DRAFT

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

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

THURSDAY 16 JULY 2026

Councillors Present: Stephanie Steevenson (Chairman), Martha Vickers (Vice-Chairman) Adrian Abbs, Antony Amirtharaj, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Brooks, Billy Drummond, Nick Carter, Patrick Clark, Heather Codling, Iain Cottingham, Laura Coyle, Carolyne Culver, Nigel Foot, Denise Gaines, Stuart Gourley, Clive Hooker, Owen Jeffery, Paul Kander, Jane Langford, Ross Mackinnon, David Marsh, Geoff Mayes, Tom McCann, Biyi Oloko, Justin Pemberton, Christopher Read, Matt Shakespeare, Richard Somner, Joanne Stewart, 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), Shannon Coleman-Slaughter (Service Director for Finance, Property & Procurement and S151 Officer), Laura Callan (Interim Service Director for Development and Housing), Nicola Thomas (Deputy Monitoring Officer and Service Lead for Legal and Democratic Services), Honorary Alderman Gordon Lundie

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Erik Pattenden, Councillor Martin Colston, Councillor Vicky Poole (Attending Online), Councillor Alan Macro, Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Councillor Paul Dick, Councillor Janine Lewis, Councillor Louise Sturgess, Councillor Dominic Boeck, Honorary Alderman Hilary Cole, Honorary Alderman Graham Jones, Honorary Alderman Adrian Edwards, Honorary Alderman Anthony Stansfeld, Honorary Alderman Andrew Rowles, Honorary Alderman Tony Linden, Honorary Alderman Rick Jones, Honorary Alderman Paul Bryant, Honorary Alderman Graham Bridgman, Honorary Alderman Graham Pask

PART I

1. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported that she had attended 17 different events since being elected as Chairman at the Annual Meeting of Council on 14 May 2026. Specifically, she highlighted her attendance at multiple citizenship ceremonies, the Supported Internship Graduation Ceremony held by Amazon, the Learning Disability Week awards, and the Lord Lieutenants Summer Reception.

The Vice-Chairman also attended a number of events since the last ordinary Council meeting, including the Thatcham Freedom of the Town Parade, the Read to the Beat Summer Reading Challenge launch event, the Rank-and-File Theatre Showcase, and the Castle School Expansion Opening.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Jeff Brooks, also notified Council about the progress of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). Earlier in the day, the Government announced that they had chosen a three unitary council model for Oxfordshire and West Berkshire, meaning that a new Ridgeway Council would be established from 2028 and cover the areas of West Berkshire Council and most of South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse District Councils. A Northern Oxfordshire and Greater Oxford Council would also be established.

Although the two unitary option was preferred by West Berkshire Council, the Leader indicated that this three unitary model was still a positive outcome, as Ridgeway would be better placed to meet the rising demand and cost pressures that existed in Local

Government. The Leader also confirmed that the request from Reading Borough Council to change the eastern boundary of West Berkshire had been rejected. This was welcome news and reflected the views of residents throughout the consultation process.

Councillor Brooks indicated that many important decisions would be taking place over the next 21 months, but that the transition would be well managed, and West Berkshire services would continue to be delivered while the new Council was being created. This new Council would be ambitious, innovative, and financially strong, delivering excellent services for its residents.

2. Minutes

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

"That the Minutes of the Annual meeting of Council held on 14 May 2026 were approved as a true and correct record subject to the correction of the name 'Lambourn' and were signed by the Chairman."

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

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

"That the Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held on 14 May 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

There were no declarations of interest received.

4. Petitions

There were no petitions presented to Council.

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 questions B and H in the name of John Gotelee would receive a written response, given that he was unable to attend the meeting.

6. Membership of Committees

There were no proposed changes to the membership of Committees.

