

DRAFT

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

EXECUTIVE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 2020

Councillors Present: Steve Ardagh-Walter, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Hilary Cole, Lynne Doherty, Ross Mackinnon, Richard Somner, Joanne Stewart and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Joseph Holmes (Executive Director - Resources), Shiraz Sheikh (Legal Services Manager), Councillor Adrian Abbs, Councillor Jeff Brooks, Councillor Carolyne Culver, Councillor Lee Dillon, Councillor Clive Hooker, Councillor Owen Jeffery, Councillor Rick Jones, Councillor Alan Law, Councillor Alan Macro, Councillor Thomas Marino, Councillor David Marsh, Councillor Steve Masters, Councillor Erik Pattenden, Linda Pye (Principal Policy Officer), Councillor Claire Rowles, Phil Rumens (Digital Services Manager), Councillor Garth Simpson, Councillor Martha Vickers and Councillor Tony Vickers

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: John Ashworth (Executive Director - Place) and Andy Sharp (Executive Director – People)

PART I

15. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Leader subject to the following amendment:

Page 18, Item 11 – Future Arrangements for the provision of Public Health across West Berkshire, Wokingham and Reading - third sentence, third paragraph should read:

'They recommended dissolving the current arrangement and moving to two hub and spoke arrangements across three borough geographies.'

16. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

17. Public Questions

There were no public questions submitted.

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

(a) **Question submitted by Mr Ian Hall to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of the London Road Industrial Estate would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(b) **Question submitted by Mr Ian Hall to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of reports on the London Road Industrial Estate would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

(c) **Question submitted by Mr Ian Hall to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of Compulsory Purchase Orders in relation to the London Road Industrial Estate would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(d) **Question submitted by Mr Ian Hall to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of replacement premises for businesses on the London Road Industrial Estate would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(e) **Question submitted by Mr John Gotelee to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr John Gotelee on the subject of qualifications held by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(f) **Question submitted by Mr Peter Gower to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Mr Peter Gower on the subject of preventing people becoming homeless would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(g) **Question submitted by Mr Simon Pike to the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Mr Simon Pike on the subject of Mandatory Cycle Lanes would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.

18. **Petitions**

There were no petitions presented to the Executive.

19. **London Road Industrial Estate - Draft Development Brief (EX3946)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 6) concerning the draft Development Brief for the London Road Industrial Estate (LRIE) as submitted by Avison Young.

The Council had a new draft Development Brief that confirmed regeneration of the LRIE remained a viable proposition. It was acknowledged that the process would be long, challenging and potentially risky depending on whether the Council considered any element of self-delivery. Nonetheless, bringing forward regeneration was within the Council's capability.

The draft Development Brief set out a number of delivery options that represented different balances between financial risk and reward and corresponding levels of control. This level of information should give the Council confidence to now present the draft Development Brief to the public for comment and where the aim should be to appropriately acknowledge feedback on the draft Development Brief and publish it in its final form later in the year. At that point the Council could review matters again and consider in detail the next technical steps to be taken should the Council decide to proceed further in the process of bringing forward regeneration on the LRIE.

Councillor Ross Mackinnon stated that the report sought approval to publish the document and to launch a public consultation exercise. It had been a long held vision of

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

the Council to regenerate the site and it was hoped to attract high quality development with a mix of office and residential accommodation. The development of this area was linked to the Recovery Strategy.

The Development Brief confirmed that regeneration of the site was still viable and set out two overarching approaches – a 'Baseline Masterplan' which presumed a progressive plot by plot development or a 'Comprehensive Masterplan' which was holistic and where all elements were interrelated. Councillor Mackinnon confirmed that the Council was committed to supporting the existing businesses on the site.

Councillor Lynne Doherty seconded the report and stated that it confirmed the fact that West Berkshire was open for business and would secure job opportunities for future generations.

