proper tests for mobile home site owners and managers.

The report proposed that the fees associated with The Mobile Homes (Requirement for Manager of Site to be Fit and Proper Person) (England) Regulations 2020 be included on the Public Protection Partnership's (PPP) list of fees and charges.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Graham Bridgman and seconded by Councillor Rick Jones.

That the Council:

“Agree the fees which are based on the existing framework of Fees and Charges within the Public Protection Partnership.”

Councillor Graham Bridgman in introducing the report passed to Councillor Hilary Cole, who was not physically present at the meeting and so could not propose it herself. Councillor Graham Bridgman additionally proposed a minor amendment to the report, changing the reference to a JPPC meeting in “September 2021” to “September 2020”, this was approved.

Councillor Hilary Cole in presenting the report, noted that the Regulations were introduced in 2020, creating a Fit and Proper Person test for Mobile Home Site owners and managers. This came with two potential fees, for the processing of applications, and maintaining and monitoring the scheme. The Joint Public Protection Committee agreed recommendations in June that were proposed by the Public Protection Partnership, and proposed a schedule of fees.

Councillor Carolyn Culver asked what other local authorities were doing with these fees, and whether what the Council was proposing was similar. Councillor Culver asked how long the application process would take, and asked how long the check-in process would take so that residents could find out how much these fees would cost them.

Councillor Alan Macro stated that the process had been forced upon them, applicants did not know how long the process was going to take, and that they were being asked to sign up to a programme without knowing what the fees would be.

Councillor Steve Masters raised similar concerns to Councillor Macro, noting that the charges were arbitrary and open-ended, and that applicants might be excluded on a financial aspect or be later unable to pay the fees. There were real concerns that the policy was too vague, and that there were fairness and discrimination issues which required addressing.

Councillor Rick Jones explained that the £259 an hour fee was universal across the PPP, and was calculated upon an estimated number of hours.

Councillor Hilary Cole noted that the guidance had been issued in June, and that the fees were in accordance with the general fee-setting process, and that other local authorities would have a similar fee scheme as the PPP. Councillor Cole had every confidence that the fees were set fairly. The fees were for owners of sites, and so much of the fee would likely be passed on to customers.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Council Chamber and remotely showed Conservative Group approval. Councillor Lee Dillon noted that the Liberal Democrat Group would abstain, and Councillor Carolyn Culver noted that the Green Group would vote against.

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

38. Notices of Motion

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17a refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers relating to Public Funds for Public Access.

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead it would be referred to the Environment Advisory Group for consideration as the detail of the Motion fell within the remit of the Executive. A report would be considered at Executive and the outcome reported to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Tony Vickers and seconded by Councillor Howard Woollaston.

“That Council notes:

1. How the pandemic has highlighted the importance of outdoor exercise for our mental and physical health and wellbeing and our understanding of the interconnections between farming, biodiversity and food production;
2. That the Environment Agency accepts that the benefits of outdoor exercise could be worth billions to the NHS and care services;
3. That the Environment Bill includes provision for “public funds for public goods”;
4. That the Agriculture Act contains powers to provide financial assistance to support public access to the countryside, through replacing the EU funding system known as the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP);
5. The excellent work done by this Council’s Rights of Way Team and many volunteers from bodies represented on the Mid & West Berkshire Local Access Forum to maintain and improve public access to our beautiful countryside, and
6. The emphasis in our local planning and transport policies towards more ‘active travel’ opportunities, as part of combating Climate Change.

Council therefore supports the campaign of the Outdoor Access Alliance of organisations that represent countryside access groups to enable this “BREXIT Bonus” for funding to be channelled through local government to help improve our rights of way network;

And calls on this Council to work with local and national organisations to improve the relationship between urban communities, landowners and farmers as the rural environment and economy is transformed by BREXIT and climate change, so that all our residents better understand the connections between food production, biodiversity, landscape and public health.”

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17b refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon relating to the finish time for Council meetings.

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead it would be referred to the

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Constitution Review Task Group for consideration, and following that, a report would come back to Council later this year.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Lee Dillon and seconded by Councillor Carolyne Culver.

“That the decision to end a meeting of Full Council rests with the Members in the Chamber deciding a suitable end time rather than any pre-set limit.”

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17c refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Tony Linden relating to sprinklers.

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead be referred to the Planning Advisory Group and the Asset Management Group for consideration prior to a report being considered by the Executive. The outcome of that would also be reported to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Tony Linden and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks.

