DRAFT

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

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

THURSDAY 15 OCTOBER 2026

Councillors Present: Stephanie Steevenson (Chairman), Martha Vickers (Vice-Chairman) Adrian Abbs, Antony Amirtharaj, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks, Billy Drummond, Patrick Clark, Heather Codling, Martin Colston, Jeremy Cottam, Iain Cottingham, Laura Coyle, Carolyne Culver, Nigel Foot, Denise Gaines, Paul Dick, Stuart Gourley, Clive Hooker, Owen Jeffery, Paul Kander, Alan Macro, David Marsh, Tom McCann, Erik Pattenden, Justin Pemberton, Vic Poole, Christopher Read, Matt Shakespeare, Richard Somner, Joanne Stewart, Louise Sturgess, Clive Taylor, Tony Vickers, and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Joseph Holmes (Chief Executive), Paul Coe (Executive Director for Adult Social Care), AnnMarie Dodds (Executive Director for Children and Family Services), Clare Lawrence (Executive Director for Place), Sarah Clarke (Executive Director for Resources), Bob Dray (Interim Service Lead for Planning), Nicola Thomas (Deputy Monitoring Officer and Service Lead for Legal and Democratic Services), Stephen Chard (Democratic Services Manager), Honorary Alderman Adrian Edwards, and Honorary Alderman Rick Jones

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jane Langford, Councillor Geoff Mayes, Councillor Ross Mackinnon, Honorary Alderman Hilary Cole, Honorary Alderman Anthony Linden, Honorary Alderman Graham Jones, Honorary Alderman Paul Bryant, Honorary Alderman Gordon Lundie, Honorary Alderman Andrew Rowles, Honorary Alderman Graham Bridgman, Honorary Alderman Mollie Lock, Honorary Alderman Keith Chopping, and Honorary Alderman Graham Pask

Councillors Absent: Biyi Oloko, Janine Lewis, and Nick Carter

PART I

1. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported that she had attended 26 events since the last Council meeting on 16 July 2026. Specifically, she highlighted her attendance at the 30th anniversary of the Royal Berkshire Charity, multiple care home visits, Afrofest, A-Level results day at the Willink School, tea in the Education Marquee at the Newbury Show, Longmoor Challenge Day, and multiple citizenship ceremonies.

The Vice-Chairman also attended a number of events since the last ordinary Council meeting, including the opening of the Shaw House Playground and the Gym at the Downlands Sports Centre, a visit to the Hungerford Day Care Centre, the BBC Radio Berkshire Make a Difference Awards, and the lights switch on at the Faraday Road Football Ground.

2. Minutes

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and seconded by Councillor Owen Jeffery:

“That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.”

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

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Tony Vickers declared an interest in Agenda Item 12(a) as he was the Council's representative on the North Wessex Downs Council of Partners Board. However, as this was not prejudicial, he determined to remain in the meeting and participate in the discussion and deliberation.

4. Petitions

Councillor Laura Coyle presented a petition containing 62 signatures relating to a requested reduction in the speed limit from the start of the national speed limit (60 miles per hour) on Holly Lane to the bottom of Palmers Hill.

The Chairman thanked the Member for presenting the petition and confirmed that officers would review it and confirm within ten working days what action would be taken.

5. Public Questions

Details of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: Q&As.

It was agreed that the questions standing in the name of Paula Saunderson (questions A, D, F, G, H, and I) would receive a written response, given that she was unable to attend the meeting.

(Councillor Howard Woollaston joined the meeting at 7.10pm)

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Tony Vickers and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

"That the order of business be varied so that Council consider Agenda Item 12(a) at this point."

