DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

THURSDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 2015

Councillors Present: Steve Ardagh-Walter, Peter Argyle (Chairman), Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Nick Goodes, Manohar Gopal, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb (Vice-Chairman), Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Also Present: John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Sarah Clarke (Team Leader - Solicitor), Martin Dunscombe (Communications Manager), Nathan Gregory (Group Executive (Conservatives)), Rachael Wardell (Corporate Director - Communities), Honorary Alderman Jeff Brooks, Moira Fraser (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), Honorary Alderman Royce Longton, Charlene Myers (Democratic Services Officer), Linda Pye (Principal Policy Officer) and Honorary Alderman Andrew Rowles

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jeremy Bartlett, Councillor Jeff Beck, Councillor Sheila Ellison and Councillor James Podger

Councillor Absent: Councillor Paul Hewer

PART I

64. Declarations of Interest

The Deputy Monitoring Officer announced that in respect of Item 3 (Council Tax Discount for Vacant Property) all Members present at the meeting except Councillors Howard Bairstow and Nick Goodes had completed an Application for a Grant of a Dispensation in relation to "any beneficial interest" in land within the Authority's area. The Monitoring Officer had granted the dispensation to allow all those Members that applied for a dispensation to speak and vote on this item. Councillors Goodes and Bairstow would however not take part in the debate or vote on this item.

Councillor Alan Macro declared an interest in Agenda Item 4, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

All Members declared that they had been lobbied on Item 4.

65. Council Tax Discount for Vacant Property (C3045)

(All Members present except Councillors Bairstow and Goodes had been granted a dispensation to take part in the debate and vote on this item)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 3) which sought to clarify the policy on Council Tax discount for vacant properties as handed down from its meeting on 13th December 2012.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Roger Croft and seconded by Councillor Laszlo Zverko:

That the Council:

"revise the decision from 13th December 2012 so that, with regard to empty and unoccupied property formerly within exemption class "C", it reads as follows - Limiting the duration of exemption class "C" (empty and unoccupied property) to a maximum of 28 days per unoccupied period and allowing 100% relief during that period. The 28 day period free of council tax charges will be allowed when a property is first vacated, after which full council tax will become payable. If the property should become occupied during a period of 6 months commencing from a date of vacation, and is subsequently vacated during that same 6 month period, a further 28 day "free" period will not apply."

Councillor Roger Croft presented the report which asked Council to clarify the policy regarding rules for Council Tax discount on empty and unoccupied property which had been agreed by Council in December 2012. This need had arisen in response to the identification of the 2012 report's resolutions as being capable of a different interpretation than had been intended.

In December 2012 Council considered a report entitled "Technical Reforms to Council Tax". This report made various recommendations to change council tax discounts for empty properties following the relaxation of various statutory rules and the introduction of local discretion on the extent to which relief was allowed.

The relaxation of statutory rules coincided with a reduction in government grant when council tax benefit was replaced by local council tax reduction schemes. The report's recommendations focused on restriction of relief for vacant property in order to generate additional council tax income. This was a means to bridge the gap between the cost of council tax reduction and the reducing level of Government grant.

All recommendations were adopted by Council as policy to be applied from 1 April 2013.

Recommendation (5) to the report was "Limiting the duration of exemption class c (empty and unoccupied property) to a maximum of four weeks in any six month period and allowing 100% relief during that period".

The reference to a six month period related to the churn on shorter term tenancies – the intention being that, if a property were to be occupied and vacated for a second time before the expiry of a six month period, a further period of discount would not be allowed. However, recent events had indicated that this recommendation might be interpreted as giving longer term empty properties a recurring entitlement to a 28 day period free of council tax every six months. This was never the intention of the recommendation. The purpose of the December 2012 report was to seek the means to generate council tax income rather than to introduce new discounts. Members would have been aware of these factors and it was assumed that they took their decision based on the intention behind the Officer's recommendation.

Council were being asked to revise the text of the recommendation so that it was clear that an additional 28 day free period would not arise at the end of each six month period during which a property remained vacant.

The revised text recommended to Council was as follows:

"Limiting the duration of exemption class C (empty and unoccupied property) to a maximum of 28 days per unoccupied period and allowing 100% relief during that period. The 28 day period free of council tax charges would be allowed when a property was first vacated, after which full council tax would become payable. If the property should become occupied during a period of six months commencing from a date of vacation, and was subsequently vacated during that same six month period, a further 28 day "free" period would not apply."