7. Motions from Previous Meetings

Council was informed about the responses to the following Motions:

- That Councillor Adrian Abbs' Motion on the experimental traffic order for Newbury Town Centre was heard at the Executive Meeting on 21 May 2026.
- That Councillor David Marsh's Motion requesting a review of the ethical investment policy relating to the Council and Berkshire Pension Fund was also heard at the Executive Meeting on 21 May 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. Annual Scrutiny Report 2025/26

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 10) concerning the Annual Scrutiny Report for 2025/26.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Carolyne Culver and seconded by Councillor Martha Vickers:

"That Council be informed of the Annual Scrutiny Report for 2025/26."

Councillor Culver introduced the report and highlighted that the Council's Scrutiny functions were divided into three committees over the past year, allowing for more opportunity to go into more detail into a greater range of topics. Transparency and accountability were at the heart of scrutiny as they needed to be able to provide an independent challenge to the Executive. In 2025/26, the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee had produced two task and finish reports, one about the proposed Sports Hub and the other on project management. They also scrutinised many different areas in finance and transformation. Councillor Culver also highlighted that more work would be done on scrutinising water utilities and affordable housing provision, particularly in rural areas.

Members thanked the Chairman of all three Scrutiny Committees for their work, as well as the Officers and young people co-optees on the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee for their questions and insight.

Some Members questioned the Administration's commitment to scrutiny given the limits they had put on opposition Members questions during Executive meetings. However, the Leader informed Council that the current administration had introduced a new Scrutiny Committee and appointed opposition Chairman to two of those Committees, so it had a proven commitment to scrutiny at the Council.

On call-ins, it was noted that the Executive Forward Plan did not always include a lot of information about upcoming reports. Therefore, the Chairman of these Committees reserved the right to conduct post-decision scrutiny. A point about meeting timetabling was also noted as there had been a number of occasions where there were only a few days between a Scrutiny meeting and the Executive meeting where a decision was going to be made. In order to provide more time for the Executive to consider any recommendations from Scrutiny, it was suggested that the gap between these two meetings be increased.

The Executive was also encouraged to use Scrutiny as a way to test out new ideas and to get them more involved in the budget making process, especially given the Council's financial position and the new local government settlement. In addition, as there had been a motion sent to scrutiny for their input, more clarity about the remit of the committees in this regard was requested. Finally, a point was made that the recommendations from Scrutiny should be tracked so that Members and residents could easily see what happened to the recommendations, and if they were adopted by the Executive, whether they had been implemented.

Members also suggested that the new Scrutiny arrangements in Ridgeway should take these learning points on in order to make them as effective as possible. A final such learning point would be for the allowing of public questions to be submitted to these meetings.

Overall, as Council were satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendation.

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

10. Health and Wellbeing Board Annual Report 2025/26

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 11) concerning the Health and Wellbeing Board's Annual Report for 2025/26.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Nigel Foot and seconded by Councillor Patrick Clark:

"That Council be informed of the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board and its partners during 2025/26."

Councillor Foot introduced the report and highlighted that the Board was changed following a Local Government Association (LGA) peer review, allowing it to be nimbler and take more actions. That work had been implemented and involved three main strategic areas: ensuring the best possible start in life, adult and children's mental health, and healthy neighbourhoods.

It was also noted that Health Watch, an independent body representing users of health services, would cease their responsibilities over the next year and that its work would be transferring to the Integrated Care Board. Councillor Foot thanked them for their valuable contributions and noted that there was a lot of work already planned for 2026/27.

Members noted the changes to the Board, welcoming the new roles it had taken on following the peer review, now essentially becoming a type of scrutiny body for the Council. It was also highlighted that public and Member questions were allowed during Board meetings and Members wanted to publicise these options and encourage their uptake.

Overall, as Council were satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendation.

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

11. Monitoring Officer's Annual Report 25/26 and Governance Statement

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 12) concerning the Monitoring Officer's Annual Report for 2025/26 and Governance Statement.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Vicky Poole and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks: "That Council be informed of the contents of the report which will be circulated to all Parish and Town Councils in the District for information."