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

6. Notices of Motion

The Council considered the first, under-mentioned, Motion (of which Agenda Item 12(a) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers relating to 'Protecting UK Farming'.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Tony Vickers and seconded by Councillor Chris Read:

That the Council:

"Protecting UK Farming

Council notes:

This Council thanks DEFRA for the recently announced extra support for English farming but recognises:

- *That farming is the backbone of the West Berkshire rural economy, directly sustaining around 1,000 jobs, supporting some 10,000 more and generating significant (circa £50million per annum) economic value annually while providing a critical service by putting food on the tables of the county's residents;*
- *That farming is central to our district's cultural identity and that this shared heritage unites Berkshire with our Ridgeway neighbours and the rest of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape;*

- *That farming is an industry which this Council is proud to support;*
- *That food security is both a national priority and a local responsibility, thus West Berkshire's farming community can play a key role in ensuring local communities have access to locally grown, affordable and nutritious food, particularly for households experiencing food poverty;*
- *That farmers and rural landowners in West Berkshire are custodians of the vast majority of our District's natural landscape and operate to some of the highest environmental, food safety and animal welfare standards in the world - with more than half engaged in agri-environmental schemes - and that it is important they are not placed at a competitive disadvantage by imports produced to standards that would not be permitted for domestic producers. The Council supports the principle that food imported into the United Kingdom should meet standards equivalent to those required of British farmers.*
- *That the decisions farmers make in our countryside can significantly mitigate the impacts of climate change, in particular by conserving and improving soil depth and quality and the special biodiversity supported by it on our chalk downlands.*
- *That likewise the decisions farmers make in our countryside can help protect our waterways and countryside from pollution by runoff.*
- *Concerns raised by farming organisations regarding the impact of changes to inheritance tax arrangements, agricultural support schemes and post Brexit trade agreements.*
- *That there is an opportunity to strengthen ties between farmers, rural communities and local organisations including this Council, to build a more resilient local food system that works for residents and supports the long term sustainability of farming.*

Council resolves:

1. *To engage with farmers, rural communities and businesses across the West Berkshire area and report back within 12 months on the issues identified and any actions the Council could take to support the sustainability of the rural economy.*
2. *To request that the Executive review the support currently provided by the Council for farmers' markets, local food producers and the rural economy, and identify opportunities to strengthen that support through economic development, tourism, skills and apprenticeship initiatives.*
3. *To request that the Executive consider opportunities to increase the use and promotion of locally produced food through Council services, partnerships and community initiatives, including through the development or expansion of Farm to Fork and similar programmes where appropriate.*
4. *To support and promote Open Farm Sunday and other initiatives that connect farmers with schools, food banks and community organisations to strengthen food security and improve public understanding of farming and food production across Berkshire.*
5. *To request that the Executive investigate opportunities and support the founding of community-supported agriculture schemes and local food partnerships that give residents a direct relationship with farms.*

6. *To request that the Executive work with farmers to develop initiatives that enable them to contribute surplus produce to those most in need, reducing food waste while supporting households facing food poverty.*
7. *To support farmers to develop initiatives to protect the countryside and waterways to minimise environmental impacts and protect waterways from pollution and runoff.*
8. *To write to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs expressing the Council's support for maintaining high environmental, food safety and animal welfare standards in food production and for ensuring that British farmers are not undercut by imported food produced to lower standards."*

Councillor Vickers introduced the motion and highlighted that farmers in the district were residents and constituents, and the Council should do what it was able to do to support them. He indicated that, as the Council's representative on the North Wessex Downs (NWD), he had learnt about the support that farmers were receiving and that in return for the Councils £18k contribution to the NWD, it received £500k in return.

The lack of government funding for small farmers was also mentioned. As the promotion of the farming sector would be crucial for the drive towards food security and whole society resilience, this lack of funding was a national risk. For these reasons, Council was encouraged to show their support for these vital businesses and custodians of the landscape.

Farming was also noted as being a key part of the Councils rural identity, as well as creating jobs both directly in the industry and throughout the supply chain.

Members were also informed that one in six households experienced hunger at any one time. For this reason, some Members encouraged local supermarkets to reduce their food waste and distribute excess food to those who needed it, such as through school meals or food banks.

In addition, the link between farming and the environment was mentioned, as without a financially sustainable farming industry, those farmers would not be able to fulfil their critical environmental role. Therefore, investing in farming was an investment into the wellbeing of the whole of West Berkshire.

