COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2021

Councillors Present: Adrian Abbs, Steve Ardagh-Walter, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Hilary Cole, Carolyne Culver, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Rick Jones (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Alan Law, Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Ross Mackinnon, Alan Macro, Thomas Marino, Steve Masters, Erik Pattenden, Garth Simpson, Tony Vickers, Andrew Williamson and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Sarah Clarke (Service Director (Strategy and Governance)), Susan Halliwell (Executive Director - Place), Joseph Holmes (Executive Director - Resources) and Andy Sharp (Executive Director (People)), Councillor Jeff Beck, Stephen Chard (Democratic Services Manager), Councillor James Cole, Councillor Gareth Hurley, Councillor Owen Jeffery, Councillor David Marsh, Councillor Andy Moore, Councillor Claire Rowles, Phil Rumens (Digital Services Manager), Councillor Richard Somner, Councillor Joanne Stewart, Councillor Martha Vickers and Councillor Keith Woodhams

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Peter Argyle, Councillor Jeff Cant, Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Councillor Billy Drummond, Honorary Alderman Adrian Edwards, Councillor Clive Hooker, Councillor Nassar Hunt, Councillor Geoff Mayes, Councillor Graham Pask and Honorary Alderman Andrew Rowles

PART I

40. Chairman's Remarks

It was noted that things were starting to return to normal after a year of disruption. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman had attended 11 ceremonies, including:

- The High Sherriff's reception.
- The Cycling and Wellbeing Festival in Calcot
- The Thames Valley multi-faith service organised by the High Sheriffs of Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire at Eton Dorney held in memory of those who had lost their lives during the pandemic.
- The dedication ceremony for the Newbury Friends of the Earth Lockdown Woods Project at Goldwell Park.
- The summer tea party of the Reading and West Berkshire Motor-Neuron Disease Association.
- The thank you event for West Berkshire staff at Shaw House.

The Vice-Chairman noted that it was Emergency Services Day and thanked the individuals that made up the emergency services teams who had gone above and beyond to keep communities safe. A two minute silence had been held that morning and the day had been marked with a video, which had been posted on the Council's social media channels.

He indicated that he had gained good insight into the external work of the Chairman and how it was appreciated by local communities.

41. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Vice-Chairman subject to the following amendments:

- On page 24, paragraph 7, it was clarified that Councillor Lee Dillon had said "there was no beast of electoral fraud that the Council had to fight against"
- Councillor Dillon had seconded the voter ID motion rather than Councillor Graham Bridgman.

42. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Claire Rowles declared an interest in Agenda Item 14, and reported that, as her interest was a disclosable pecuniary interest or an other registrable interest, she would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter.

43. Petitions

Councillor Phil Barnett presented a petition on behalf of residents of Mill Lane and Connaught Road in Newbury requesting traffic calming in Mill Lane. He noted that the residential area was on the south side, with many properties built in the pre-war period and without double glazing. Although the road had a 20 mph speed limit, vehicle travelled in excess of 30 mph and some in excess of 40 mph. The road was not very wide and more parking permits had been issued that there were available parking spaces. The road was also used by HGVs, resulting in noise and disturbance. Residents sought traffic calming in the short-term, but hoped that when the new road link was built between Sainsbury's roundabout to Hambridge Road, through traffic would be discouraged from using Mill Lane.

The Chairman stated that the petition would be referred to the Highways Team for consideration.

44. Public Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: <u>Transcription of Q&As</u>.

- (a) A question standing in the name of Anthony King on the subject of traffic forecasts for the Membury Industrial Estate and the capacity of the local road network was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (b) It was agreed that a question standing in the name of Louise Coulton on the subject of biodiversity experts used by the Council would receive a written response given that she was unable to attend the meeting.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Steven Beeson on the subject of the David Lock reports was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Alison May on the subject of professional surveys of trees, hedgerows and ponds was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Simon Pike on the subject of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (f) It was agreed that a question standing in the name of William Beard on the subject of changes to planning guidance to support take-up of electric vehicles in the AONB would receive a written response given that he was unable to attend the meeting.
- (g) A question standing in the name of Paul Morgan on the subject of competitive tendering for the Monks Lane sports hub was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.

- (h) A question standing in the name of Alan Pearce on the development contract with St Modwen Developments Ltd was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (i) A question standing in the name of Alan Pearce on access to files relating to development agreements, developer contributions and development transactions was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (j) A question standing in the name of Vaughan Miller on the subject of planned activities and milestones for the proposed sports ground at Monks Lane was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (k) A question standing in the name of Vaughan Miller on the subject of the Council's plans to welcome Afghan refugees was answered by the Leader of the Council.