“That this Council:

- Acknowledges that sprinklers and other Automatic Fire Suppression Systems (AFSS) save lives, protect property, reduce the impact of fire on the environment, reduce interruption to business and improve safety for individuals in the community in general and firefighters. In recognising these benefits supports the National Fire Chief’s Council position on sprinklers by writing to Central Government to express support for the creation of a legal requirement to fit sprinklers or AFSS in buildings.
 - Commits to installation of sprinklers or other AFSS within its own building stock when planning for and constructing new buildings or as a retrofitted solution when undertaking major refurbishments of existing buildings.
 - Through building regulations, promotes and supports the installation of sprinklers or other AFSS for all new or refurbished buildings and particularly those that present the most significant risk to the public and firefighters.”
-

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17d refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Lynne Doherty relating to Afghan Local Employed Staff.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion, if seconded, would be debated at the meeting.

Councillor Lynne Doherty proposed a minor alteration in the text of the motion confirming that the period of support in question was twelve months. Councillor Tony Vickers, seconding, agreed to this minor alteration. The amendment was additionally approved by Members present.

AMENDED MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Lynne Doherty and seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers.

“This Council recognises:

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

the commitment and bravery shown by Locally Employed Staff (LES) who supported British Armed Forces in Afghanistan; that many members of LES have had their safety threatened in Afghanistan and are at genuine risk due to their work with the United Kingdom; that HM Government has established two schemes designed to help current and former LES – the Ex- Gratia Scheme (EGS) and the Afghan Relocations and Assistance Policy (ARAP) each of which offers a route to LES meeting certain criteria to apply for leave to enter the UK; that LES who qualify and choose to relocate to the UK with their families are not expected to return to Afghanistan and that in due course they will be able to apply for permanent residence ensuring that they can settle permanently and build their lives and future here; and concludes:

- that the United Kingdom has a responsibility to make sure these individuals are protected from harm;
- that HM Government is right to introduce these schemes to support current and former LES.

This Council notes that it is being asked by HMG to provide **twelve** months of support to those LES who have been relocated (funded by HMG) including: reception arrangements upon arrival at the airport including handover from flight escorts and welcome briefing; accommodation; a package of advice and assistance covering employment, welfare benefits, housing, health, education and utility supply; assistance with registration with GPs and local Job Centre Plus (including allocation of a National Insurance Number); assistance in securing school places for school aged children; and cash support.

This Council Resolves to:

- inform HM Government that it is willing to support the ‘Afghan Locally Employed Staff – relocation schemes’; and
- develop plans to appropriately support the relevant LES and their families.”

Councillor Lynne Doherty in introducing the motion noted that her first motion as a new Councillor was to support the Syrian Refugee scheme, and commended the Council’s willingness to reflect this country’s support for refugees. This request to support the locally employed staff who assisted British troops in Afghanistan had come at the bequest of the Home Secretary, Secretary for Defence and Secretary for Communities and Local Government. Councillor Doherty stated that those workers who had assisted British troops as interpreters and medics, among other roles, were now at risk of retribution by the Taliban, and were no longer secure in Afghanistan.

Councillor Steve Masters noted that he wished to second this motion but could not as he was present remotely. Regardless, he commended Councillor Doherty for proposing it, and noted that he had encountered and been helped by many locally employed staff during his deployments around the world, particularly in the Middle East, and noted their dedication despite the dangers presented. Councillor Masters urged that assistance be extended to locally employed staff in other places such as Iraq, and that this be raised with the Home Office alongside this policy.

Councillor Masters reiterated the dangers, noting that at least 20 had been killed in Afghanistan, and stated that he would be following the work of the Council in implementing this motion. Councillor Masters concluded by warning that while this work was commendable, it was not right to believe that asylum should be limited just to those who had done something for the country, and that it should be universal, noting the integration of unaccompanied minors into schools and colleges in West Berkshire.

Councillor Dominic Boeck reassured Councillor Masters that the Council had the resources to support asylum seekers. Councillor Boeck commended the effort to grant

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

this asylum to locally employed staff and their families, and for helping them to settle in the community. Councillor Boeck noted that he had heard of the story of a care leaver in West Berkshire who had come as an unaccompanied minor, and had just graduated from university with a First Class Honours degree and was now studying for a Masters.

Councillor Andy Moore stated that he also wished to support the motion as the Armed Forces Champion. He requested that while the parallels were not exact, that any locally employed staff that were settled in West Berkshire be treated with the same respect as a member of the Armed Forces.