Councillor Tony Vickers raised concerns that the Council was looking at a masterplan which was business led. It would have no formal status as a planning document and therefore it presented as considerable risk. He noted that there seemed to be a number of gaps in the brief such as flood risk which was an important factor. He was also concerned about displacing existing business community assets who might incur a loss of revenue or constraints of moving from the current site. Councillor Ross Mackinnon responded that the Development Brief was silent on the planning issue was that the local authority had an interest as landowner which could be a conflict of interest and therefore it was proper to keep it separate. However, he acknowledged that Councillor Vickers had made valid points but he stressed that this report was merely asking for permission to go out to consultation and a further report would be produced for further consideration once the consultation exercise had completed and all responses had been taken into account.

Councillor Alan Macro stated that there were a large number of businesses on the estate who would be worried out their future and he asked what the Council would be doing to reassure businesses. Councillor Ross Mackinnon stated that the Council would commit to supporting businesses to remain on the site or to move to alternative premises.

Councillor Steve Masters referred to paragraph 9.45 of the Development Brief and asked whether there was any further detail which had been provided on the figures/assumptions. For example, how were the values arrived at, what was the cost of relocating the football ground, cost of SUDs and clean-up of the site and the compensation for businesses? Councillor Ross Mackinnon replied that these were very specific questions and this was not the forum for that level of detail. All of these queries would be answered by Officers through the consultation process.

RESOLVED that the publication of the draft Development Brief be approved and the public consultation on the draft Development Brief would be launched in order to bring forward regeneration on the London Road Industrial Estate.

Reason for the decision: To launch the public consultation on the Development Brief for the London Road Industrial Estate.

Other options considered:

- (1) To sell the Council's freehold interest in the London Road Industrial Estate.
- (2) To note the contents of the Development Brief and for the Council to decide not to initiate and drive forward regeneration on the London Road Industrial Estate.

20. West Berkshire Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Strategy (EX3944)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 7) concerning the proposed Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle Strategy.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor Richard Somner stated that this Strategy sat underneath the Environment Strategy and set out the Council's current direction to promote and develop low emission vehicles and charging infrastructure in West Berkshire. It provided a sound platform to build upon. Vehicle licensing data from the Department for Transport set out that there were 119,664 vehicles registered in the district in 2019 of which 1,007 were ULEV (0.84%). In 2019 for the UK as a whole ULEV's represented 0.68% of the vehicles registered which suggested that West Berkshire was slightly above the average ULEV uptake.

It was noted that work needed to begin on the actions within this proposed Strategy as soon as practical in order to build on existing use and improve uptake in the district promptly.

The Government might bring forward the requirement for all new vehicles to be electric to 2035, however, if the aims of the Environment Strategy were to be achieved, transport emissions needed to decrease rapidly and ideally be zero by 2030. Any delay effectively reduced the chance of achieving this by delaying measures to increase low emission vehicle uptake.

Councillor Somner in summarising stated that this was a rapidly changing sector but the strategy enabled the Council to plan and build upon the work already started and to keep it under review.

The report was seconded by Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter who fully endorsed the report. He agreed that this was a rapidly evolving sector which provided a number of consumer choices. He anticipated that over the next 3-4 years there would be even more purchases of electric vehicles. Hopefully the Strategy would encourage people to buy electric as it set out a framework.

Councillor Adrian Abbs noted that the Government was thinking about bringing forward the date for all new vehicles to be electric from 2035 to 2030. The Council's aim was to have zero emissions in the district by 2030. He felt that there seemed to be a lack of ambition and the Council should have a Zero Emission Strategy in place as otherwise the target date of 2030 would not be achievable. He also queried when the document had been drafted as it seemed to be out of date in some places and he therefore felt that the document should remain in draft form. Councillor Richard Somner agreed that this was an area which was evolving rapidly. Not everyone would be able to afford an electric vehicle and consequently there was a need to be realistic in order to bring the public and businesses on board. The strategy had been in draft form for some time and had been through various Boards and therefore the document would look slightly dated. However, it was a snapshot in time and would be reviewed on a regular basis through the Transport Advisory Group and the Environment Advisory Group. He would take the comments made by Councillor Abbs on board and he welcomed his engagement on this issue. Councillor Abbs stated that the outcome that all Members were aiming for was the same but he was asking Councillor Somner to consider a change in order to get ultra-levels down to zero.