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

66. West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD): Proposed Submission (C3023)

(Councillor Alan Macro declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4 by virtue of the fact that he lived opposite one of the sites (THE009) identified as a housing site in the DPD. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

(All Members declared that they had been lobbied on this item)

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 4) concerning the proposed submission version of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and supporting documentation. The report sought to approve these for publication for a 6 week period of public consultation before submission to the Secretary of State for Examination. This was a regulatory stage of the DPD process and required Council resolution.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Alan Law and seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole:

"2.1 That Council resolves that:

(1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the Newbury and Thatcham spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A are included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

2.2 That Council further resolves that:

(1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the Eastern spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A are included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

2.3 That Council further resolves that:

(1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the East Kennet Valley spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A are included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD and that sites for housing within the designated Neighbourhood Area of Stratfield Mortimer are allocated in accordance with the emerging Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2.4 That Council further resolves that:

(1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A are included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

2.5 That Council further resolves that:

(1) New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston, is included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as a permanent site for Gypsies and Travellers.

(2) Longcopse Farm, Enborne, is included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as a permanent site for Travelling Showpeople.

(3) Clappers Farm, Beech Hill, is included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as an area of search for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation after 2021.

2.6 That Council further resolves that:

(1) Policies C1 to C8 on Housing in the Countryside as set out in Appendix C are included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

(2) Policy P1 on Parking Standards as set out in Appendix C is included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

2.7 That Council finally resolves that:

(1) the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission documents are published in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;

(2) a period of six weeks from 9 November 2015 to 21 December 2015 is allowed for the receipt of representations on the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission documents in accordance with Regulations 17 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and following this

(3) the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document and accompanying documents are submitted to the Secretary of State under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and

(4) delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning and Countryside to agree any minor typographical and presentational changes to the proposed submission DPD and supporting documentation before publication."

Councillor Alan Law in introducing the report stated that an addendum had been circulated to Members which contained some factual amendments to Appendix F. Councillor Law explained that Members were being asked, as elected representatives of the people of West Berkshire as a whole, to consider the Development Plan Document (DPD) and that they should not be considering opinions of narrow sections of the community.

The Council adopted its Core Strategy in July 2012 which set out a housing requirement for the District of 'at least' 10,500 dwellings from 2006-2026. The Core Strategy set out an overall spatial strategy to accommodate this level of housing across the District and in addition it allocated two large strategic sites in Newbury (Newbury Racecourse and Sandleford Park).

Whilst the Core Strategy allocated strategic development and set out strategic policies, it only formed one part of the Local Plan. There was therefore a requirement to prepare additional document(s) to allocate non-strategic housing sites across the District and to allocate sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. Some policies were also being updated as part of this process, namely those related to development in the countryside and residential parking standards.

The DPD was prepared in a series of stages and information about these would be set out in the Statement of Consultation that would accompany the DPD. This would detail the key issues raised and the Council's response to these issues. The consultations had resulted in a significant number of comments, which had been taken into account in formulating the recommendations in the report.

The Council was required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to meet the 'full, objectively assessed needs' of the area and work had been completed on

establishing this requirement by undertaking a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in partnership with other Berkshire authorities and the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

The SHMA gave an objectively assessed housing need (OAN) for the District of 665 dwellings per annum between 2013 and 2036. Discussions were now underway about how the number for the Housing Market Area would be distributed, taking into account development opportunities and constraints to development.

This DPD allocated the remainder of the 'at least' 10,500 housing figure from the Core Strategy, with added flexibility in the numbers which included the long term Sandleford Park strategic site and windfalls. This approach meant that the Council was allocating the first part of the objectively assessed housing needs for the District, in the short to medium term. Following the adoption of the HSA DPD, a new Local Plan would be prepared. This would allocate the rest of the new housing requirement for West Berkshire and look longer term to 2036, as well as dealing with other policy issues.

The major part of the DPD was the site allocations for housing. The purpose of the DPD was to allocate smaller (non-strategic in scale and function) extensions to settlements within the settlement hierarchy in accordance with the spatial strategy of the West Berkshire Core Strategy. It was a regulatory requirement that this was in general conformity with the Core Strategy.

27 sites had been included within the DPD as housing allocations and each of these had a policy which set out parameters to guide the future development of the sites. A small number of contingency sites were included to give additional flexibility in case sites did not deliver as expected.

Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council was preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). This would include the allocation of housing for Mortimer in accordance with the Core Strategy. The Council was supporting the preparation of the Stratfield Mortimer NDP.

In addition to the housing allocations, settlement boundaries had been drawn around the developable areas of the housing allocations. In some cases further changes had been made to settlement boundaries in accordance with consistent criteria.

There was a requirement for the Council, as the local planning authority, to identify sites to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, based on the evidence set out within the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The DPD allocated a site for Gypsies and Travellers at Paices Hill and a site for Travelling Showpeople at Longcopse Farm in Enborne, and a policy was included for each of these allocations.

