

# **COUNCIL**

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON**

### **THURSDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2020**

**Councillors Present:** Adrian Abbs, Steve Ardagh-Walter, Peter Argyle, Phil Barnett, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Jeremy Cottam, Carlyne Culver, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Owen Jeffery, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Ross Mackinnon, Alan Macro, Thomas Marino, David Marsh, Steve Masters, Andy Moore, Graham Pask (Chairman), Erik Pattenden, Claire Rowles, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Joanne Stewart, Martha Vickers, Tony Vickers, Andrew Williamson, Keith Woodhams and Howard Woollaston

**Also Present:** John Ashworth (Executive Director (Place)), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Sarah Clarke (Service Director (Strategy and Governance)), Andy Sharp (Executive Director (People)), Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer) and Moira Fraser (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Jeff Cant, Joseph Holmes (Executive Director (Resources)), Councillor Gareth Hurley, Councillor Rick Jones and Councillor Geoff Mayes

**Councillor Absent:** Councillor Nassar Kessell

#### **PART I**

##### **16. Chairman's Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting including those that were watching the webcast and in particular he welcomed the Honorary Aldermen and Alderwomen who were watching the meeting remotely. He apologised for the short delay in the commencement of the meeting.

The Chairman used the opportunity to pass on his heartfelt thanks all the volunteers and voluntary groups across the District as well as Officers for all the hard work they were undertaking to improve the lives of residents during the Covid pandemic. The Chairman noted that, since the last Council meeting, due to the pandemic he had only been able to attend one official event on behalf of the Council and that was to the laying of a wreath at an event to mark VJ Day in Newbury.

##### **17. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

##### **18. Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Carlyne Culver, David Marsh, Tom Marino, Graham Bridgman, Lynne Doherty, Tony Vickers and Martha Vickers declared an interest in Agenda Item 16a, but reported that, as their interest was a personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and would vote on the matter if a vote was undertaken.

*Following a vote the meeting was adjourned at 7.20pm and was reconvened at 7.33pm to give Members an opportunity to consider information that had been provided to them shortly before the meeting.*

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

### 19. Petitions

There were no petitions presented to the meeting.

### 20. 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 submitted by Mr Graham Storey on the subject of the yield generated by the Council's commercial property portfolio received a written response from the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (b) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the Council's definition of an affordable care placement received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (c) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the number of affordable placements, excluding Walnut Close, that were available in West Berkshire received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social.
- (d) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the current average price paid by West Berkshire Council for an externally purchased placement received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (e) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the current average price for a placement in one of the West Berkshire Council managed Care Homes, excluding Walnut Close, received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (f) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the number of dementia placements available in West Berkshire, excluding Walnut Close, received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (g) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the number of dementia placements available in West Berkshire Council managed Care Homes, excluding Walnut Close, received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (h) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the Council's projections for the number of patients diagnosed with Dementia in the fiscal years ending 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (i) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of how the Council's projections of the number of patients diagnosed with Dementia compared with the CPEC published projections for West Berkshire received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (j) A question submitted by Mrs Paula Saunderson on the subject of the Council's plans to address the predicted shortage in affordable supply of placements received a written response from the Executive Member for Adult Social Care.
- (k) A question submitted by Mr Paul Morgan on the subject of the reasoning behind turning the London Road Industrial Estate into a housing estate received a written response from the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (l) A question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of the number of contract tracers employed and trained by the Council and private companies received a

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

written response from the Executive Member for Public Health and Community Wellbeing.

- (m) A question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of the level of training and resourcing of the Council's tracing team and its impact on the ability to deliver other services received a written response from the Executive Member for Public Health and Community Wellbeing.
- (n) A question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of having to reduce services if no additional financial support was offered by Government received a written response from the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (o) A question submitted by Dr Julie Wintrup on the subject of training for Councillors on the use of social media received a written response from the Leader of the Council.
- (p) A question submitted by Mr Alan Pearce on the subject of timescales for accessing CVS files relating to planning applications on the Council's website received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing.
- (q) A question submitted by Mr Alan Pearce on the subject of submission dates of URLs to the national register of developer contributions received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing.
- (r) A question submitted by Mr Alan Pearce on the subject of access to information and agreements relating to highway improvements along the A339 received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Countryside.
- (s) A question submitted by Dr Susan Millington on the subject of the publication dates of the delivery plan for the Environment Strategy received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Environment.
- (t) A question submitted by Dr Susan Millington on the subject of the Council purchasing and leasing land for woodland creation received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Environment.
- (u) A question submitted by Mr Paul Morgan on the subject of the Council's reasons for refusing to publish the Surfacing Standard Limited report looking at possible alternative sites for the football ground received a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.

### **21. Membership of Committees**

No changes to the membership of Committees were proposed at the meeting.

### **22. Motions from Previous Meetings**

Councillor Lee Dillon requested that the request to note the outcomes of the motions be deferred to the December Council meeting as the links set out in the agenda were not working properly.

### **23. Licensing Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 14 May 2020.

### **24. Personnel Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Personnel Committee had met on 14 May 2020 and the 17 July 2020.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

### 25. **Governance and Ethics Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Governance and Audit Committee had met on 14 May 2020, 15 June 2020 and 24 August 2020.

### 26. **District Planning Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the District Planning Committee had met on 14 May 2020 and 08 July 2020.

### 27. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission had met on 14 May 2020, 25 June 2020 and 28 July 2020.

### 28. **Joint Public Protection Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Joint Public Protection Committee had met on 24 June 2020.

### 29. **WBDC response to Planning for the Future White Paper (C3957)**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 15) which formulated the Councils' response to the Planning White Paper published in August 2020 which was currently out for consultation which would close on the 28<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers:

That the Council:

“formally responds to the consultation questions as set out in appendix 1 subject to the inclusion of the amendments circulated under separate cover and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and the Shadow Portfolio Holders for Planning to amend any typographical errors and make any additional minor amendments needed prior to submission.”

Councillor Hilary Cole thanked all those Members that had attended the briefings and provided comments directly to Officers on the consultation. She also wished to thank members of the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) who had held a frank discussion in formulating the Council's response where wide consensus was reached. She also wished to convey her thanks to Officers for all the work they had put into compiling the response.

Councillor Cole commented that the White Paper proposed a radical reshaping of planning and represented the biggest change to the planning system since the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act was introduced. She commented that not all the proposals were bad as some of the proposals would help to expedite the process. She felt however that speed and certainty should not be at the cost of democracy and quality and should not be to the detriment of future generations. She also did not feel that it was appropriate that residents would have to meet the costs of providing up front infrastructure which should be funded by the developers in the first place.

She noted that the South East Strategic Leaders Group, which the Council was a member of, and the Local Government Association would also be providing responses to the consultation. The Council was therefore also working collaboratively to respond to the consultation.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Some minor amendments, which had been circulated under separate cover, had been agreed at the last PAG meeting and those would be included in the Council's response.

Councillor Alan Macro stated that he was in broad agreement with the proposals put forward. He noted that at PAG there had been some disagreement over what the Government termed renewal or growth zones and protected zones where it was proposed that automatic planning permission would be granted. While he could see the merits of doing so in growth areas provided that master plans were in place there would however be a great deal of expenditure on these plans by the local authority who would simultaneously also be deprived of income from planning applications. He was very concerned about the automatic permissions associated with renewal zones and protected zones.

Councillor James Cole supported the Council's proposed balanced response. There were some issues with the existing planning regime that he believed needed to be changed and modernised. He was concerned that the changes would not impose a duty on developers to build out their permissions. He was also concerned that the proposals would to some degree centralise this function and would not adequately take cognisance of local initiatives such as the Neighbourhood Development Plans. He thanked Bryan Lyttle and his team for the approach they were taking and for their efforts in preparing the response. The Chairman echoed this thanks to Officers.

Councillor Alan Law stated that he agreed that Officers had done an excellent job in preparing a response and he was generally supportive of the approach proposed. He stated that the fundamental flaw with the proposal was that it was difficult to draft national policies that covered rural, metropolitan and urban areas. He did however agree that local plans did need stream lining. He supported the idea of development zones but stated that the devil would be in the detail as to how they would be implemented. He lamented that there was not a general countryside zone which was needed to make all of it work. He was not supportive of central government dictating the local housing numbers.

Councillor Adrian Abbs also passed on his thanks to Officers but stated that unfortunately he was not able to support the proposed response. He felt that the additional amendments set out on the addendum to the agenda weakened the Council's response. He would have preferred to stick to the original responses.

Councillor Tony Linden was concerned about the long term approved sites that were not being developed and were being land banked. He would prefer to see permissions being lapsed where development was not commenced.

Councillor Tony Vickers was happy to second the motion. The reason for the change from 'no' to 'not sure' was to reflect that much of the detail was not yet available. He supported stream lining the process, making best use of digital technology, focussing on better design, sustainability and beauty, improving infrastructure delivery and ensuring that communities could engage and support the process. There were some issues that did concern him. The first was the notion that the planning system had failed which had resulted in a failure to deliver the number of houses needed, there was no evidence to support this in the paper. He believed that this was a result of land market failure which needed to be addressed. He was also concerned that the planning system was also not being properly funded.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor Hilary Cole thanked Members for their cross party support and work on this issue.

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

### 30. Notices of Motion

*(Councillors Carlyne Culver, David Marsh, Graham Bridgman, Lynne Doherty, Tony Vickers and Martha Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda item 16(a) by virtue of the fact that they had invested in the Council's Abundance Bond. As their interest was personal and not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest they determined to remain in the meeting and take part in the discussion on this item.*

*Councillor Tom Marino declared a personal interest in Agenda Item (16(a) by virtue of the fact that he was employed by Alok Sharma MP, who was the Secretary of State for Business and Energy. As his interest was personal and not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest he determined to remain in the meeting and take part in the discussion on this item.)*

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 16(a) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter relating to locally generated renewable energy. It was noted that Councillor Adrian Abbs would however be proposing the motion.

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would be referred to the Environment Advisory Group for consideration prior to a report being submitted to the Executive. The outcome of that discussion would in turn be reported back to full Council.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Adrian Abbs and seconded by Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter:

That the Council:

"In our commitment to working towards being a Carbon Net Zero District by 2030 this Council has made a substantial investment in photovoltaic technology, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting renewable energy. In delivering this significant element of our Environment Strategy, we not only supply the Council with clean energy, we also reduce the cost of running our buildings.

However, the very large financial setup and running costs involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers result in it being very difficult, if not impossible, for local suppliers to do so. We recognise that making these costs proportionate to the scale of the renewable electricity supplier's operation would enable and empower new local businesses, or Councils such as West Berkshire, to be such providers of locally generated renewable electricity, and that the revenues received could be used to help improve the local economy, local services and facilities, and to reduce local greenhouse gas emissions.

The cross-party Local Electricity Bill, reintroduced into Parliament on 10 June and currently supported by 187 MPs, would, if made into law, establish a *Right to Local Supply* which would promote local renewable electricity supply companies and co-operatives by making the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate to the size of the supply operation.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

This Council would therefore welcome the opportunity to benefit further from the creation of a Right to Local Supply and RESOLVES to support the Local Electricity Bill and to seek the support of our local MPs in ensuring the passage of the Bill through Parliament and into law.”

---

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 16(b) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Joanne Stewart relating to the Equalities and Diversity Strategy and Policy.

The Chairman informed the Council that under Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would be debated at the meeting.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Joanne Stewart and seconded by Councillor Lynne Doherty:

That the Council:

“West Berkshire Council stands firmly against all inequality, unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation or any other form of activity that creates disadvantages for individuals within the community. The Council will always promote equality of opportunity, challenge inequality and ensure respect for **everyone**: within the local community; as an employer; and as a partner.

The Council forges strong links with all groups, both within West Berkshire and within other neighbouring authorities too. Through our Equality and Diversity Officer, we will continue to hear and listen to all voices, especially our hard to reach groups.

We will always promote fairness and accessibility to all services, as well as employment opportunities and apprenticeships and regardless of background.

As times and perspectives are evolving, it is even more important to reinforce our commitment to welcoming diversity and challenging inequality, and therefore this Council **RESOLVES** to:

- Update and refresh our Equality and Diversity Policy and Objectives, as well as implement an Equality and Diversity Strategy to lead us and our residents through these challenging times.
- As part of that Strategy we will ensure Council employees and Members continue to be fully informed and updated through regular Equality and Diversity training to promote positive and inclusive attitudes.
- Through the Health and Wellbeing Board we will work with local partners and review guidance issued by Public Health, to offer support for those at greatest risk of the impact of Covid-19.”

In proposing the Motion Councillor Stewart requested that the final bullet point be **amended** as follows and this was seconded by Councillor Doherty:

- ~~“Through~~The Health and Wellbeing Board **be asked to** ~~we will~~ work with local partners and review guidance issued by Public Health, to offer support for those at greatest risk of the impact of Covid-19.”

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

---

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 16(c) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor David Marsh relating to extending the 24 hour traffic free zone in Newbury Town Centre.

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would be referred to the Transport Advisory Group for consideration prior to a report being submitted to the Executive. The outcome of that discussion would in turn be reported back to full Council.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor David Marsh and seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers:

That the Council:

“notes the success of the 24-hour traffic-free zone covering part of Newbury town centre.

It made social distancing easier and was popular with shoppers. It helped to promote active travel, in line with the Prime Minister’s announcement on 28 July, which included a commitment to “improving air quality and reducing traffic” by introducing zero-emission zones in towns and cities, and with the Council’s own recently published Environment Strategy, which stresses the importance of reducing vehicle emissions.

This Council further notes that the threat posed by Covid-19, and the need for social distancing, remain, and are likely to do so for the foreseeable future. It therefore regards the decision to return to “business as usual”, taken without allowing Council members to debate the issue, or even informing them of the decision, and without consulting Newbury Town Council, as premature at best.

This Council further notes the following statement by Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport: “We’ve got a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create a shift in attitudes for generations to come.”

Allowing people to enjoy the town centre free of all but essential traffic is good for their health and wellbeing, and good for business. It conforms to the Council’s own aims with regard to carbon emissions, road safety, and creating a more attractive town centre for both residents and visitors. It is a win-win for the people of West Berkshire.

This Council therefore **RESOLVES** that:

- (a) The 24-hour traffic-free zone, with appropriate exemptions for deliveries and disabled access, be reinstated with immediate effect.
- (b) Officers will monitor the effect on social distancing, businesses (including the market), air quality and active travel, and report their findings to the Transport Advisory Group and Environment Advisory Group by the end of 2020.
- (c) Following this process, any recommendations as to making the traffic-free zone permanent or otherwise would be considered by the first full Council meeting of 2021.”

Councillor Carolyn Culver asked why it was not possible to debate this motion at the meeting that evening. The Monitoring Officer explained that the Constitution set out how motions relating to Executive functions had to be dealt with. Paragraph 4.9.8 of the Constitution stated that where the subject matter fell within the remit of the Executive it needed to be referred there without discussion. The motion proposed sought a road closure which was an Executive function and therefore it had to be dealt with in the manner explained by the Chairman.

---

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 16(d) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Richard Somner relating to fireworks.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

The Chairman informed the Council that in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8 the motion, if seconded, would be referred to the Licensing Committee for consideration prior to a report being submitted to full Council.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Richard Somner and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

That the Council:

“In consideration of the rural nature of the area we share, and communications received by both residents and animal welfare organisations such as the RSPCA, recognises the need to take action on the increasing concern of firework use across our District.

As a Council we have historically acted on the need to set appropriate licensing fees for fireworks and the need to restrict the areas in which sky lanterns can be used, this motion sets to add to those actions and to develop a safer environment for residents, their pets and the numerous livestock and wildlife in West Berkshire.

Whilst we recognise that fireworks are used throughout the year, and when used sensibly can be enjoyed by many, we approach a time of year when their use will see a dramatic increase.

The very nature of Fireworks as explosives are that they make loud and high intensity noises that are unpredictable and can affect a wide area.

As with sky lanterns, once reaching the ground the resultant debris can also pose a hazard to animals, such as horses and farm livestock.

We recognise that some people may not be aware of the anxiety or danger that may be created, and so there is a need to raise awareness generally including amongst owners of animals.

The short lived nature of firework noise can make it difficult for the police or local authority officers to pinpoint locations and take action.

This Council **resolves:**

- to require all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people
- to actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks
- to write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays
- to encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display.”

---

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (which was an urgent item) submitted in the name of Councillor Lynne Doherty relating to public engagement in remote Council meetings.

The Chairman informed the Council that In accordance with paragraph 4.9.4 (Urgent Motion) he had consented, as he believed that it was right and proper that the current arrangements be reviewed, that the motion be considered at this Council meeting as urgent agenda item.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

The Chairman reported that in accordance with Rule 4.16.1 [Six Months Rule] the Motion has been signed by at least one quarter of the Members of Council. (Councillors: Lynne Doherty, Graham Bridgman, Howard Woollaston, Hilary Cole, Ross Mackinnon, Richard Somner, Jo Stewart, Steve Ardagh-Walter, Dominic Boeck, Alan Law and James Cole.)

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Lynne Doherty and seconded by Councillor Lee Dillon:

That the Council:

**“RESOLVES** that, with effect from 1 October 2020:

- 1 Its Resolution of 29 April 2020 in relation to Remote Council Meetings is rescinded.
- 2 The following changes to the Constitution are approved insofar as they apply to Remote Council Meetings (“Remote Meetings”) only:
  - a) Any right given to a member of the public by the Constitution to make a submission to any Council meeting shall not apply to Remote Meetings. This right will be replaced with the ability to make written submissions.
  - b) Written submissions that replace the right of a member of the public to speak for up to five minutes shall be limited to a written submission of no more than 500 words. (This limit shall be applied pro rata to any different time limit detailed within the Constitution.) Written submissions must be submitted to the Council by no later than midday, two working days before the meeting.
  - c) Where practicable, written submissions made as an alternative to a previous right to address a Committee will be read aloud at the Remote Meeting. Where multiple parties make written submissions, these will all be made available to the Members of the Committee, but it will not be appropriate to read all aloud. In such circumstances, an officer will provide a verbal summary for the Remote Meeting of the issues raised.
  - d) Where a member of the public has made a written submission they will be invited to attend the Remote Meeting to answer any questions that Members of the Committee might wish to ask in relation to their submission (but questions may only be asked to clarify a statement made and not to introduce new business). If members of the public attend as invited they will be in the Remote Meeting with a right to speak for only so long as they are receiving and answering such a question or questions.
  - e) Where a member of the public has submitted a written question to a Council meeting they will be invited to attend the Remote Meeting to hear the answer to their question and to ask any supplementary question they might wish (in accordance with the Constitution). If they attend as invited they will be treated as being in the Remote Meeting with a right to speak for only so long as they are asking and receiving the answer to such a question or questions.
  - f) The requirement for any questioner to say (eg) “I ask my question as set out in the Summons” is replaced by a requirement for the Chairman of the meeting to refer to the question and invite the Member responding to answer.
  - g) Nothing in this Resolution affects the ability of the Chairman of the meeting to determine how a question shall be answered as set out in the Constitution (eg at 4.12.5).
  - h) Members of the public will have no right to present a Petition in person during a Remote Meeting.
- 3 Any statutory right for a person other than a Member or Officer of the Council to attend, and/or speak at, and/or raise verbal questions at, a Remote Meeting shall not be affected by this Resolution.
- 4 The Monitoring Officer is authorised to publish a statement setting out the effect of

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

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 to assist Members and others in the way in which the Council conducts Remote Meetings.”

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

### 31. 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) A question submitted by Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of progress on the work on the effect of inequality on the health and life chances of residents received a response from the Executive Member for Public Health and Community Wellbeing
- (b) A question submitted by Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of the number of refuge places for women and families at risk of domestic abuse received a response from the Executive Member for Public Health and Community Wellbeing.
- (c) A question submitted by Councillor Peter Argyle on the subject of assistance provided by the Council to young people after the summer break received a response from the Executive Member for Children, Young People and Education.
- (d) A question submitted by Councillor Jeff Cant on the subject of the plans for the Lido received a written response from the Executive Member for Public Health and Community Wellbeing.
- (e) A question submitted by Councillor Tom Marino on the subject of Council employees working from home received a response from the Executive Member for Internal Governance.
- (f) A question submitted by Councillor Carlyne Culver on the subject of the creation of a Nature Recovery Network received a response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.
- (g) A question submitted by Councillor Carlyne Culver on the subject of the permanent pedestrianisation of Northbrook Street received a response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.
- (h) A question submitted by Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of consultation with Newbury Town Council about traffic flow received a response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.
- (i) A question submitted by Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of involving Newbury Town Council in the master-planning of Newbury town centre received a response from the Executive Member for Planning and Housing.
- (j) A question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of the delay in responding to his motion on constitutional changes received a response from the Executive Member for Internal Governance.
- (k) A question submitted by Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of communication from government about preparing for dealing with the end of the transition period without any trade deals in place received a response from the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (l) A question submitted by Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of a response to the safer schools motion received a response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.

## COUNCIL - 10 SEPTEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

- (m) A question submitted by Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of having themed debates received a response from the Leader of the Council.

*(The meeting commenced at 7.15pm and closed at 9.37pm)*



**CHAIRMAN**

**Date of Signature**

3 December 2020