Councillor Tony Linden expressed his support for the motion.

Councillor Owen Jeffery endorsed the speeches made on the motion thus far, and noted that as a former member of the Royal Naval Reserve he wished to see those who had supported servicemen be treated right. Councillor Jeffery noted that while it was not a naval engagement due to the location of Afghanistan, many members of the Naval Reserve had gone and served, and expressed support for settling those who had helped before the situation in Afghanistan worsened.

Councillor Tony Vickers in seconding the motion stated that he was quite humbled to be doing so, noting that he had not put his life on the line during his service in the Armed Forces like Councillor Masters had. Councillor Vickers noted that his work as a military survey officer had brought him to West Berkshire, and that many in his role had served in Afghanistan. Due to that, locally employed staff who were settled in West Berkshire would be wholly welcomed by the community.

Councillor Lynne Doherty in concluding the debate stated that the teams working to settle locally employed staff in West Berkshire would work to help and integrate them. Councillor Doherty noted that it was a fast-moving situation and that the South East Migration Partnership would be very relieved by the support.

The Chairman informed Councillor Lee Dillon that as he had momentarily left the Chamber, he would be unable to vote. Councillor Dillon accepted this and stated that he would have voted in favour.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Council Chamber and remotely approved the Amended Motion.

The Amended Motion was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED**.

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17e refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks relating to the regeneration of the Newbury evening economy.

The Chairman informed the Council that as it related to an Executive function the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead be referred to the Economic Development Board for consideration prior to a report being considered by the Executive. The outcome of that would be reported to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Jeff Brooks and seconded by Councillor Erik Pattenden.

“In order to assist the regeneration of the Newbury evening economy and provide support to hospitality businesses, including cafes, restaurants and pubs, this Council resolves to:

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

- Introduce extended hours pedestrianisation of Northbrook Street and the Market Place with the utmost haste – with pedestrianisation lasting from 10.00 hours to 24.00 hours every day of the week.
 - This will give time between 00.00 hours to 10.00 hours for store deliveries with emergency vehicles having the ability to enter at any time by lowering the street barriers.
 - By such rapid measures, hospitality businesses will be able to take advantage of the longer summer evenings and extend their premises across pavements and outside areas.
 - Only by taking this decision this evening and implementing it with proper speed, will the Council be able to make a difference to this key economic sector in this summer.”
-

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17f refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks relating to the booking system in place at West Berkshire’s two Household Recycling Centres.

The Chairman informed the Council that as it related to an Executive function the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead be referred to the Environment Advisory Group for consideration prior to a report being considered by the Executive. The outcome of that would be reported to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Jeff Brooks and seconded by Councillor Adrian Abbs.

“During the period from March 2020 to May 2021 the public understood the need for the Council to take steps to protect them from Covid 19 and amongst those measures people understood the introduction of the Booking system at our two HWRCs in order to manage social distancing and those centres.

Now that our society is opening up, the public should expect the Council to rapidly re-instate the services that they pay their Council Tax to have available to them.

Whilst the Booking system at these facilities has merit, consultation with the public should be undertaken to help determine if such a system should remain in place.

Whilst that is undertaken, there is no reason for the restriction that allows a household to visit the facilities only once a week and for those facilities to close at 17.30 when they would normally stay open much later in the spring and summer months.

Since both centres are not particularly busy and a booking can be made on the day or at least the following day, we call upon the Council to immediately lift the once a week restriction and extend the opening hours without delay.

This is the time of year when households need maximum access to the facilities and we are bound to provide the access they are used to and have paid for.”

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17g refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver relating to a government proposal requiring that voters provide photographic identification to vote.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion, if seconded, would be debated at the meeting.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Carolyne Culver and seconded by Councillor Graham Bridgman.

“West Berkshire Council recognises that electoral fraud in the form of impersonating another voter at a polling station is a vanishingly small problem: at the 2019 general election, there were 34 allegations of this offence, with one conviction, out of 34 million votes cast.

Government proposals to introduce photographic identification as a requirement to vote are, therefore, unnecessary, putting up barriers to voting that would disproportionately affect people least likely to have appropriate documents, in particular members of disadvantaged communities.

According to the Electoral Commission, 11 million UK citizens have no driving licence or passport and 3.5 million no access to photo ID at all.