Councillor David Marsh stated that the biggest problem was that some charging points were inaccessible as people tended to park in them who were not using electric vehicles. He felt that dedicated bays should be provided and he asked how that process could be accelerated in order to encourage people to take up the purchase of electric vehicles. Councillor Somner disagreed as he felt that the reason people were not buying electric cars was due to the cost – the cost needed to come down. The Council had a strategy and a plan in place and it could look at moving some of the charging units if necessary – this was something that would be reviewed regularly. However, it was possible for people to have a charge point in their home.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor David Marsh also asked if consideration could be given to taxis and the possibility of having more attractive licence fees if an operator used electric vehicles. The strategy seemed to be vague on this and he felt that this was an area where the Council should move more quickly as there was a willingness to embrace this by the taxi operators. Councillor Somner did not dispute the issue with taxis, however, a wide spectrum of discussion was required in terms of licensing, location and charging rates but he would ensure that this was something which was implemented as quickly as possible. Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to a discussion which had taken place at a Licensing Committee and his recollection was that there had been an issue with different fees for different vehicles but he would need to come back to Councillor Marsh on that.

RESOLVED that the Strategy and its actions be approved as the Council's direction for aiding the uptake of low emission vehicles in West Berkshire.

Reason for the decision: To approve the Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle Strategy which would enable Officers involved to work to a plan of action to help assist vehicle take up and annually report back to Environment Board on progress.

Other options considered: To do nothing.

21. 2020/21 Performance Report Quarter One (EX3883)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 8) concerning the provision of assurance that the core business and Council priorities for improvement measures were being managed effectively as at Quarter One of 2020/21. The report also highlighted successes and where performance had fallen below the expected level, presented information on any remedial action taken, and the impact of that action.

Councillor Jo Stewart stated that in Quarter One it was possible to see the impact of Covid-19 in some areas but there were many core business areas which had retained a 'green' position due to resilience in the workforce. One area which had been particularly challenging was the collection of non-domestic rates as this had been impacted by the Council's conscious measures put in place to support local businesses. Councillor Stewart highlighted a number of areas where performance had improved such as the Library Service, reduction in staff sickness and the launch of the Employee Assistance Programme.

Councillor Graham Bridgman seconded the report and stated that it included some interesting information. He referred to the significant drop in the number of people receiving long term services in Adult Social Care. This was largely due to Covid and it was an area where there had been a particularly high number of deaths. There had also been a reduction of 24.8% in the number of new adult safeguarding enquiries. The Care Quality Commission had not been operating as it had prior to Covid in terms of inspecting service providers as it had not wanted to add to the burden on care homes.

Councillor Lynne Doherty thanked Officers for their hard work in providing and contributing to the Quarter One report particularly as many had been involved in supporting the Covid response. The majority of indicators were positive but one area of concern that she raised was the increase in the number of reported domestic abuse cases which aligned with the national trend. There was a 36.8% rise in cases compared to the Quarter One figure for 2019/20. She was surprised to see this level of increase as the Council had done a lot of hard work in raising awareness around domestic abuse. Councillor Howard Woollaston confirmed that he had also been alarmed by this figure and he had raised the issue with Thames Valley Police. There was a difference between domestic crime and abuse. There was always more which could be done in this area and it would be necessary to ensure that thinking was joined up with other partner agencies.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

He would look at the background to the figure quoted in conjunction with Councillor Jo Stewart as he agreed that it did not feel right.