Some Members believed the Motion to be performative due to the lack of meetings of the Rural Business Forum, a group that had been established by the previous Conservative led Administration. However, it was noted that this Forum had met in 2025, although there was a gap in 2024 due to a lack of officer resources.

Energy security was also mentioned, as accessible energy was imperative to the financial sustainability of the practice. Some farms in other areas of the country had gone off grid due to their widespread use of solar, wind, and battery storage, and this approach was encouraged for farmers in West Berkshire.

Overall, as Council was satisfied with the Motion, they agreed to approve it as proposed.

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

7. Motions from Previous Meetings

Council was informed about the responses to the following Motions:

- That Councillor Jeff Brook's Motion on Automatic Fire Suppression Systems was heard at the Executive meeting on 2 July 2026,

- And, that Councillor Nick Carter's Motion on the Council's response to the Basingstoke and Deane's Local Plan was actioned via letter on 2 September 2026.

8. Updates from Committees

Council noted the meetings that had been held since the last ordinary meeting of Council as laid out in Agenda Item 9.

9. Planning Committee and National Scheme of Delegation

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 10) concerning the changes to the Council's Planning Committees following the National Scheme of Delegation.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Denise Gaines and seconded by Councillor Alan Macro:

That the Council:

1) "Replace Section 8 (Service Director – Development and Housing) of the Scheme of Delegation in Part 11 of the Constitution with the changes shown in Appendix A to implement the National Scheme of Delegation and ensure the amended Constitution is in accordance with the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025 and the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026.

2) Amend Part 6.8 Appendix Planning Committees with the changes shown in Appendix B to replace the existing three committee structure with a single Planning committee.

3) Delegate to the Monitoring Officer to make any minor substantive changes to the Constitution they deem necessary to ensure the Council's planning delegation arrangement comply with the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025 and the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026. This delegated authority is provided that any such changes are the minimum necessary to ensure compliance, and subject to the amendments being ratified by Full Council as soon as practicable.

4) Endorse a review of the new arrangements by the Service Lead for responsibility for planning between 6 and 12 months following implementation.".

Councillor Gaines introduced the report and highlighted that Local Councils had been given no choice in making the proposed changes as Government planning reforms required the new process to be adopted by 31 October 2026. After that, the Council would be legally required to determine all Schedule 1 applications by officer delegation and only Schedule 2 application that meet certain tests would be referred to the Planning Committee. The test would be to determine if the application was a significant planning, economic, social, or environmental matter to the local area. There was also a risk to the Council if the changes were not approved, such as the potential non-determination of applications and the risk of appeals and Judicial Reviews resulting in costs being awarded against the Council.

One of the other key changes highlighted was around the removal of call-in powers from Members and objectors, resulting in a feeling like there had been a reduction in their rights over planning.

Although the legislation was non-negotiable, the local triage process for Schedule 2 applications provided some room for discretion as they would be determined by the nominated officer and Member.

As these changes were expected to result in a significant decrease in applications coming to committee, a single Planning Committee was proposed to replace the existing Eastern Area, Western Area, and District Planning Committees.

Councillor Gaines also indicated that planning officers had liaised with South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils to ensure that this scheme could work when the Councils merged into Ridgeway Council. She also stressed that the new scheme would be reviewed between six and 12 months from when it was actioned in order to make improvements on the process.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and seconded by Councillor Martha Vickers:

"That the Council amend speaking rights for this item so that:

- The Proposer of the Amendment is allowed 10 Minutes
- The Seconder of the Amendment is allowed 6 Minutes
- The Proposer of the original Motion is allowed 10 Minutes"

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

AMENDMENT: Proposed by Councillor Adrian Abbs and seconded by Councillor Carolyn Culver:

"That the following amendments be made to the reports:

1. Appendix F: the Nominated Officer to be the Chief Planning Officer; remove the Executive Member with responsibility for Planning as a substitute Nominated Member.
2. 8.1.2: the Nominated Member and substitutes to be appointed by Full Council or Planning Committee, with any changes reported to the next meeting.
3. 8.1.10(c): add a right to re-flag within 14 days of any re-consultation or material amendment; nominated persons to notify the flagging member, and the parish/town council, of the outcome and reasons before determination.
4. 8.1.10: add triage triggers for (i) a parish/town council objection where the recommendation is approval, and (ii) any proposal contrary to a made Neighbourhood Plan.
5. 8.1.15: decisions and reasons published on the website within 5 working days and reported to every Planning Committee meeting.
6. 8.1.6: insert 'subject to 8.1.9(b)' so own-interest Schedule 1 applications can be referred; widen 8.1.10(d) to cases where the Council, a member or an officer 'has an interest'; add an express recusal clause (guidance para 26).
7. 8.1.7: delete (a)–(c) (keep them as Schedule 2, outside automatic triage) and remove the duplication between (c) and (e).
8. 8.1.17 / Rec 2.3: limit to changes required by statute, guidance or a court decision; consult Group Leaders; report to the next ordinary Council.
9. Rec 2.4: review to be carried out by Scrutiny or the Constitution Review Task Group, with published data; any change to triage to return to Full Council.

10. Appendix B 4.1: Planning Committee of 13 members, with a minimum drawn from each of the former east and west areas."

Councillor Abbs spoke to the amendment, noting that it was the law but that the Council should make the best of the requirements. He also indicated that the existing situation was working well and rejected the stated purpose of legislation as Councillors were not the cause of slow determination of applications. The proposed amendments did not look to delay the implementation of the proposal, but to ensure that the Council was only doing the minimum of what was required. He then clarified a number of the points proposed to Council.

Members welcomed the proposals but highlighted that there were a number of detailed points that had been provided without sufficient notice to fully examine them in advance. Questions were also raised about what Council could amend in the report, and what was required by the legislation.

Council noted that the Constitution was regularly reviewed and so these proposed amendments could be considered after the approval of the recommendations. This would ensure the Council did not risk missing the 31 October deadline. The governance process for this review would take the amendments through the Constitution Review Task Group, the Audit and Risk Committee, potentially the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee, and then finally full Council for determination. Some Members wanted the review of the proposals to be sooner than six months, suggesting that three months would be preferable.

On the nominated Members, it was noted that the Chairman of the Planning Committee would be the nominated Member and if they were unavailable, it would be the Vice-Chairman, and then the relevant Portfolio Holder. This was proposed in order to avoid having a single point of failure.

Ward Members were encouraged to look more closely at all applications in their area and contact the planning officer with any resident’s input. It was also confirmed that decisions relating to the Schedule 2 determinations would be published on the website for public viewing.

Council regretted the requirements that had been handed down by Central Government but were satisfied that there was scope to review the proposal without needing to approve the amendments at this point in time.

The Amendment was put to the vote and declared **NOT CARRIED**.

Council returned to debate the Substantive Motion.

Members reiterated that the government legislation undermined the democratic role of local government and refuted the claims that housing delays were due to Members involvement in the process, or due to environmental and sustainability requirements. The previous system was working well and deliberation was done effectively. A potential solution to planning delays without these forced changes could be for the Government to provide local authorities the funds to recruit more planning officers to speed up the deliberation process.

The role of Members was to look at an application, policy, and the exceptional circumstances around the application to make a balanced judgment. This was the role that the legislation undermined, resulting in a situation where parish and town Councils would have more involvement in the planning process than the District Councillors.

With a single planning committee, some Members were concerned about the milage they would have to do to attend site visits across the district. The workload placed on the

nominated Member was also a concern as every parish council, resident, and Member would be going to them to lobby on their applications.

Members were assured that these arrangements would be reviewed in six to nine months and the outcome would come back to them for consideration.

One potential positive resulting from these changes was that Members would be free to get involved and lobby for applications in their wards without risk of fettering their discretion as the application would not be going to a committee.

Council was encouraged to make it clear to residents that this was not something the Council wanted to do, but that it was forced on them by Central Government. The Executive were also suggested to write to Secretary of State to express the displeasure of Council at the changes being forced on them.

Overall, Council agreed to approve the recommendations.

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

10. Membership of Committees

Before the commencement of this item, Council adjourned for a comfort break at 8.55pm and reconvening at 9.05pm.