The burden to provide “free voter cards” for people in this position would fall on local authorities, at an estimated cost of £20m per election. It is unclear who would pay for this, but all too clear that this system would create much more work for council staff, both in between elections and at polling stations on Election Day.

This Council therefore urges the government to abandon these proposals, and to give an assurance to the people of West Berkshire that not a penny of their council tax will be spent on implementing any such scheme.”

Councillor Graham Bridgman noted that he had offered to second the motion because a second Green Member was not present to do so, and made a request to the Chairman that a Green Member be asked to speak at the end of the debate in his place. Instead, Councillor Lee Dillon offered to be a full seconder, and Councillor Bridgman withdrew to allow this to happen.

Councillor Carolyne Culver in introducing the motion thanked Councillors Bridgman and Dillon for their offers to second the motion. Councillor Culver noted that in the 2019 general election, there were just 39 allegations of election fraud out of 34 million votes, most of which was campaigning offences such as not putting the imprint on election literature or fraud in the nomination process. Only 24% of allegations were voter fraud, of which one conviction and one police caution actually occurred. In this context, Councillor Culver asked whether a Voter ID policy was necessary to combat this, and stated that it would instead act as a barrier to people wishing to exercise their right to vote. Councillor Culver noted the proportion of people without any form of photographic identification, and stated that many of these will be disenfranchised by such a policy, and turned away from the polling stations.

Councillor Culver noted the pilot scheme in Mid Sussex, in which 78 people were unable to vote, with three wards being won by margins under 25 votes and therefore potentially having their outcome changed. Councillor Culver noted that the free voter cards would create costs of up to £20 million, and add a strain on the work of officers who administrated elections, and who would need to heavily publicise such work. Therefore, Councillor Culver noted that the motion called for a total abandonment of such a policy by central government.

Councillor Ross Mackinnon stated that the issue that this motion was concerned with was a matter for central government, and there was little that could be done on a local level. Councillor Mackinnon noted the line in the motion calling for council tax to be unaffected by the policy, and responded that the Cabinet Office had made it clear that central

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

government would bear the cost. Councillor Mackinnon noted that it was not an unusual request that voters present such identification, and was common around the democratic world and Europe, and that it was required in Northern Ireland since 2003, and was recommended by the Electoral Commission, an independent and impartial body, since 2014. Councillor Mackinnon noted that voter impersonation was not often detected and apprehended because it was a relatively easy crime to commit, with investigation of electoral fraud in Tower Hamlets showing it was a much wider phenomenon than believed. Councillor Mackinnon said that he believed it would therefore be dishonest to take these statistics at face value. Councillor Mackinnon additionally noted that IFS statistics had found 98% of voters had the necessary ID, with non-typical and expired ID being accepted.

Councillor Tom Marino stated that applying for a job, foreign travel, or opening a bank account were all things that required photographic ID, and that voting would not be out of place. Councillor Marino noted that it was additionally required in British Overseas Territories such as Gibraltar, and that it had been successful in Northern Ireland at tackling the issue of voter impersonation. Councillor Marino noted that the overwhelming majority of voters had no issue, and that it had no notable effect on turnout, with voters returning with acceptable ID, and only 0.3%-0.7% of people having this issue in trials. Councillor Marino disagreed with the assertion that it was voter disenfranchisement, noting that free voter ID was readily available to all voters, as well as with the statement that the issue was too small to tackle, stating that it was a crime. Councillor Marino finished by quoting a Forbes article that stated that the only reasons to oppose voter ID was either from ignorance of the issue, or an understanding that there was a benefit from voter fraud to a party or candidate.

Councillor David Marsh noted that Councillor Marino had compared relatively mundane tasks with the valuable exercise of democratic rights. Councillor Marsh stated that free voter ID was akin to ID cards, and quoted Boris Johnson's opposition of the proposal in the early 2000s, and quoted David Davis' statement that it was an illiberal solution to a non-existent problem. Councillor Marsh disagreed that it would present no costs to local government, noting that that promise from the Cabinet Office was not present in the White Paper, and stated that it would be additional strain on poll workers and discourage people from voting. Councillor Marsh noted voter suppression efforts by Republicans in the United States included stringent requirements for voter ID. Councillor Marsh stated that if the policy was implemented for the 2023 local elections, that would make West Berkshire guinea pigs for the policy, and noted that the effects from the policy was more likely to impact Members with low turnouts in their wards, with voters in those wards needing encouragement to vote instead. Councillor Marsh stated that if voter impersonation was an issue that the central government cared about, polling cards would be sufficient enough to discourage it.