45. Membership of Committees

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

Councillor Lynne Doherty proposed that Councillor Andy Williamson replace Councillor Peter Argyle as a substitute for the Eastern Area Planning Committee. The motion was seconded by Councillor Ross Mackinnon. At the vote, the motion was **RESOLVED**.

46. Licensing Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 6 September 2021.

47. Personnel Committee

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

48. Governance and Ethics Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Governance and Audit Committee had met on 26 July 2021.

49. District Planning Committee

Councillor Ross Mackinnon highlighted that although the agenda papers indicated that the District Planning Committee had met on 8 September, the meeting had in fact been cancelled.

50. Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had met on 10 August 2021 and 31 August 2021.

Councillor Lee Dillon stated that there were no published minutes, so Members were not aware of what had been resolved or discussed at the meeting. He indicated that he would be abstaining from any vote.

Sarah Clarke confirmed that a vote was not required and informed Members that the item was just to advise them that the meetings had taken place and suggested it should be noted that the minutes had yet to be published.

Councillor Alan Law noted that any minutes would be in draft form and would not be approved until the subsequent meeting.

51. Joint Public Protection Committee

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Joint Public Protection Committee had not met.

52. Recommendations of the West Berkshire Council Independent Remuneration Panel 2021 (C4117)

(Councillor Claire Rowles declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 14 by virtue of the fact that she was Chairman of the Health Scrutiny Committee. As her interest was personal and prejudicial she left the meeting and took no part in the debate or voting on the matter).

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 14) concerning Recommendations of the West Berkshire Council Independent Remuneration Panel 2021. The report set out the recommendations of the West Berkshire Independent Remuneration Panel following their meeting on 23 June 2021.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Howard Woollaston and seconded by Councillor Tony Linden:

That:

"Council is asked to consider and, if appropriate, agree the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel as set out in paragraph 4.10.

Authority be delegated to the Service Director: Strategy and Governance to amend Part 14 of the Constitution (Members' Allowances Scheme) and the associated procedures and guidance in line with any changes agreed by full Council.

Once amended, Part 14 of the Constitution (Members' Allowances Scheme) be publicised as directed in The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003."

Councillor Howard Woollaston introduced the report and highlighted three minor errors in the report, which did not have any significant impact on the recommendations.

- 1. On page 45, reference was made to paragraph 4.10, but the correct reference was paragraph 5.
- 2. The same error was repeated on page 49.
- 3. In paragraph 6.2, the future review of all Members' by September 2024 should have been a recommendation.

Councillor Woollaston explained that the Health Scrutiny had been setup to deal, since the issues involved were highly technical and beyond the remit of OSMC, with Councillor Claire Rowles had been appointed as Chairman. It had been agreed, given the significant amount of time required and the associated level of responsibility, that the Chairman should receive a special responsibility allowance. The recommendation was for a Tier 7 allowance, which matched those for Licensing, Governance and Ethics and Personnel Committees.

Councillor Carolyne Culver noted the chart on page 56 suggested that the Minority Group Leader received an allowance in 2019/20, but she confirmed that it was only last year or the start of the current year that the Independent Pay Review decided that the Minority Leader would receive an allowance and the Minority Leader did not exist before 2019. Also, she sought clarification that the Opposition was entitled to an allowance provided they had at least four Members and the Independent Pay Review decided that the Minority Group would be entitled to an allowance if they had at least three Members, but

they had voted to postpone that and the introduction of a higher allowance for all Councillors. She asked for this correction to be made. She had been asked if she had refused the allowance in 2019/20, but it had not existed at that time.

Councillor Lee Dillon supported the findings of the report. He considered Health Scrutiny to be an important function and confirmed that OSMC did not have the time or resource to focus on it. He agreed that it would be a lot of work for the Chairman and so the role should be allocated a Special Responsibility Allowance.

Councillor Linden noted that he had been Chairman of the previous Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee and had been paid an allowance. He indicated that there was a lot of work associated with the role and so it merited an allowance.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and those attending remotely indicated that Members were supportive of the Motion.

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

53. Notices of Motion

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15(a) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver.

The Vice Chairman informed the Council that should the motion be approved, under Procedural Rule 4.9.8 it would be referred to the Environment Advisory Group for consideration, prior to a report being considered by Executive. Councillor Culver would be invited to attend the meetings where this Motion was discussed in order to explain the motion. The outcome of the process would be reported back to Council.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Carolyne Culver and seconded by Councillor Steve Masters:

"West Berkshire Council notes:

West Berkshire Council declared a climate emergency in July 2019 and subsequently produced an Environment Strategy and Environment Strategy Delivery Plan, with the objective of delivering carbon neutrality by 2030 in support of limiting global warming to less than 1.5 degrees centigrade.

The Environment Strategy Delivery Plan includes objectives designed to protect and enhance biodiversity.

The climate emergency cannot be tackled by reducing emissions in isolation. Our ecological systems are intrinsic to life on earth and should be protected and enhanced as a valued asset.

The State of Nature 2019 report highlighted the critical decline in biodiversity in the UK, where 15 per cent of species are threatened with extinction.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the relationship between humans and nature. When we destroy and degrade habitats, we disrupt the equilibrium of our ecological systems resulting in an increased risk of transference of pandemic type diseases between wildlife and humans.

The State of the World's Plants and Fungi 2020 report from Royal Botanic Gardens Kew estimated that 39 per cent of plants are threatened with extinction.

The IPCC Report Sixth Assessment Report published in August 2021 concluded that climate change is 'widespread, rapid and intensifying' and urgent action is required to reduce carbon emissions and secure the long-term sustainability of planet earth and its inhabitants

In June the previously titled Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill was reintroduced for the 2021/22 parliamentary session as the Climate and Ecology Bill with support from across the House of Commons.

The government is running a public consultation about Nature Recovery Network Strategies, which ends on 2 November 2021.

West Berkshire Council resolves to:

- Declare an ecological emergency.
- 2. Support the Climate and Ecology Bill and ask the Leader to write to our three local MPs urging them to support it.
- 3. Participate constructively in the government's public consultation about Nature Recovery Network Strategies before it closes on 2 November."

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15(b) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Alan Macro.

The Vice Chairman informed the Council that the motion should be debated in order to facilitate the discharge of business in accordance with Procedural Rule 4.9.8.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Alan Macro and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

"Recognising that Council should take every measure to ensure that no resident is excluded from council services and also recognising that many residents are not familiar, or not comfortable, with using online services, or with using payment methods such as direct debit.

Council therefore resolves that:

- all services should be accessible to residents in person, or by phone as well as online
- all payments by residents for council services can be made by cheque, or by credit or debit card, in person, or by phone, as well as via all forms of online banking."

Councillor Alan Macro in introducing the Motion indicated that the Council existed to provide services and support for its residents. He believed the Council should do its utmost to do so in ways that were appropriate for each resident. He was keen to make the most of technology that allowed the Council to deliver services in a more efficient way. While he preferred to use the Internet to access Council services, many residents were unable or uncomfortable in doing do. Some had conditions that made it difficult or impossible to use the Internet, while others did not have access or could not afford high quality broadband. He noted that some people relied on pay as you go mobile phones which had a high cost for data, while others did not have relevant devices and could not easily access local libraries. He added that using online services was fine if you knew what you wanted, but it was better to speak to someone if you were unsure. He felt that the Council must allow residents to contact it in person or by phone. He acknowledged that direct debits worked well for some people, but some people were uncomfortable with giving organisations powers to take money out of their bank accounts, while others wanted control of when money was taken so they would avoid becoming overdrawn. He noted that some people preferred to use credit cards so charges could be spread over a period of time, and 4% of adults did not even have a bank account. Therefore, he felt that the Council must allow residents to pay for services using debit or credit cards as well as direct debit. He suggested that the Council should cater for all residents regardless of

age and ability. This applied to all public-facing Council services. Councillor Macro stressed that the Council must put residents' needs at the forefront of what it did.

AMENDED MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Howard Woollaston:

That the Council:

"Recognising that Council should take every measure to ensure that no resident is excluded from council services and also recognising <u>first</u> that many residents are not familiar, or not comfortable, with using online services, or with using payment methods such as direct debit, <u>but second that the nature of some services are that they are by their very nature delivered online and thus not available in person,</u>

Council therefore resolves that wherever possible:

- all services should be accessible to residents in person, or by phone as well as online; and
- payments by residents for council services <u>should</u> be <u>permitted</u> by cheque, or by credit or debit card, in person, or by phone, as well as via all forms of online banking."

In introducing the proposed Amendment to the Motion, Councillor Hilary Cole indicated that while the Administration was supportive of the Motion, they could not accept it as it stood.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and those attending remotely indicated that Members were supportive of the proposed Amendment to the Motion. She advised that the Conservative Administration had achieved significant improvements in the quality of service to customers. When she had first joined the Customer First Programme Board, most systems had been paper based and transactions with residents were via phone, mail or face-to-face, but things had changed as people became more used to using the Internet. She suggested that there were many services where it would be inappropriate for them to be accessible to the public (e.g. Child Protection and Adult Safeguarding). She noted that there were many instances where online services had improved the customer experience (e.g. Housing and Kooth emotional health service for children and young people). Furthermore, she noted that the report a problem service meant that residents did not have to come to Market Street to report a pothole. However, the Council recognised that not all residents were comfortable in using online services or access, which was why residents could still access services in a variety of ways - letter, telephone and email as well as the website. She firmly believed that residents still needed to speak to people in certain circumstances, particularly when distressed. In the last month over 28,000 transactions were processed including 12,000 phone calls. Also, the Council had remained open for business during the pandemic, albeit with restrictions on personal payments. She assumed that the proposed Motion was related to annual subscription payments for the green waste collection service. She noted that residents could call the payment line or visit the Market Street offices, but stressed that the Council could not accept payments in cash. She indicated that the Council was committed to excellence in customer service and she believed that the officer who picked up the call should own the problem. She concluded by announcing that the Council would launch a customer charter later in the year.

Councillor Lee Dillon welcomed the amendment, but expressed concern that "wherever possible" would allow things not to be done. He accepted the examples of online services that had been given by Councillor Hilary Cole, but stressed that where a customer did not use these, support would still be provided by other means. He recognised that an app

would only be accessed online, but the services offered via the app would have an element of personal support.

Councillor Jeff Brooks expressed concern about digital exclusion and the ability to access services. He noted that discussions had been ongoing for many years about how to make services easier for residents to access, but he felt that the philosophy was not present yet. He suggested that accessibility should come first and delivery mechanisms second, and felt that there was a rush to online services to the detriment of people who had difficulty in using them. He suggested that some people got frustrated with online services and gave up. He welcomed the fact that the contact centre would continue to take calls and appreciated the broad support for the original motion. However, he noted that the green waste collection was strongly directing people to use direct debit and this was an example of where the department had made the decision on the basis of what would be good for them rather than the public. He agreed with Councillor Dillon about the use of the phrase "wherever possible" and wondered if reports should consider the impacts of changes to services on residents. He suggested that service accessibility should be monitored through the Executive system, and this should be the philosophy rather than service efficiency.

Councillor Dominic Boeck suggested that all parties were in agreement that the Council should act in a way that was best for its residents. He noted that the Kooth service would never be delivered in person because of its nature. He suggested that people were becoming 'digital natives' and demand for in-person contacts and payments would reduce, and a degree of elasticity was needed. He felt that the Administration would be taken to task if it did not live up to commitments around "where appropriate" or "where possible".

Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter noted that the green waste collection scheme was voluntary and required payment. He suggested that there was broad agreement on the need to be customer led and enabling customers to pay for Council services in the best way for them. He indicated that there was no desire to force people to use direct debit. However, because most garden waste subscriptions had to be taken over a narrow period of time, the Council was not confident that credit card payments could be taken in that window without causing online chaos. He suggested that the term "wherever possible" would cater for this sort of operational issue. He acknowledged that the Council had been forced to ask the majority of residents to make payment by direct debit, and they had done so, but indicated that credit card payments would be an option next year, including online and in–person options. He agreed that all parties were philosophically aligned on this issue.

Councillor Tony Vickers indicated that he broadly supported the proposed amendment, but was concerned if there would be occasions where cash payment could not be taken. He recognised that cash payments had reduced, but stated that some people would still want to pay in cash. He hoped that the word "possible" encompassed the word "legal" and that it was illegal to refuse to accept cash for essential, universal services.

Sarah Clarke confirmed that cash payments could be made via banks and the post office, but cash payments direct to the Council disappeared when the cash office was removed.

Councillor Alan Law noted there was agreement on both sides on the principles. He noted that there were some services that could only be provided online and so the term "wherever possible" was appropriate. He noted that the Motion and proposed Amendment focused on the means of communication, but he was more concerned about the content of the message. He had tried to report broken traffic lights, but the out of hours service did not have an option for him to be report a highways issue. He stressed that there was a need to look at the interfaces and messages.

Councillor Graham Bridgman indicated that he had helped to word the proposed Amendment. He noted that not all services could be made accessible in different ways and this had to be reflected in the wording of the Motion.

Councillor Erik Pattenden felt that provided alternative payment and communications methods were available then that would be acceptable. He suggested an impact assessment be included in Council reports where services were changing. This would provide reassurance that the impacts had been considered.

Councillor Lynne Doherty noted that the Council had a long list of KPIs, which had been reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission. She suggested that these could be changed as Members felt necessary. Also, she recognised that technology was changing and the Council had to allow people to contact it in different ways. She stated that West Berkshire Council had been one of the last public services to close in lockdown and one of the first to re-open. She thanked Councillor Macro for the Motion and supported the proposed Amendment.

Councillor Howard Woollaston noted that the proposed amendment addressed some key practical issues. He noted that the Council had processed 27,810 green waste requests and the Waste Team were confident of passing the previous year's total. He confirmed that 99% of payments were via direct debit. Credit card payments were made through the contact centre, or residents could pay directly at Market Street. This showed the system was working. However, he acknowledged concern about those who were not digitally enabled. He had only had one complaint. He indicated that the proposed amendment clarified the original Motion and hoped that Members would pass it.

Councillor Hilary Cole noted comments made by Councillors Brooks, Pattenden and Law, which she felt were valid and would take their suggestions to Customer First Programme Board to see how they could be incorporated in future reports. She noted that there was broad agreement on the issue and she believed in good customer service and that no customer should be disenfranchised, which was why the Council continued to offer alternative means of accessing services.

Councillors Jeff Brooks and Owen Jeffery expressed frustration that they were not permitted to suggest a change to the wording of the amendment.

Sarah Clarke confirmed that the current amendment had to be disposed of before further amendments could be considered.

Councillor Macro indicated that he shared others' concerns about the use of the words "wherever possible".

The proposed Amendment to the Motion was put to the meeting and duly approved.

AMENDED MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Jeff Brooks (based on the previous amendment) and seconded by Councillor Lee Dillon:

That the Council:

"Recognising that Council should take every measure to ensure that no resident is excluded from council services and also recognising first that many residents are not familiar, or not comfortable, with using online services, or with using payment methods such as direct debit, but second that the nature of some services are that they are by their very nature delivered online and thus not available in person,

Council therefore resolves there will be a presumption that:

 all services should be accessible to residents in person, or by phone as well as online; and

• payments by residents for council services should be permitted by cheque, or by credit or debit card, in person, or by phone, as well as via all forms of online banking unless it is clear that access by residents can only be delivered by online services."

Councillor Brooks indicated that the term "wherever possible" was subjective.

Councillor Dillon suggested that the proposed Amendment acknowledged the points made by Councillor Boeck that some services would be digital only.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and those attending remotely indicated that Members were supportive of the Motion.

Councillor Hilary Cole indicated that she was happy to accept the proposed Amendment.

Councillor Brooks felt that the proposed Amendment gave a clear steer to officers.

Councillor Steve Masters suggested that the parties should work more closely in future on working of Motions where there was broad agreement.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and those attending remotely indicated that Members were supportive of the proposed Amendment to the Motion.

The proposed Amendment to the Motion was put to the meeting and was duly approved.

Councillor Brooks felt that a good solution had been achieved. With regards to Kooth, he noted that the Council had engaged directly with young people prior to the advent of the Internet. In relation to the green waste collection scheme, he encouraged better communication.

An indicative vote of all Members present in the Chamber and those attending remotely indicated that Members were supportive of the Amended Motion.

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

54. Members' Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: <u>Transcription of Q&As</u>

- (a) A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver on the subject of Council owned property leased to tenants was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of the number of letters issued to residents threatening legal actions for comments on social and other media was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of the tender process for the Monks Lane Sports Hub was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of the completion date for the Monks Lane Sports Hub was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of funding allocated for the replacement pitch at the Monks Lane Sports Hub was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.

- (f) A question standing in the name of Councillor Alan Macro on the subject of negotiations with Sport England regarding the Monks Lane Sports Hub was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (g) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of public concern about anomalous electoral arrangements was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance. Leisure and Culture.
- (h) A question standing in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of the provision of budget papers and regular management accounts to Members of Kennet JAC was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (i) A question standing in the name of Councillors Phil Barnett and Billy Drummond on the subject of the use of front gardens for off-road parking was answered by the Executive Member for Planning and Transport.
- (j) A question standing in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver on the subject of attendance at the Parish Climate Forum was answered by the Executive Member for Environment and Waste.
- (k) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of officer time spent reviewing social media outside of the Council's own social media accounts was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (I) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of whether the Monks Lane Sports Hub would be a net carbon zero project was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (m) A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of consideration of Newbury Community Football Group's and the ward councillor's views on the Faraday Road football pitch was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (n) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the London Road Industrial Estate was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (o) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of ownership of the Monks Lane Sports Hub was answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Economic Development.
- (p) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of insurance of the Faraday Road Clubhouse was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.
- (q) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of meetings with Sport England was answered by the Executive Member for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.

55. Questions and Answers

(The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and closed at 9.10 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature 2 December 2021