The Chairman varied the order of business to consider a report (formerly Agenda Item 7) about the new allocations to the Planning Committee following the changes agreed in the previous item.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Vic Poole and seconded by Councillor Tom McCann:

That the Council:

1) “Agrees to the allocation of seats to the Political Groups in accordance with section 15(5) of the Local Government Act 1989 as set out in Table A at paragraph 5.11 of the report.
2) That the number of substitutes on each of the Committees be as set out at paragraph 5.14.
3) That the Council approves the appointment of Members to the committees as set out in appendix A, which are in accordance with the wishes of the political groups.
4) That authority be delegated to the Monitoring Officer to make any changes required to the Constitution as a result of the changes to the number of Members of the Council and following the appointments to committees.”

Councillor Poole introduced the report and highlighted that it followed on from the changes Council had made in Agenda Item 10 and was required in order to ensure the new Planning Committee was politically proportional and in compliance with the relevant legislation. For this reason, the Committee was proposed to have 11 Members, seven from the Liberal Democrat Group, three from the Conservative Group, and one from the Minority Group.

Concern was raised about the potential travel needed to be done by Members on the periphery of the district in order to attend site visits. This additional travel would also disproportionately affect Members who were employed. It was raised that technology should be deployed on site visits to enable those who were unable to attend to still benefit from the visit.

Overall, Council agreed to approve the recommendations.

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

Two further changes to the membership of committees were proposed.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

"That Council approve the following changes to the membership of Committees:

- That Councillor Jeremy Cottam will stop being a full Member of the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee and replace Councillor Geoff Mayes as a Substitute Member of that Committee, and:

- That Councillor Martin Colston becomes a full Member of the Resources and Plance Scrutiny Committee."

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

11. Youth Justice Plan 2026/2027

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 11) concerning the Youth Justice Plan for 2026/27.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Heather Codling and seconded by Councillor Justin Pemberton:

That the Council:

"Agree and formally endorse the Youth Justice Plan 2026/2027".

Councillor Codling introduced the report and highlighted that it had been supported by the Executive before coming to Council. The West Berkshire Youth Justice Support Team had been recognised for its outstanding child centred, trauma informed, approach, prioritising early support for children at risk. Going forward, the Team would work with children, families, and partner organisations to address inequality, protect victims and communities, and ensure the services reflect lived experiences in order to reduce offending and encourage children to have positive, safe, and successful futures. Members also noted that West Berkshire had some of the lowest levels of youth offending and custody rates in the region.

The plan was welcomed by Council and praised its focus on early intervention. Swift engagement with children was crucial in preventing them falling further into the justice system and helping them to reconnect with education, family, and positive activities. The strong multiagency partnership working and putting families at the heart of the work was considered an important part of the Team's success.

Although not prevalent, Members were concerned about knife possession due to the potentially severe impact of the related offenses and Council welcomed the work that was being done with their partners on prevention in this area.

Several challenges that children and young people face were discussed and included the lack of teaching about basic civics, like opening a bank account, as well as the poor apprenticeship opportunities and the uptake in employers' usage of artificial intelligence. As those that drop out of education were more likely to end up with the Youth Justice Team, this was suggested to be something the Council to consider.

Members thanked all the staff in the service who supported vulnerable young people, from prevention through to rehabilitation. As Council was satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendations.

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

12. Notices of Motion

Council received three Motions on notice.

As the first Motion had been discussed previously, Council considered the second, under-mentioned, Motion (of which Agenda Item 12(b) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver relating to 'Cool Spaces for Summer 2027'.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Carolyne Culver and seconded by Councillor David Marsh:

That the Council:

"Cool Spaces for Summer 2027

Council notes:

- *There were several heat waves in 2026, resulting in unnecessary excess deaths. This trend is likely to continue in the future.*
- *During the cost-of-living crisis several 'warm spaces' were established across the district.*
- *Many of these warm spaces have evolved into community cafes which continue to operate to this day.*
- *Based on UK Health Security Agency advice, WBC issues alerts and comprehensive advice to Members and residents during periods of excessive heat or cold.*

Council resolves to request that the Executive:

1. *Investigate the establishment of 'cool spaces' across West Berkshire in preparation for summer 2027.*
2. *Identify council owned properties that could be made available and which can be advertised as cool spaces during periods of extreme heat, subject to operational feasibility and available resources.*
3. *Work proactively with stakeholders across the district to identify spaces that they own, manage or hire, which the council could help advertise as cool spaces.*
4. *Consider how existing Council communication channels can be used to widely advertise these cool spaces to the public.*
5. *Report back to the Executive and Members on the proposed arrangements before 1 May 2027."*

Councillor Culver introduced the motion and highlighted that, a few years ago, warm spaces were established in the winter to help with the cost-of-living crisis. This motion focused on attempting to establish something similar in order to address the excess deaths that would result from the hot weather during the upcoming summers. Heat alerts were valuable to residents, but homes in the United Kingdom were not designed to deal with long hot spells, and so, many lived in homes that were intolerable in periods of significant heat. It was also highlighted that summer 2027 could be exceptionally hot due to the developing El Niño and so these spaces would be very valuable.

Some examples of cool spaces could be churches, such as St John's in Wash Common, community facilities, and libraries. Having the Council put a list together would encourage residents to go to these facilities whereas they might have previously felt uncomfortable

doing so. The Motion was also clarified, as it was proposing the Council identify and publicise existing cool spaces, not invest in the creation of new ones.

Council noted that the past heatwaves had highlighted inequalities in housing, as wealthier residents had installed more costly cooling measures, like air conditioning, whereas poorer households had no ability to properly cool their homes.

It was emphasised that the financial situation of the Council would limit the ability to invest officer resources in developing and implementing the proposal. However, Members argued that the Council should take leadership on the issue.

In addition, the potential role of parish and town councils in promoting the scheme was raised as a cost minimal action, and the encouraging of businesses to invest in overhead sails across the Highstreet to create a wider public cooling effect was also mentioned. Members could also highlight potential cool spaces in their wards to help officers with the identification process.

Overall, as Council was satisfied with the Motion, they agreed to approve it as proposed.

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

Continuation of meeting: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and Seconded by Councillor Stuart Gourley.

RESOLVED: In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Part 3, point 10.8, the Council supported the motion that the remaining business could be concluded by 10.30pm, and therefore that the meeting would proceed with the agenda item.

The Council considered the third, under-mentioned, Motion (of which Agenda Item 12(c) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Carolyne Culver relating to 'Questions at Scrutiny'.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Carolyne Culver and seconded by Councillor Richard Somner:

That the Council:

"Questions at Scrutiny

Council notes:

- *30 minutes is allocated for public questions at Council and Executive.*
- *Members of the public are allowed to submit questions to the new Highways Improvement Group.*
- *There is no provision for a public questions agenda item at our scrutiny meetings. Currently we must suspend standing orders to allow members of the public to speak.*
- *Many other councils allow a public questions agenda item at their scrutiny meetings.*

Council resolves:

1. *To allow time for a public questions agenda item at scrutiny meetings.*
2. *Public questions must relate to the meeting's agenda items or the committee's work programme, to ensure that the relevant Members and officers are on hand to respond.*

3. *That the relevant Members and officers consult with the three chairs of scrutiny about the details of how this can be implemented."*

Councillor Culver introduced the motion and highlighted that it would allocate time for agenda related questions at the three Scrutiny Committees of Council. Currently, if public were to speak at the meeting, the Chairman would need to suspend standing orders. This was not seen as very open and so the proposal would be likely be welcomed by residents and put the Council in line with other authorities around the country.

Councillor Vic Poole, as the relevant Portfolio Holder, spoke to the Motion and ensured Council that it would go through the proper internal governance processes.

The Chairman informed Council that the Motion would not be debated at this meeting. In accordance with Procedure Rule 12.6.2, the Motion would be referred to the Constitution Review Task Group. This would enable their input and that of expert Officers, before then coming back to Council for debate.

13. Members' Questions

Details of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: Q&As.

(The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and closed at 10.18pm)

CHAIRMAN …….

Date of Signature …….