Councillor Erik Pattenden quoted Councillor Marino's assertion that voter impersonation was a vanishingly small problem, and stated voter ID was proposing to fix a problem that did not exist, and questioned why liberally-minded MPs such as that for Newbury would support it. Councillor Pattenden noted that voters needed encouragement to vote, and that voting was for many people the only level of political engagement they had. Councillor Pattenden asserted that the proposals would disenfranchise voters, making them unable to access the ability to have their say on local services.

Councillor Marino raised a point of order to state that he did not say that voter impersonation was a "vanishingly small problem" and had been misquoted by Councillor Pattenden.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Owen Jeffery stated that the policy was an unnecessary scheme aimed to suppress those who opposed the government.

Councillor Adrian Abbs quoted Councillor Marino's assertion that turnout would drop by between 0.3% and 0.7%, noting that that was between 123,000 and 287,000 people disenfranchised. Councillor Abbs stated that it was an undemocratic, illiberal policy, and urged democratically-minded Conservatives to oppose it.

Councillor Alan Law stated that the first two elections he had voted in were in Northern Ireland, where he was encouraged to "vote early, vote often", and that Northern Ireland was a place which was incredibly sensitive to peoples' rights. Councillor Law stated that despite voter ID, constituencies in Northern Ireland had the highest levels of turnout in the country, and so the policy was not discouraging voting.

Councillor James Cole noted that Councillor Law's statements were correct, and noted that government had taken too long to make the proposal.

Councillor Graham Bridgman stated that if a person wished to impersonate somebody on the electoral register, they were going to make certain that they were not discovered. The policy was therefore necessary, as discouragement would be more effective than enforcement.

Councillor Lee Dillon disagreed with the assertion that this was not a local issue, stating that it was the job of local authorities to lobby central government and reflect the feelings of residents on any issue, especially one such as this policy which would adversely affect residents of West Berkshire. Councillor Dillon disagreed with the assertion by Councillors Mackinnon and Law due to the absence of evidence, and disagreed with Councillor Law that voter ID and high turnout in Northern Ireland were related. Councillor Dillon asked the Council whether they trusted members of the community, and whether they were interested in encouraging people to get out and vote for them. Councillor Dillon stated that a Freedom of Information Act request to the Electoral Services team in West Berkshire had revealed zero instances of electoral fraud in the district's history. Councillor Dillon concluded that there was no beast of electoral fraud, that safeguards already existed for voters who feared they had been impersonated, and so the policy was an effort to suppress voters.

Councillor Howard Woollaston as Portfolio Holder stated that catching voter impersonation was almost impossible, and as a liberal conservative he could not see any issue with ID cards, and so he would be opposing the motion.

Councillor Culver thanked Members for having a fair, good-natured debate, contrasting it with the UBI motion. Councillor Culver urged Members to vote on the issue with their heart, not based on party line.

Councillor Law raised a point of order that Members were not asked whether they wished to vote against during indicative votes. Councillor Brooks concurred, stating that indicative votes should give clear indications of who supported and who opposed. Councillor Jeffery requested a named vote, which the Chairman rejected.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Council Chamber and remotely rejected the Motion. 17 in favour, 21 against, 1 abstention.

The Motion was put to the vote and declared **LOST**. 6 for, 8 against, 0 abstentions.

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17h refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon relating to green infrastructure.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

The Chairman informed the Council that under Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission for consideration and report back to the Council as this was a matter within their remit.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Lee Dillon and seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers,

“This Council notes that:

- Core Strategy policy 18 (CS18) defines the current football club site at Faraday Road as Green Infrastructure (GI).
- That CS18 requires that developments resulting in the loss of green infrastructure or harm to its use or enjoyment by the public will not be permitted.
- Where exceptionally it is agreed that an area of green infrastructure can be lost a new one of equal or greater size and standard will be required to be provided in an accessible location close by.
- That the recent West Berkshire Council Playing Pitch Strategy (approved Feb 2020) highlights that ‘there is a significant deficit of 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) provision in the area, with only one full sized 3G pitch available to the community (at Park House School) and a requirement to increase provision. There is a deficit of 7 full sized 3G AGP’s currently, based on FA calculations of 38 teams per 3G AGP.

Council therefore resolves that:

- The Executive have acted outside of the Council’s existing policies in relation to Green Infrastructure.
- Given the requirement to replace green infrastructure with ‘a new one of equal or greater size and standard’ means that the new facility being promoted at Newbury Rugby club is not a replacement facility for the current football club, but that it does help in reducing the deficit of AGP’s in the district.”