Councillor Poole introduced the report and highlighted that standards remained high across the district, with only 17 complaints being received, the majority resulting in no further action or informal resolutions. The role of the independent members and parish council representatives were also emphasised, and Councillor Poole thanked them for their work. The declarations of gifts and hospitality recorded in the register, published as part of the report, was also highlighted as a way the Council was promoting transparency and accountability.

It was noted that West Berkshire Council had historically not suffered from poor Member conduct, albeit there was a spike in complaints received before the last election in 2023. There was a general desire for this not to be repeated in the follow-up to the election in 2027.

Overall, as Council were satisfied with the report, they agreed to note the recommendation.

12. Community Governance Review Request

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 13) concerning a Community Governance Review Request.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Vicky Poole and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

"That Council:

A) Proceed with a CGR of the parishes of Lambourn and Shaw-cum-Donnington, in accordance with the requirements of the 2007 Act and associated guidance as described in this report;

B) Approve the terms of reference in respect of the community governance review, including the proposed timetable, as set out in Appendix A and Appendix B to this report;

C) Delegate authority to the Service Lead – Legal and Democratic Services in consultation with Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Governance and Commercialisation and relevant Ward Members to consider and approve draft proposals following initial consultation;

D) Delegate authority to Service Lead- Legal and Democratic Services to approve minor amendments and/ or typographical amendments pertaining to the final recommendations prior to submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission, save for the power to make substantive amendments which is delegated to be undertaken in consultation with Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Governance and Commercialisation and relevant Ward Members;

E) Delegate authority to Service Lead – Legal and Democratic Services to exercise powers under the 2007 Act in relation to the CGR."

Councillor Poole introduced the report and highlighted that the proposed review followed a request from both Councils. Specifically, Lambourn had asked to reduce their Councillors in order to improve their ability to recruit and retain new Members and Shaw-cum-Donnington had asked for it so that their boundaries could reflect the increase in the number of developments that had been built out in the area.

This was not a formal petition, but it was recommended that West Berkshire Council proceed with the review. Council noted that the proposed review process would include a consultation with interested stakeholders and that the final proposal would come back to Council for final approval and that this was currently targeted for the Council meeting on 26 November 2026.

Members also noted that the Council had resolved to conduct a full District wide community governance review before the last election, in 2023, but that it had not proceeded due to its resource implications. Parishes were also encouraged to merge or work more closely with others, as well as taken on more responsibilities, as Local Government Reorganisation would enable them to have a much more significant local role.

Overall, as Council were satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendations.

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

13. Constitution Changes

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 14) concerning proposed changes to the Council's Constitution.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Vicky Poole and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

"That Council approve the following changes to the Constitution:

A) Part 11 Scheme of Delegation be updated in accordance with the changes detailed in Appendix A to the report to reflect the changes to Senior Management within West Berkshire Council and guidance.

B) Part 5 – Executive Rules Key decision threshold be affirmed at £500,000 but that social care placements should be excluded from key decisions as set out in Appendix C to the report.

C) Task Group guidance (Appendix F) be formally added to the Constitution by amending Part 6 para 3.4 with the addition of: *3.4.3.3 shall adhere to the Task Group guidance appended*.

D) Deletion of Health and Wellbeing Board sub-bodies that have been dissolved or no longer meet in public."

Councillor Poole introduced the report and highlighted that the Constitution Review Task Group (CRTG) had been tasked with ensuring that the constitution was fit for purpose. The proposed changes would enable the decision-making arrangements to reflect current arrangements and practice as well as making delegations clearer and updating the rules around key decision thresholds. Councillor Poole also noted that there were minor amendments proposed by the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee to the Task Group Guidelines which were intended to improve effective decision making. On the details of the recommendations by Scrutiny Committee, Members noted that they proposed that Task and Finish Groups would be given the right to change the list of witnesses they could call and also to remove the recommendation for the Executive to use SMART targets. This was proposed as it was not considered to be appropriate to specify that level of detail.

With the agreement of the Chairman and Proposer and Seconder of the Motion, the task group guidance amendment proposed by the Resources and Place Scrutiny Committee was accepted as a minor amendment.

Council was informed that the CRTG had been through the entire Constitution, and their work would likely change substantially with the announcement of the new Ridgeway Council. Overall, as Council were satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendations as reflected with the minor amendment.

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

14. 2026-2027 Council Strategy Refresh

Council considered a report (Agenda Item 15) concerning the 2026-27 Council Strategy Refresh.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Jeff Brooks and seconded by Councillor Heather Codling:

"That Council approve the refresh of the Council Strategy for 2026-27, to include an additional, cross-cutting strategic priority of Financial Resilience."

Councillor Brooks introduced the report and highlighted that Administration had completed 54 items from the current Strategy, including the introduction of a simplified job application process, the review of the Community Infrastructure Levy customer journey, and the adoption of a new pothole strategy. He believed that the Strategy needed to be refreshed as some items had to be removed and to better reflect the Council's current position. Members also noted that a delivery plan for the proposed Strategy items would be presented soon. Given the Ridgeway announcement, Councillor Brooks also emphasised that the Council should continue to be bold and ambitious for as long as possible.

AMENDMENT: Proposed by Councillor Adrian Abbs and seconded by Councillor David Marsh:

“That Appendix A be amended to include, under "A prosperous and resilient West Berkshire", the measure:

> "Report to Council on the deliverability, timescale and funding options for a new Community Sports Stadium at Faraday Road (31/03/2027)"."

Councillor Abbs spoke to the amendment and highlighted that, although it was a commitment of the Administration, as the Council had received a number of questions relating to the provision of football at Faraday Road, adopting the amendment would formalise the reporting arrangements of this project and would ensure residents were in the loop about its progress.

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

Council returned to debate the Substantive Motion.

It was highlighted that the Playing Pitch Strategy and Council Strategy had been operating independently, which could be leading to resident confusion, and it was proposed that they could be better joined up. The Leader also confirmed to Members that the 3g pitch at Faraday Road would be going to the Executive when it was ready.

Members highlighted that the document contained contradictory elements, such as with the references to the delivery plan and the Town Centre Masterplan. In addition, some Members took issue with the presentation of the refresh at this point in the Council term, only nine months out from the planned election. It was suggested that this had been done for party political reasons. Also, several points were made about the targets that were presented.

In response to the targets that had been removed, some Members argued that the Administration should not have included any targets that were beyond their ability to control, such as the rate of school academisation. On the targets that had their deadlines pushed back due to a changing implementation schedule, some Members believed that this was a way of extending their deadlines without saying they had been missed. In addition, some concern was raised about the limited climate and ecological emergency section. However, in response Council was informed that there had been significant progress on the climate and ecological goals of the Council and that this was presented in the Environment Strategy. Some of these achievements included the record recycling rates and the reduction of emissions – down 20 percent on previous years.

Council also noted that this would likely be the last refresh of the West Berkshire Strategy as the elections in May 2027 would be for the Ridgeway Council, with the West Berkshire Council term being extended by a year. Overall, as the majority of Members were satisfied with the report, they agreed to approve the recommendations.

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

15. Notices of Motion

Adjournment of meeting: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and Seconded by Councillor Martha Vickers.

RESOLVED: In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, Part 3, point 19.1.2, the Council supported the motion to hold a short adjournment.

The Council reconvened and considered the under-mentioned Motion (of which Agenda Item 16(a) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor David Marsh relating to ending of the use of the chemical weedkiller glyphosate.

The Chairman informed Council that the Motion would not be debated. In accordance with Procedure Rule 12.6.1, it would be referred to the Executive for consideration without debate as the subject matter fell within their remit. Councillor David Marsh raised a point of order, requesting this decision be reconsidered due to a perceived lack of consistency in which Motions were referred and which ones were debated. However, the Chairman confirmed that, as this Motion fell within the remit of the Executive, it should be referred to the decision-making body responsible for those functions.

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

> *"**Ending the use of the chemical weedkiller glyphosate***
>
> *Council notes that:*
>
> *The chemical weedkiller glyphosate, which has been designated a "probable carcinogen" by the World Health Organisation, is a threat to both human health and the natural world.*
>
> *Glyphosate residues are found in our food, in our tap water, and in our bodies. It is devastating for wildlife, killing bees and other insects while stripping away food and shelter for birds and mammals, and polluting our rivers.*
>
> *Many local authorities have banned or are phasing out the use of glyphosate based pesticides on public land. Lee Dillon, MP for Newbury, is one of 35 MPs to sign Commons Early Day Motion 607, Pesticides in Public Spaces, which commends more than 100 local authorities across the UK that have either ended or significantly reduced their use of pesticides, and calls on more councils to do so.*
>
> *The MPs also express support for the Plant Protection Products (Prohibition on Public Sector Use) Bill, tabled by Sian Berry MP in May 2026, which would introduce a national phase-out of pesticide use in public spaces.*
>
> *However, many councils and other public authorities still use pesticides to manage unwanted vegetation. In 2024, 354 tonnes of pesticides were sprayed by councils across our towns and cities in the UK. Residues have been found in more than half the playgrounds analysed by Pesticide Action Network UK.*
>
> *The Soil Association and an increasing number of growers, conservation groups, and wildlife charities, which are supported by many thousands of our residents, are calling for a complete nationwide ban when the government reviews its glyphosate licences in December 2026.*
>
> *Council therefore resolves:*
>
> 1. *To commit to end the use of glyphosate-based herbicides and pesticides on land owned or managed by West Berkshire Council, due to the associated risks and potential damage to human and animal health.*
> 2. *This policy to be phased over 24 months in to allow the exploration and trialling of alternatives to the use of herbicides in public spaces and an alternative method for removing weeds from the highway.*
> 3. *To alert residents of West Berkshire to the health and environmental risks associated with glyphosate (used in widely available weedkillers).*

4. *To promote to residents the benefits of pollinator-friendly gardens and green spaces where insects such as bees and butterflies can thrive"*

Councillor Marsh introduced the motion and highlighted that Glyphosate was a threat to human health and the natural world and had been designated as a probable carcinogen by the World Health Organisation in 2015. Residues had been found in bread, tap water, and human bodies, and Members noted that exposure to the chemical was linked to reproductive defects, developmental disorders, and cancers.

Usage of the chemical had risen 1,000 per cent since 1990, despite the findings that there was no accepted safe level of exposure. More than 100 local authorities had already banned or were phasing out its usage on public land and the Newbury MP had also signed the early day motion in the House of Commons commending councils for doing this. However, it was still widely used and in 2024, 354 tonnes had been sprayed by councils. West Berkshire Council had reduced its reliance on the chemical. The Countryside team only used small amounts, which could be eliminated. However, its use by the Highways team was more significant, and thus more difficult to eliminate. For this reason, the Motion proposed a two-year period to phase in alternatives.

The relevant Portfolio Holder, Councillor Stuart Gourley, responded to the Motion, informing Council that the Administration would respond fully after getting officer input. He also informed Members that the Council kept pesticide and herbicide usage to a minimum.

The chemical was mainly used in two areas, public highways and in parks and countryside, however, this was generally limited to areas where alternatives were not effective or proportionate. Councillor Gourley also noted that there were a number of case studies from across the country with varying degrees of success, and so he welcomed the proposal.

The Council then considered the under-mentioned Motion (of which Agenda Item 16(b) refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Nick Carter relating to developments proposed in the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Local Plan consultation which adjoin West Berkshire, and a proposed West Berkshire Council response.

The Chairman informed Council that should the Motion be proposed and seconded, then it would be debated in order to facilitate the discharge of business in accordance with Procedure Rule 12.6.3.

MOTION: Proposed by Councillor Nick Carter and seconded by Councillor Denise Gaines:

That the Council:

"Response to Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan

This Council notes that:

- *Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation includes a proposed allocation of approximately 350 dwellings at Land at West End Farm, Mortimer West End.*
- *This site would function in practice as an extension of Stratfield Mortimer, a settlement within West Berkshire, and would rely substantially on West Berkshire infrastructure and services, including healthcare, education, transport, utilities and environmental assets.*

- *West Berkshire Council, ward members, parish councils and residents have submitted detailed representations raising concerns regarding cross boundary infrastructure capacity, deliverability, environmental constraints, and consistency with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's stated spatial strategy.*
- *The proposed level of development at Mortimer West End would represent a significant population increase relative to the size and infrastructure capacity of Stratfield Mortimer.*
- *There is currently no clear, funded and agreed mechanism demonstrating how cross-boundary infrastructure impacts would be mitigated or how West Berkshire services would be protected from additional pressure.*
- *Questions have been raised regarding the consistent application of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's own site selection methodology, settlement hierarchy principles and strategic constraints — including the treatment of AWE emergency-planning constraints and cross-boundary infrastructure reliance — when compared with other candidate sites within the borough.*

The Council appreciates the positive engagement that has taken place with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council to date.

Notwithstanding that, this Council believes that:

- *Development immediately adjacent to the West Berkshire boundary must be infrastructure-led and supported by robust, proportionate and transparent evidence.*
- *West Berkshire residents should not experience degradation of healthcare access, school capacity, transport safety, wastewater performance or environmental quality as a consequence of an adjacent Council's Local Plan.*
- *Cross-boundary sites must be subject to the same transparent and consistent application of settlement hierarchy principles, infrastructure tests and environmental constraints as sites located within Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's own defined service centres.*

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. *Formally write to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council requesting:*
    - *Clear evidence of how cross-boundary infrastructure impacts will be assessed, funded and delivered prior to allocation at Regulation 19.*
    - *Publication of any site-specific transport, healthcare, wastewater and environmental capacity assessments relevant to West Berkshire residents.*
    - *Clarification of how the Council's site selection methodology and spatial strategy criteria have been applied consistently across all candidate sites, including the treatment of AWE emergency-planning constraints, settlement hierarchy principles and cross-boundary infrastructure reliance.*
2. *Seek formal engagement with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and relevant infrastructure providers to ensure that West Berkshire's interests are fully represented in ongoing plan preparation.*

3. *Request that no future allocation adjoining West Berkshire by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council should proceed unless and until proportionate, deliverable and secured mitigation is evidenced for impacts falling within West Berkshire.*
4. *Continue to support residents and parish councils in ensuring that cross boundary impacts are properly considered through the Local Plan process."*

Councillor Carter introduced the motion and highlighted that it was a response to development on West End Farm which was located just over the border from West Berkshire, inside Basingstoke and Deane. This development would essentially form an extension of Mortimer West End. As it was located some distance from the railway station, and had no continuous active travel routes, the lack of clarity about the necessary infrastructure that would be needed for the additional 350 homes was raised as a concern. In addition, this housing figure was noted as being one fifth of the current residential population.

As he believed that it would not function as a self-contained settlement, Councillor Carter stressed the importance of the infrastructure delivery for the site. This infrastructure was requested to be costed and proven to be sustainable. In addition, the adopted Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Plan had not accounted for this site as it was outside the Plan area. Council debated the motion but agreed to the importance of working with Basingstoke and Deane's Members and Officers constructively in order to solve any infrastructure problems. However, some Members were sceptical of the Motion as they noted that these conversations had already been ongoing for a long period of time, and that the period for consultation responses (called the Regulation 18 stage) was over. In response however, it was generally agreed that the Motion would be an effective way of formalising the Council's position on the proposed development and demonstrating to residents that they were working to address their concerns.

Overall, as Council was satisfied with the Motion as proposed, they agreed to approve the recommendation. The Motion was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED**.

16. Members' Questions

Continuation of meeting: Proposed by Councillor Stephanie Steevenson and Seconded by Councillor Howard Woollaston.

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.

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 10.28pm)

CHAIRMAN ……

Date of Signature ……

This page is intentionally left blank