Councillor Lee Dillon thanked Officers for all their hard work and he was pleased to see such a positive report as he was sure that most Members would have expected to see a decrease in performance over this period. The focus around staff wellbeing was also welcomed. He noted that there had been a downturn in figures in a lot of areas and he was concerned that once services re-opened there would be a backlog which might be challenging for staff to accommodate. He supported the Business Rate exemptions but felt that the paper had not been updated as the decision around that had been made in August. Councillor Stewart confirmed that her focus was to ensure that staff felt supported at all times. She would also update the report to reflect the position around the Business Rate decision.

Councillor Erik Pattenden referred to paragraph 5.10 where it stated that referrals to Children and Family Services had reduced across the board. With the re-opening of schools there could be more referrals and he queried what capacity there was to cope with that. Councillor Dominic Boeck responded that the resources were the same as it had always been but this was a situation which needed to be monitored. However, the local authority also relied on partners to deliver services and if a peak did arise then it would need to be managed appropriately.

Councillor Alan Macro referred to paragraph 5.12 relating to the reduction in the number of new adult safeguarding enquiries and the fact that the focus had been on ensuring a thorough triage process. He queried whether all valid cases were getting through. Councillor Graham Bridgman responded that this was an area of uncertainty as it often relied on someone else to make the enquiry. However, those that presented were being dealt with properly. He would ask Officers to provide a more developed response to Councillor Macro.

Councillor Alan Macro also mentioned the exception reports and in particular the CQC rating for care homes. The report did not say much about Walnut Close and he asked for assurance that other domains would be addressed in the immediate future. Councillor Graham Bridgman confirmed that there was ongoing consultation taking place to look at the future of Walnut Close as the fabric of the building was not fit for purpose. Consultant were also looking at the whole provision of services at Birchwood.

Councillor Tony Vickers raised a number of issues in relation to increase in the number of households on the Common Housing Register and the likely further demand in the future; the drop in the number of permanent carriage repairs and the slippage of submitting a new Local Plan for examination by December 2022. Councillor Hilary Cole stated that the Housing Team were working closely with providers and there were financial packages in place. The expectation was that the numbers would rise. Councillor Vickers stressed the need for more affordable housing to accommodate people who might lose their homes. In relation to the carriage repairs Councillor Somner confirmed that a different scale of criteria would be used to review that as there had been a fewer cases of damage being reported to the Council. Councillor Hilary Cole confirmed that there had been slippage and this had been raised at Planning Advisory Group some months ago. This was due to vacancies in the Planning Policy Team but she was confident that the deadline of December 2022 would be achieved.

Councillor Adrian Abbs referred to paragraph 5.18 and the increase in fly tipping of 38%. He asked if the Portfolio Holder could explain the reason for that. Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter agreed that fly tipping was unwelcome at any time. However, incidents of fly tipping in this area remained low. West Berkshire was starting from a low base when compared with neighbouring authorities. Any rise was unwelcome but it was not green

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

waste which had been fly tipped but more general rubbish. The charge for the green waste collection service had not increased the fly tipping of green waste.

Councillor Alan Law confirmed that he was chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and had been involved in setting the targets. However, this was the first time that he had seen the results. He specifically referred to the target around supporting local employers which should state that Senior Officers and Members should meet with the Chief Executive of the top ten businesses on a regular basis. He therefore asked if Councillors Jo Stewart and Ross Mackinnon could review and change this target. Councillor Mackinnon confirmed that he would give consideration to amending this prior to Quarter Two along with a number of other KPI's.

Councillor Martha Vickers referred to the figures around domestic abuse and she stated that it was good to see that these were being looked into but she asked when it was likely to get a report back on what action was being taken. Would the report go to the Health and Wellbeing Board? Councillor Lynne Doherty confirmed that the Health and Wellbeing Board would be the best place to take it. It would be necessary to look at where the figure was coming from and if it was realistic. She was aware that work was ongoing on this issue but she agreed that the report should be directed to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

RESOLVED that progress and achievements be noted and to review the appropriateness of any remedial actions taken to improve performance, in particular in relation to non-domestic rates collected as a percentage of non-domestic rates due.