Councillor Lee Dillon in introducing the motion observed that the motion was being referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission, which was not a decision-making body, and would instead make recommendations, and so Councillor Dillon did not understand why such a referral was appropriate. Mr Shiraz Sheikh clarified that the OSMC would consider and report back to Council. Councillor Dillon questioned why a Council motion required input from another body, and why such a decision had been made against his wishes.

Councillor Alan Law responded that as the Chairman of OSMC he had sympathy with Councillor Dillon, and that the Commission should have been consulted on an item being added to their agenda. Councillor Dillon responded that he was the Vice-Chairman of OSMC, and agreed that it was inappropriate, asking who had responsibility for referring the motion. The Chairman responded that he did, and Mr Sheikh clarified that the decision was made because the motion suggested that the Executive had acted outside of Council policy. Councillor Dillon asked whether the Chairman wished to refer a motion to OSMC if neither the Chairman nor Vice Chairman would accept it. Councillor Law interjected and denied that he said he would not accept it, but reiterated that he should have been consulted. The Chairman stated that he had taken legal advice in making the decision, and that it was based on a thorough consideration of the information provided to him. Councillor Dillon responded that he respected the Chairman’s decision, but not the advice and information given to him on the question of motion referral.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17i refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs relating to defibrillators.

The Chairman informed the Council that under Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would not be debated, and instead be referred to the Health and Wellbeing Board for consideration with a report to Executive, as the matter fell within their remit. The outcome of that would be reported to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Adrian Abbs and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks,

“This Council notes:

- That existing telephone boxes are being offered to the council for free or as little as £1.
- That telephone boxes make ideal environments to place public access defibrillators due to their existing power and the shelter they offer.
- That defibrillators are known to save lives.
- That those minutes and seconds are critical to a positive outcome where defibrillators are used.

This Council, therefore resolves to:

- (1) Take a default position where it would adopt any telephone boxes being offered throughout West Berkshire for use as an Open Access Defibrillator location.
- (2) Install an Open Access Defibrillator in each adopted box should another defibrillator not be present within 100 metres.
- (3) Make residents local to that defibrillator aware of its presence
- (4) Provide a “how to use a defibrillator” guide to all residents within 400 metres of the device.
- (5) Ensure the location of the device is added to the emergency services register of defibrillators.
- (6) Undertake the minimal servicing required to keep the devices active or devolve this to the local parish or town council.

Cost

Costs are maximum £1500 per defibrillator including purchase and installation.”

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17j refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers relating to proposals for the reform of the planning system.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion, if seconded, would be debated at the meeting.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Tony Vickers and seconded by Councillor Adrian Abbs,

“Council notes:

- A. that the Queen’s Speech announced that “plans to modernise the planning system, so that more homes can be built” in England, will be brought forward in a Planning Bill in this Parliament and
- B. that the plans set out in the Planning White Paper were in the main last autumn unanimously rejected by this Council on the advice of its professional planners and

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

- C. that the House of Commons Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee's first report on those plans, published in May, have criticised that White Paper on numerous counts, including:
 - 1. Denying local people and their local councils from having any influence on individual planning applications;
 - 2. Further diminishing the prospects for achieving public acceptance of Local Plans and hence the democratic accountability of those Plans;
 - 3. Failure to include any measures to incentivise developers to complete consented housing developments in a timely manner;
 - 4. Absence of any additional resources for Local Planning Authorities
- D. Furthermore the Select Committee report refers to its predecessor's report on Land Value Capture in 2018 which called for more of the uplift in land value resulting from allocation of land for housing and from planning consent to be captured for public benefit. This could be perhaps by breaking the link between 'hope value' use in compulsory purchase, which gives landowners – including some in West Berkshire - and a small number of large national speculative homebuilders immense unearned profit, greatly reducing the available funding for high quality, affordable homes and their essential infrastructure.
- E. This Council has no confidence that the measures in the White Paper will achieve the Government's stated aims without tackling these problems in the land market at the same time – problems which are widely accepted to be more significant than any flaws in the planning system.

The Council therefore resolves:

That whilst it supports the aspirations of the Government to take urgent measures to restore a functioning land and homes market that results in more affordable and better quality homes and a socially sustainable and climate resilient built environment, it will write to the three MPs representing West Berkshire urging them to resist those measures in the Planning Bill that their colleagues on the all-party Select Committee have so roundly condemned and to call for a more fundamental reform of the land market."

Councillor Tony Vickers in introducing the motion stated that he intended to withdraw the motion. Councillor Vickers noted that the Leader of the Council, Councillor Lynne Doherty, had assured him that she had worked through the Local Government Association and with central government to secure significant improvements to the Planning Bill that would address fears of all parties and parts of local government. Councillor Vickers stated that he would withdraw the motion for now to allow that process to take place and for central government to fulfil that promise.

Councillor Vickers highlighted Part D of the motion on Land Value Capture, noting that the main concession that would be achieved by the LGA would be the retention of local consultation. However good the involvement of local communities in the planning system, and however radical the reforms proposed, the issue causing the lack of housing provision was not the planning system, but the failure of the land market to allocate appropriate value, and that increased the wealth divide in society. There was therefore not enough value in building good and affordable homes, or to provide necessary infrastructure.

Councillor Vickers brought a procedural motion to withdraw the motion under Procedural Rule 4.9.12.f. The Chairman recommended that it be withdrawn.

Councillor Doherty raised a point of personal information to note that Councillor Vickers wanted to see the Council liaise with MPs and central government, which was what they were already doing. The Planning Bill White Paper received a cross-party response and was going to significantly change, but the final proposal was still unclear. Councillor

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Doherty noted that it was up to the Portfolio Holder and the PAG system to compose another cross-party response, and thanked Councillor Vickers for withdrawing.

The Procedural Motion to withdraw the Motion was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED**.

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 17k refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Graham Bridgman relating to Covid-safe Member participation in public meetings.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion, if seconded, would be debated at the meeting.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Graham Bridgman and seconded by Councillor Lee Dillon.

“Background

With the expiry of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 any public meeting (“Meeting”) of the Council or a Council Committee, Board, Sub-Committee, etc (“Body”) must take place in person at a single, specified, geographical location (“Meeting Room”).

However, there is a continuing need to ensure that Meetings are conducted safely and follow public health guidance regarding covid precautions, social distancing, etc.

Motion

In order to ensure that Meetings are held in a covid-safe manner, but that each member of the Body (“Member”) can contribute to, and members of the public can engage with, the Meeting, this Council RESOLVES that, at the sole option of the Chairman of the meeting (“Chairman”):

- those individuals who are not physically in the Meeting Room but are present virtually - including Members, other members of council, officers and members of the public - may be invited by the Chairman to speak, provided that they would be allowed to speak if physically present;
- those Members who are not physically in the Meeting Room but are present virtually may be invited by the Chairman to join in an indicative, but non-binding, vote so that the Members in the Meeting Room can gauge the feelings of the entire membership on a particular item before voting substantively upon it;
- where a member of the public, interested party, etc, has a right to ask a question at, or make a submission to, the Meeting, they may choose to ask that question or make that submission virtually; and
- the requirement for any questioner to say (eg) “I ask my question as set out in the Summons” is replaced by an option for the Chairman to refer to the question and invite the person responding to answer; but that
- nothing in this Resolution affects the ability of the Chairman to determine how a question shall be answered as set out in the Constitution (eg at 4.12.5); and
- the Monitoring Officer is authorised to publish a statement setting out the effect of this Resolution in the Constitution and in any other place considered necessary to bring it to the attention of anyone affected as she deems fit, and to publish any Protocol or Guidance regarding the way in which the Council conducts Meetings.”

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Graham Bridgman in introducing the motion stated that the Council meeting was currently being run under a non-notice procedural motion, and that the Motion would prevent them from having to propose such a procedural motion each time a meeting was held. Councillor Bridgman noted that he hoped central government would listen on the question of virtual meetings, on which an overwhelming majority of local authorities agreed, and bring forward legislation to allow them to happen. Councillor Bridgman noted that this motion was wider than Covid-19, but would allow for permanent engagement from Councillors who could not attend and members of the public who would not normally engage. Councillor Bridgman described the process of indicative votes as 'clunky', but noted that they would get better over time, once the Chairman and officers had found an effective way in which to hold them.

Councillor Jeff Brooks firstly congratulated the Chairman on conducting the indicative votes, but stated his view that the process of debating and voting tonight would be disengaging and confusing to observers, and did not work. Councillor Brooks disagreed with the embrace of virtual work and meetings, stating that it would be damaging to socialising, networking, training and mentoring. However, Councillor Brooks stated that as the process was necessary in certain situations, he would vote for it, but asserted that he opposed Councillor Bridgman's suggestion that the system could be used permanently, as councillors should be seen to be working and representing properly.

Councillor Doherty disagreed with Councillor Brooks, asserting that the Council had been hugely innovative in their embrace of virtual meetings and engagement, and willingness to continue adapting to changes. Councillor Doherty stated that digital was here to stay, and commended the officers and the Chairman for facilitating the changes and working through difficulty to do so. Councillor Doherty conceded that the process was not perfect, but that the legislative process was going to be slow to adapt. Councillor Doherty highlighted the hybrid system as being particularly innovative, and supported the motion.

Councillor Tony Linden stated that he had chaired a hybrid meeting, and that he hoped the government would legislate to allow people attending remotely to properly vote.

Councillor Richard Somner disagreed with Councillor Brooks, stating that as a manager in the NHS, he had seen an enormous need for remote working, which allowed those who had been shielding, self-isolating or with childcare needs to continue to work. Councillor Somner stated that he did not believe anybody was suggesting that everybody work from home, and that instead it was a means to use digitalisation to work around problems, and that other members would understand that it was a force to enable people to take part, noting the use of YouTube to allow people to watch the meetings.

Councillor Rick Jones noted that he had chaired a hybrid meeting, and agreed with Councillor Brooks that it was clunky, awkward and difficult to chair. Councillor Jones however stated that times had changed, and that the Council needed flexibility and the ability to use digital to return to some form of normality.

Councillor Claire Rowles noted that hybrid meetings were difficult, and was a cultural shift for members. She commended the Monitoring Officer and Chairman for their work facilitating the meeting. Councillor Rowles noted that the Council must move with the times and adapt to virtual engagement and voting, and engaging people in politics through digital.

Councillor Adrian Abbs concurred with Councillor Brooks' preference for physical meetings, and noted that technology was a tool for fixing a problem, and that it would not change the preference for physical engagement. Councillor Abbs supported the motion because it was important to ensure hybrid meetings were as good as they could be, but that until it was truly effective, it should not be completely relied on.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Tom Marino agreed that the provision of virtual meetings had been very important over the previous 18 months, and agreed with Councillor Linden that there should be provisions set aside for those with genuine needs. However, Councillor Marino did somewhat agree with Councillor Abbs and Councillor Brooks, and expressed a preference for physical meetings as they were more natural.

Councillor Lee Dillon in seconding the motion stated that he agreed with all Members, but reiterated that the debate was not about working from home in the future, or the Council's provisions in the future. Instead, it was a stopgap measure, and that it was to fix a current problem and put all Members on the same footing. Councillor Dillon stated that it was also a question as to whether officers or Members should make decisions, and if Members were to make decisions it would need to be over digital solutions. Councillor Dillon expressed his wish that physical meetings be returned to where practical, apart from resident and voter engagement, where the convenience of residents should be put before the Council's processes.

Councillor Woollaston as Portfolio Holder expressed his preference for physical meetings, but noted that it was an important solution to improve the diversity of candidates.

Councillor Bridgman in summarising responded to Councillor Brooks by expressing that he looked forward to the return of physical meetings, and did not wish to replace them with virtual meetings. However, it was important to deal with the current issue. Councillor Bridgman expressed that there were three things that would be achieved or enhanced by this Motion. Firstly, streaming of meetings would be kept as it would hugely increase the abilities for engagement. Secondly, that it would increase the level of public engagement, without requiring residents to come to the building in Newbury. Thirdly, to allow Members who could not attend to engage fully with the meeting, and contribute to debates even if they could not currently vote. Councillor Bridgman stated that there would be a myriad of reasons why Members would not be able to attend, and all should be covered, and expressed his wish that they would soon be able to vote.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Council Chamber or remotely approved the Motion. 35 in favour, 0 against.

The Motion was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED**.

39. Members' Questions

A full transcription of the Member question and answer session is available from the following link: [Transcription of Q&As](#).

- (a) A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of the pupil premium was answered by the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Education.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Councillor Phil Barnett on the subject of electric scooters was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Transport.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of CIL was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Transport.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of the booking system at recycling centres was answered by the Executive Member for Environment.

COUNCIL - 8 JULY 2021 - MINUTES

- (e) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the allocation of parish councillors to wards was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.

(The meeting commenced at 7:00PM and closed at 10:26PM)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. T. Jones', is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

9 September 2021