As already stated, policies to guide housing in the countryside were also included within the DPD. These policies reflected updated national policies and responded to local issues in Berkshire. They had been updated since the preferred options draft to reflect the outcomes of consultation and to reduce some repetition. Once adopted, the policies would replace some of the existing saved policies of the Local Plan.

Revised parking standards for residential development had also been amended following consultation and there were a smaller number of zones.

Subject to Council approval, the DPD would be consulted upon for six weeks, commencing on 9 November 2015. Post the consultation, once the consultation comments had been summarised, the DPD would be submitted to the Secretary of State for independent Examination. The DPD would be independently examined by a Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. The Inspector’s role was to assess

whether the plan had been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements had been met and whether it was sound. If the Inspector concluded that the HSA DPD was sound and met the necessary tests, it could be adopted by Council and would form part of the Local Plan for the District, helping to proactively manage development.

Councillor Law stated that it was vital that the document was adopted a whole.

Councillor Alan Macro stated that he had hoped to move an amendment to remove four of the sites. Sarah Clark explained that the amendment could not be moved as its effect would be to negate the content of the original motion. Councillor Macro stated that although he disputed that the amendment would negate the original motion he reluctantly accepted the reasoning. Councillor Macro accepted the need for more houses but set out his objections to a number of sites.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that if a Member was not present for the whole of a discussion they could speak to an item but not vote on the item. As Councillor Manohar Gopal had arrived after the discussion on this item had started he would not be permitted to vote on this item.

Councillors Graham Pask and Paul Bryant stated that if the Council did not adopt a Local Plan the Council would lose all control over housing numbers.

Councillor Emma Webster stated that while she supported development she would not support development in the wrong place without the necessary infrastructure in place. It was therefore with a heavy heart that she would be voting against the Eastern spatial area and the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

Councillor Anthony Pick noted that 84 sites had been put forward for Newbury and through this process the final number had been reduced to six. He therefore had no hesitation in recommending the DPD as proposed for Newbury.

Councillor Croft stated that it was important to have a DPD in place to protect Thatcham from large scale speculative development. The Lower Way site was not perfect but it was the least worst site in Thatcham.

Councillor Pamela Bale stated that she objected to site 002 in Pangbourne and felt that it was not viable in planning terms. She was concerned about the impact the development would have on the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that the site was hampered by poor road and pedestrian access. The site was outside the settlement boundary and there was some evidence of protected species on site. There were also issues around waste water. She however recognised the need to have a DPD in place and would therefore be voting in favour of that aspect of the report.

Councillor Garth Simpson stated that he objected to site 045 as he felt that it was not viable in planning terms and it was located in a sensitive landscape. He also felt that site CA006 was also not viable in planning terms as it was in a sensitive landscape, there were no pavements, had a high car dependency and would exacerbate the traffic issues outside St Finian's School. He however recognised the need to have a DPD in place and would therefore be voting in favour of that aspect of the report.

Councillor Anthony Chadley noted that 25% of the objections received during the consultation related to proposed development in his ward. He welcomed the fact that the Pincents Hill development had now been removed from the DPD. He believed that the saturation point had been reached with regard to congestion on the roads in this area and development would erode the green gaps. He therefore could not vote in favour of the DPD as currently proposed.

Councillor Graham Bridgman noted that a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) empowered a community in deciding where development should go. He therefore welcomed Mortimer's NDP and the impact that it had on the DPD.

Councillor Tony Linden supported the position taken by his fellow Ward Members and thanked their residents for their contribution to this process.

Councillor Lee Dillon commented that Thatcham had already had more than its fair share of development and that the infrastructure in the town had not kept pace with development. he felt that a period of consolidation was needed for the town.

Councillor Richard Somner stated that sites 0025 and 0026 in Calcot were not viable in planning terms primarily due to the impact on the area and flooding issues. The roads in the area were already congested and that the full impact of the IKEA development was yet to be ascertained. He did however agree that in principle a DPD was needed to ensure that the Council had control over where development would be permitted and he therefore supported its adoption.

Councillor Rick Jones explained that while he noted the opposition to the development in his ward and in the adjacent wards he felt that in the long term the Council would be in a worse position if they failed to maintain a five year land supply. He therefore reluctantly supported the proposals.

Councillor Adrian Edwards reminded residents that they could voice their concerns in the consultation period that would follow and that these objections would be considered by the Inspector during the Examination in Public of the DPD that would follow.

Councillor Marcus Franks stated that it was important to have the DPD in place so that power was not handed to the developers. He also noted that residents would have the opportunity to raise their objections when planning applications for individual sites were submitted.

Councillor Gordon Lundie thanked Councillors Alan Law and Hilary Cole for the work they had done in the preparation of the DPD. He also thanked those members of the public for attending the meeting.

Councillor Mollie Lock noted the hard work involved in the production of the Mortimer NDP. She explained that this group of people had worked very hard to achieve the right to chose where development would take place.

Councillor Billy Drummond commented that Greenham too had had more than its fair share of development.

Councillor Hilary Cole stated that while she had listened to the arguments, in order to remain a planning led authority, the Council had to adopt a DPD. She reiterated that the consultation that the authority had undertaken was not a statutory requirement but that Members were mindful of the views of residents. She thanked the members of staff that had worked hard to produce the documentation. She especially praised the dedicated Planning Policy Team. She felt that the DPD as presented was the right thing for the District as a whole.

Councillor Law thanked Councillors Keith Chopping and Hilary Cole for their hard work. While he accepted that there was opposition to some of the development he noted that the impact of not having a plan in place would be even greater.

RESOLVED that:

"2.1 (1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the Newbury and Thatcham spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A be

included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lynne Doherty, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb and Laszlo Zverko

Against the Motion:

Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Nick Goodes, Mollie Lock and Alan Macro

Abstained:

Peter Argyle, Anthony Chadley, Manohar Gopal, Marigold Jaques, Tony Linden, Garth Simpson and Emma Webster

2.2 (1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the Eastern spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lynne Doherty, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing and Quentin Webb

Against the Motion:

Anthony Chadley, Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Nick Goodes, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Alan Macro, Richard Somner, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Abstained:

Peter Argyle and Manohar Gopal

2.3 (1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the East Kennet Valley spatial area as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD and that sites for housing within the designated Neighbourhood Area of Stratfield Mortimer be allocated in accordance with the emerging Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lynne Doherty, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Clive Hooker, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law,

Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing and Quentin Webb

Against the Motion:

Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Mollie Lock and Alan Macro

Abstained:

Peter Argyle, Anthony Chadley, Nick Goodes, Manohar Gopal, Tony Linden, Ian Morrin, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

2.4 (1) The proposed housing allocations and settlement boundary changes in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) as set out in Table 1 of Appendix A be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lynne Doherty, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing and Quentin Webb

Against the Motion:

Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Mollie Lock and Alan Macro

Abstained:

Peter Argyle, Pamela Bale, Anthony Chadley, Manohar Gopal, Nick Goodes, Tony Linden, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

2.5 (1) New Stocks Farm, Paices Hill, Aldermaston, be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as a permanent site for Gypsies and Travellers.

(2) Longcopse Farm, Enborne, be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as a permanent site for Travelling Showpeople.

(3) Clappers Farm, Beech Hill, be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD as an area of search for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation after 2021.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Nick Goodes, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Against the Motion:

Mollie Lock

Abstained:

Peter Argyle, Graham Bridgman and Manohar Gopal

2.6 (1) Policies C1 to C8 on Housing in the Countryside as set out in Appendix C be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Nick Goodes, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Against the Motion:

None

Abstained:

Peter Argyle and Manohar Gopal

2.6 (2) Policy P1 on Parking Standards as set out in Appendix C be included within the proposed submission version of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Anthony Chadley, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Nick Goodes, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb, Emma Webster and Laszlo Zverko

Against the Motion:

Alan Macro

Abstained:

Peter Argyle and Manohar Gopal

2.7 That Council finally resolves that:

(1) the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission documents are published in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;

(2) a period of six weeks from 9 November 2015 to 21 December 2015 is allowed for the receipt of representations on the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Submission documents in accordance with Regulations

17 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and following this

(3) the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document and accompanying documents are submitted to the Secretary of State under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and

(4) delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning and Countryside to agree any minor typographical and presentational changes to the proposed submission DPD and supporting documentation before publication."

For the Motion:

Steve Ardagh-Walter, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Paul Bryant, Keith Chopping, Jeanette Clifford, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Roger Croft, Richard Crumly, Rob Denton-Powell, Lynne Doherty, Adrian Edwards, Marcus Franks, James Fredrickson, Dave Goff, Nick Goodes, Clive Hooker, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Marigold Jaques, Mike Johnston, Graham Jones, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Gordon Lundie, Tim Metcalfe, Ian Morrin, Graham Pask, Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Anthony Stansfeld, Virginia von Celsing, Quentin Webb and Laszlo Zverko

Against the Motion:

Anthony Chadley, Lee Dillon, Billy Drummond, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Alan Macro and Emma Webster

Abstained:

Peter Argyle and Manohar Gopal

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.58pm)

CHAIRMAN …….

Date of Signature …….