Reason for the decision: To note progress and achievements.

Other options considered: None.

22. **Treasury Management Annual Report 2019/20 (EX3947)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 9) concerning the results of the Council's management of cash-flow, borrowing and investments in the financial year 2019/20.

Councillor Ross Mackinnon confirmed that the report dealt with borrowing and investments. The Council's revenue cost of borrowing and investment was £10.8m which was £78k less than had been budgeted for. Interest earned on investments was higher than expected because the Council had gained more than expected from the pre-payment of pension contributions because the amount set aside in 2019/20 to contribute to the pension fund deficit was slightly higher than the amount required to be paid to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

The Council's borrowing and investment strategy set a limit of £5m to be invested at one time with any one institution. On two occasions the amount held in the Council's current account exceeded this amount by a maximum of £364k due to the fact that an unexpected sum of income had been paid in late in the day. This issue had been resolved within one working day.

Councillor Jeff Brooks referred to paragraph 5.41 and queried whether IT systems had flagged this issue up or had it relied on human diligence in picking it up. Councillor Mackinnon did not know the answer to this question but would find out and report back. Councillor Brooks also referred to the £10.8m revenue cost of borrowing and investment which was 8% of the budget and he queried whether this was acceptable. It was good to see the table in respect of assets against borrowing but he felt that it would be useful to also have a mini balance sheet included in the report and he asked if that could be taken into consideration. Councillor Mackinnon confirmed that that would not be a problem.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor Dominic Boeck seconded this report which was an indication of the prudent management of the Council's investment and borrowing by the Portfolio Holder with the support of Officers.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

Reason for the decision: To ensure that sufficient funds were available on a day to day basis to enable the Council's business to continue.

Other options considered: None.

23. **2020/21 Revenue Financial Performance Report Quarter One (EX3905)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 10) concerning the in-year performance of the Council's revenue budgets as at Quarter One of 2020/21.

The Council was forecasting an under spend of £590k. The report highlighted each directorate position and any implications for budget setting in 2021/22. There was a £3.2m savings and income generation programme which was forecasting 82% achieved at Quarter One. The Covid-19 grant funding received from Government to date, and the Council's level of general fund reserves meant that the Council was well placed to focus its efforts on response and recovery from the Covid-19 in the current financial year.

Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to the first bullet point in paragraph 4.2 which noted that long term services was forecast to be £844k under spent which was a result of a higher level of deceased clients compared to the same quarter in the previous year. It was stressed that this was a prediction and not an actual outturn figure. He confirmed that he would look in more detail at the long term services model with Officers.

Councillor Jeff Brooks noted that car park income was under considerable pressure and the budget seemed to be a moveable feast. Councillor Brooks would like to see further detail on a consolidated summary of all Government grants within the report. Councillor Ross Mackinnon agreed that the budget was moveable and that he was happy to consider the format changes proposed.

Councillor Alan Macro referred to paragraph 4.2 which stated that there would be an income pressure of £311k in the four Council care homes due to falling occupancy and yet on page 267 in Appendix A there was a forecast increase in income of around £800k within the Directorate and he queried why that was the case. Councillor Bridgman confirmed that he would have a discussion off-line with Councillor Macro on that.

RESOLVED that the Quarter One forecast of £590k under spend be noted.

Reason for the decision: To monitor performance of the Council's revenue budgets.

Other options considered: None.

24. **2020/21 Capital Financial Performance Report Quarter One (EX3906)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 11) concerning the under or over spends against the Council's approved capital budget as at Quarter One of 2020/21.

It was noted that at the end of Quarter One expenditure of £50.9million had been forecast against a revised budget of £56.4million, an overall forecast underspend of £5.5 million or 9% of the approved Capital Programme. This was due to the fact that Covid had started to have an impact causing delays on projects.

The main contributing factors to the forecast position were:

- A £2.3m underspend in Education Services mainly due to a delay in the Eastern Area PRU project and a forecast underspend against the planned maintenance budget.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

- Transport and Countryside were forecasting a £3.1m underspend primarily relating to the Robinhood Roundabout and A4 development.

Councillor Dominic Boeck seconded the report and reported that Education Services was largely responsible for the underspend due to delays to construction. This seemed to be getting back on track and he referred specifically to the recent completion and opening of Theale Primary School. Councillor Alan Macro agreed that Theale Primary School was an excellent facility and he congratulated all staff involved in getting the school up and running. The Leader of the Council echoed that comment.

Councillor Ross Mackinnon confirmed that the Council had recently received £124k of Active Travel funding from the Government and a further bid had been submitted.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and in particular:

- (1) The forecast financial position as at Quarter One.
- (2) £124k of additional external funding from the Phase One of the Emergency Active Travel Fund had been received by the Council. Under delegated authority, the S151 Officer and Portfolio Holder agreed allocation of the funding to the Transport and Countryside programme in 2020/21.
- (3) A further application was to be submitted (August 2020) for Phase Two Emergency Active Travel funding, with an indicative sum of £495k.

Reason for the decision: To monitor the Council's Capital budget.

Other options considered: None.

25. Members' Questions

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

(a) **Question submitted by Councillor Carolyn Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyn Culver on the subject of investment of pension funds was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.

(b) **Question submitted by Councillor Carolyn Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Environment**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyn Culver on the subject of the creation of a working group of local environmental experts to deliver the Environment Strategy was answered by the Executive Member for Environment.

(c) **Question submitted by Councillor Carolyn Culver to the Leader of the Council**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyn Culver on the subject of meeting arrangements was answered by the Leader of the Council.

(d) **Question submitted by Councillor Carolyn Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Environment**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyn Culver on the subject of training for Members on the Council's ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030 was answered by the Executive Member for Environment.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

(e) **Question submitted by Councillor Carolyn Culver to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyn Culver on the subject of the Joint Venture for Local Housing was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(f) **Question submitted by Councillor David Marsh to the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Councillor David Marsh on the subject of extending pedestrianisation of the town centre was answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.

(g) **Question submitted by Councillor David Marsh to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Councillor David Marsh on the subject of the development of Sandleford Park was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(h) **Question submitted by Councillor Steve Masters to the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of the OSMC task group report in relation to the London Road Industrial Estate was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance.

(i) **Question submitted by Councillor Erik Pattenden to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Young People and Education**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of impact of exam results on schools and colleges in West Berkshire was answered by the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Education.

(j) **Question submitted by Councillor Erik Pattenden to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Young People and Education**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of use of funding from a youth charity for the Waterside Centre was answered by the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Education.

(k) **Question submitted by Councillor Tony Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the extension of the Government ban on evictions by private landlords was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(l) **Question submitted by Councillor Tony Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the treatment of the master planning of the London Road Industrial Estate was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.

(m) **Question submitted by Councillor Martha Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Public Health & Community Wellbeing, Leisure & Culture**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of the impact of dismantling Public Health England was answered by the Executive Member for Public Health & Community Wellbeing, Leisure and Culture.

EXECUTIVE - 3 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

(n) **Question submitted by Councillor Tony Vickers to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the impact of the end of the furloughing scheme and resulting loss of income was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.

(o) **Question submitted by Councillor Jeff Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Countryside**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of parking incentives to assist the retail and hospitality sectors was answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.

(p) **Question submitted by Councillor Rick Jones to the Leader of the Council**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Rick Jones on the subject of the function of the Community Support Hub going forward was answered by the Leader of the Council.

(q) **Question submitted by Councillor Tom Marino to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Tom Marino on the subject of the success of the Community Municipal Investment vehicle was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.

(r) **Question submitted by Councillor Claire Rowles to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care**

A question standing in the name of Councillor Claire Rowles on the subject of the seven principles for reform of adult social care and support was answered by the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00pm and closed at 7.34pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature