

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

21ST APRIL 2021, AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors R. J. Laight (Chairman), A. J. B. Beaumont (Vice-Chairman), S. J. Baxter, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, G. N. Denaro, S. P. Douglas, A. B. L. English, M. Glass, S. G. Hession, C.A. Hotham, R. J. Hunter, R. E. Jenkins, H. J. Jones, A. D. Kent, J. E. King, A. D. Kriss, L. C. R. Mallett, K.J. May, M. Middleton, P. M. McDonald, S. A. Robinson, H. D. N. Rone-Clarke, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Spencer, P.L. Thomas, M. Thompson, J. Till, K. J. Van Der Plank, S. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

Observers:

Officers: Mr. K. Dicks, Mrs. S. Hanley, J Howse, Mrs. R. Bamford, Mrs. C. Felton, Mr C. Forrester, Ms. C. Flanagan and Ms. J. Bayley

78\20 **TO OBSERVE A MINUTE SILENCE AS A MARK OF RESPECT FOR HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS, PRINCE PHILIP, DUKE OF EDINBURGH**

At the start of the meeting the Chairman led Members in paying tribute to His Royal Highness, Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh, by observing a minute silence.

79\20 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

80\20 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

81\20 **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 24TH FEBRUARY 2021**

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 24th February 2021 were submitted.

During consideration of the minutes, Councillor S. Douglas commented that her name had not been recorded for the vote in respect of the alternative budget that had been submitted at the meeting by the Liberal

Democrat, Bromsgrove Independents East District and the Bromsgrove Independents West and Central District Groups. Officers clarified that Councillor Douglas's name had not been recorded in the minutes for this vote as she had experienced connection issues and had therefore not take part in the vote.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 24th February 2021 be approved.

82\20

TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND/OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

There were no announcements from either the Chairman or the Head of Paid Service on this occasion.

83\20

TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER

There were no announcements from the Leader.

84\20

TO RECEIVE COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OR PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman welcomed Mr Bob Powell to the meeting, and advised that, in line with the Council's process for managing petitions, the petitioner had 3 minutes to present his petition. Members were advised that as the subject of the petition was also addressed in a Motion due for consideration at the meeting, the subject matter would be debated at that point in the meeting.

Mr Powell thanked Council for providing him with an opportunity to speak on behalf of the Whitford Vale Voice group, which had organised the petition on behalf of residents living on the western side of Bromsgrove and beyond. Residents who had signed the petition had been concerned for some time that the western route around Bromsgrove, through Catshill, Stourbridge Road, Whitford Road, Perryfields Road and Fox Lane was becoming an established alternative to the B04091 route through Worcester Road, Market Street and Stourbridge Road in the town centre. Mr Powell expressed the view that congestion on the Perryfields Road junction with Kidderminster Road, during peak times, had often overlapped congestion on the Fox Lane junction with Rock Hill even 10 years previously.

Members were informed that when residents had become aware that there were plans for housing development off Whitford Road, Whitford Vale Voice had been founded with the primary objective of seeking the introduction of a Western Relief Road, as proposed in paragraph 31.5 of the Local Plan. This was proposed when land at Whitford Road, Perryfields and Norton Farm had been redesignated as land for development, in order to divert through traffic from the existing western route.

Residents had calculated that the 490 dwellings in the Whitford Road planning application would translate into an additional 800 vehicles using Whitford Road and Fox Lane. Many of these journeys would take place at peak times which would exacerbate congestion levels.

Members were asked to note that at present there was nowhere else for vehicles in the western part of Bromsgrove to go, unless through the town centre, which could be congested, or by using the Perryfields Road and Whitford Road route. Planning consent for 1,300 dwellings and industrial units proposed for Perryfields would further exacerbate the situation. Furthermore, Members were informed that the proposed Perryfields spine road would force drivers to use either the town centre route or residential streets instead. For example, Mr Powell commented that this could include the undesirable use of Broad Street, which had traffic calming measures, All Saints Road, which had extensive on street parking and Millfield Road, which was narrow and without pavements.

Over the years developers had suggested amendments to the existing road system in order to address concerns amongst local residents about the impact of development on traffic and congestion. However, residents had been concerned about the potential effectiveness of these measures.

In the petition the signatories were asking for a Western Relief Road route to be included in the District Plan review. Members were advised that time was critical but it would not be too late to designate this route so that the land required would not be subject to development.

Mr Powell concluded by stating that the only satisfactory solution to the issues raised by the petitioners would be the introduction of a Western Relief Road.

85\20

CONSTITUTION REVIEW WORKING GROUP - RECOMMENDATION

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling explained that he had been contacted 30 minutes prior to the start of the Council meeting regarding a suggested amendment to the recommendation from the Constitution Review Working Group detailed in the report. To provide Members with sufficient time to consider the amendment, Members were advised that the item would be deferred for consideration at the following meeting of Council.

86\20

AMENDMENTS TO THE OFFICER SCHEME OF DELEGATIONS (REPORT TO FOLLOW)

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling presented a report which detailed proposed changes to the Officer Scheme of Delegations in respect of the administration of Government funding that was received by the Council to help manage the impact of Covid-19 on the community.

Members were advised that the Council had received many different forms of grant funding from the Government during the Covid-19 pandemic to help the community. Frequently, these sources of funding needed to be spent within tight timescales. However, due to the Committee timetable, it was not always possible for the Council to respond in a timely manner when decisions were taken through the usual decision-making process. Unfortunately, any delays to the distribution of grant funding within the community could have a detrimental impact. By contrast, Officers would be able to respond promptly should the Council agree to grant the proposed delegated authority.

The proposals detailed in the report were briefly discussed and there was general consensus that a streamlined approach to funding distribution, that ensured eligible groups received funding as quickly as possible, would be welcomed. However, concerns were raised about the late publication of the report, which had been issued to Members in a supplementary pack for the meeting. Members commented that they were required to submit Questions and Motions some time in advance of a Council meeting to ensure that these could be included in the main agenda and it was suggested that the same approach should be adopted for all reports to Council. The Leader acknowledged Members' concerns and explained that the delay had been partly caused by the fact that the guidance for many of the grants was issued to the Council after the funding, making it difficult to assess and plan in advance of the date when the report had been issued.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor G. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. May.

RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Resources to accept, administer and distribute any Government Funding, or Funding from bodies acting on behalf of Government, relating to or in response to the Covid 19 emergency and to make the necessary and corresponding adjustments to the MTFP following consultation with the relevant portfolio holder and where applicable Ward Councillor(s) and subject to meeting the conditions of grant funding.

87\20

URGENT DECISIONS

The Chairman advised that there had been two urgent decisions taken since the previous meeting of Council and he reminded Members that these were not for debate.

Council was informed that in respect of the urgent decision that had been taken on Green Homes Funding, this had been debated at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Board and Cabinet in March. However, as the Council had needed to make a decision on this subject by 15th April 2021, the proposals in respect of this matter had had to be approved through the urgent decision process.

During consideration of this item, Councillor S. Robinson requested further information about the delegation that had been granted to Officers in respect of the Green Homes Funding item. As this item was not subject to debate, the Chairman proposed that this matter should be discussed with relevant Officers outside the meeting.

88\20

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET

Financial Monitoring Report – Quarter 3 2020/21

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling presented the Financial Monitoring Report – Quarter 3 2020/21. Members were advised that the Council was anticipating a deficit of £774,000 by the end of the financial year. However, there remained £786,000 of the £1.255 million that the Council had received in Covid-19 grant funding from the Government which could be used to help address this gap. Members were also informed that a further tranche of grant funding had been announced by the Government and Bromsgrove District Council was due to receive £411,000 in this contribution.

During consideration of this item, further information was requested about the Schools Financial Literacy Programme and potential for this scheme to be rolled out to all secondary schools in the District. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling explained that 2 schools had participated in the scheme the previous year and 2 different schools would be participating in the next year.

The recommendations in respect of the Financial Monitoring Report – Quarter 3 2020/21 were proposed by Councillor G. Denaro and seconded by Councillor K. May.

RESOLVED that

- 1) an increase to the Capital programme 2020/21 of match funding from PCC for digital upgrade of CCTV of £19,000 be approved;
- 2) the increase in the capital programme of £30,000 for 2021/22, £20,000 2022/23 for Welfare and business improvements at Bromsgrove Sporting be approved; and
- 3) an increase to the revenue budget by £4,000, to be funded by reserves to help fund a school's financial literacy programme, be approved.

89\20

TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET HELD ON 24TH FEBRUARY AND 31ST MARCH 2021

The minutes of the meetings of Cabinet held on 24th February and 31st March 2021 were noted.

90\20

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The Chairman advised that 6 questions had been submitted for consideration at the meeting. There would be no subsidiary questions.

Question Submitted by Councillor P. McDonald

“The Institute for Employment Rights (IER) report, compiled by 11 specialists in occupational health and safety and labour law, claims that Covid-19 guidance is not being properly enforced by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

The government’s approach to enforcing its guidance in the workplace has been underfunded, light-touch and run by an understaffed HSE. As a result, researchers claim that workplace risk has not been managed properly, and is not in line with the government’s claim that is making workplaces Covid-secure. Researchers said there has been widespread failure to control risks of airborne and surface transmission in workplaces, shown by the emergence of infection clusters.

Considering this what action is the Council taking to ensure the Council is Covid secure?”

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling explained that the COVID-19 pandemic brought with it many challenges, many of which required swift action to put in place safety measures to ensure that the Council could continue to deliver its services in an efficient way, whilst also minimising the risks to staff of transmission of the virus. The Council had, during the previous twelve months, followed Government guidance in relation to working from home, the wearing of masks, social distancing, testing and all other guidance issued by central Government. The Council had also taken a number of actions and continued to implement any changes required by Government in order to ensure compliance. Some of these actions included:

- All business continuity plans were checked and updated as the pandemic developed in the early part of 2020.
- All staff who could work from home were told to do so with additional infrastructure and equipment provided by IT services.
- Specific risk management was undertaken for all staff in customer-facing and frontline roles.
- A frequently asked questions update had been maintained for staff throughout the pandemic, with updates based on changing Government guidance.
- Regular communications had been issued across the organisation to highlight changed guidance or the need for compliance.
- Communications reminding staff where the nearest testing centres were had been issued.
- General risk management was undertaken for all colleagues, ensuring those frontline colleagues with identified vulnerabilities were either safely redeployed or permitted to work from home.

- PPE was provided along with advice on how to best utilise it and dispose of it safely after use.
- In buildings, COVID-secure measures were put in place, such as:
 - teams being split into cohort groups to reduce transmission through the mixing of groups.
 - hand sanitiser stations provided at various points throughout buildings.
 - social distancing markings and reminder posters put in buildings.
 - limited numbers of staff allowed in offices ensuring compliance with social distancing.
 - social distancing was further enabled through the introduction of one-way systems, restricted access points, QR code posters for track and trace, signing in/out books and a desk booking system requiring staff who needed to work in the office to book a desk to ensure social distancing was maintained.
 - enhanced cleaning regimes were put in place utilising a red/green card system, where staff had used desks or other areas.
 - single person access to shared areas such as toilet facilities, had been introduced.
 - screens used in public facing areas.
- Vehicle sharing had been limited other than within cohort groups with the use of face coverings when in vehicles with windows open and reduced conversations or speaking.
- In early 2021, all staff, contractors, and visitors had been required to wear face coverings in common areas, with frontline teams such as those in the Place and Waste teams having daily temperature checks.
- From April 2021, all frontline staff were supplied with 2 home kits of Lateral Flow Tests (covering 7 weeks) and were encouraged, in line with government guidance, to test twice a week.
- A plan had been developed to conduct a thorough clean and removal of items in the workspaces such as old paperwork and items of clothing in order to ensure the work environment was as clean, uncluttered, and hygienic as possible. Clear office spaces would make cleaning regimes more effective when more staff were able to return to the workplace.
- Officers would also be expected to bring their laptops into the workspace to minimise the sharing of any equipment. Desks would have a large screen, keyboard and phone which would be regularly cleaned. Staff laptops would connect to these peripheral devices.
- Any other equipment that did not belong in the office would be removed. Staff would have access to designated clean kitchen spaces to make drinks and other refreshments again to ensure the enhanced cleaning regimes were made as effective as possible.

All measures had been published and communicated throughout the organisation and were regularly reviewed when there were significant changes, such as updates to guidance from Central Government, when entering national lockdowns or regional tiering systems. Controls were

managed locally by frontline team leaders and managers as appropriate, with regular reminders, poster campaigns and toolbox talks, with support from the Senior Health and Safety Officer.

Question from Councillor R. Hunter

“Please could you clarify what this council’s policy is on grass mowing and how regularly residents of estates that are maintained by this council can expect mowing to take place?”

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services replied by advising that the Council carried out grass cutting alongside its other duties for cleanliness across the District using the Place Team. The team did not work to a fixed schedule for grass cutting and there was some variance in the grass cutting frequency each year that reflected the level and speed of growth, as well as other priorities on the service resources.

The Council received funds from Worcestershire County Council towards the maintenance of their verges to meet highway safety, which was equivalent to 3 cuts a year. This was topped up to a higher standard at Bromsgrove District Council’s expense.

Officers aimed to cut verges between 6 and 9 times a year, depending on the growth that season and resources available. This equated to an average of 4-6 weeks between each cut. Open Spaces, Play Areas and ornamental areas were maintained to a greater frequency to reflect their usage.

Question from Councillor S. Robinson

“With High Street shops reopening this month, in order to entice shoppers back to support our High Streets, please may we have an update about when the promised car park refurbishments will be completed?”

The Leader responded by informing Members that A 5-year programme for the maintenance of the car parks was proposed and approved by Cabinet on 25th November 2020 and Full Council on 2nd December 2020. This report provided a comprehensive schedule of planned works and associated costs which ensured that all the car parks were improved and maintained to a safe and high standard.

Work already undertaken since the report was approved included the introduction of cashless payments and a virtual permit system. The work planned to take place in 2021/22 included resurfacing and the introduction of new machines and lights on Parkside and New Road Car parks. Some work planned to take place unfortunately had been delayed due to Covid restrictions in place in the early part of 2021 and would therefore be undertaken in the new financial year. This would include the installation of CCTV and the upgrading of machines to

accept car payments for North Bromsgrove Car Park and the upgrading of the lifts and lighting in the Multistorey car park.

The planned replacement of the Pay on Foot system had been delayed while negotiations took place with interested parties.

The work planned to take place in 2022/23 included resurfacing, new machines and lights on School Drive Car park together with an extension to the existing Shopmobility office.

A detailed breakdown of the works planned for 2023/24 and 2024/25 could be found as an appendix to the original report.

Question from Councillor J. King

“At a time when residents’ interest in the progress of our council’s work to mitigate climate change is very high, could the council website and social media be used much more effectively to communicate the achievements and progress made to date please?”

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services replied by explaining that action was already being taken to update the relevant pages on the Council’s website. Information about the Council work to encourage carbon reduction did already exist, though was featured on the pages for a range of service areas on the website. The Climate Change Officers had spoken to the Communications Team about optimising and linking specific search words to enable ease of access, and as such Officers had designed an updated map of pages relating to carbon reduction work and would be taking this back to the Communications team for review shortly.

Officers always put out relevant and updated messages on social media as and when there were newsworthy or interesting things to note. Recent activity included regular messages being issued regarding various waste streams, with the most recent focusing on reduction and recycling correctly over Easter. In addition, the electric vehicles charging project was advertised on social media in early April 2021 to inform interested parties about installations. Information had also been issued on social media in respect of the Burcot Lane low carbon development in March 2021.

There was insufficient time available to consider 2 further questions that had been submitted for consideration at the meeting. A proposal was made for the time available to consider Questions to be extended but this was not taken forward.

91\20

MOTIONS ON NOTICE

The Chairman opened the debate in respect of Motions that had been submitted for consideration at the meeting and in doing so reminded

Members that they could not discuss specific planning applications when commenting on the Motions.

A Western Distributor Road for Bromsgrove

Members considered the following Motion on Notice submitted by Councillor L. Mallett:

Council notes the WCC JMP Western Bypass Report, 2015. This report was subsequently discredited as a basis for understanding the feasibility of such a scheme in research commissioned by Bromsgrove Council in 2018.

Council resolves to urgently review the case and formally assess the feasibility of the Western Distributor /Relief Road. This would allow the incorporation of this scheme, should it be found to be feasible, into all relevant planning documents and funding opportunities, at the earliest opportunity.

The Motion was proposed by Councillor L. Mallett and seconded by Councillor H. Rone-Clarke.

In proposing the Motion, Councillor Mallett commented that the subject of the Motion was not new to the District, having been discussed for 2 decades and he thanked Whitford Vale Voice for the petition that they had submitted on this subject and the people who had signed the petition.

Members were advised that what was being discussed was a distributor road, not a bypass. The purpose of a distributor road would be to enable traffic to progress round to the west of the town without having to go through the town centre. Councillor Mallett noted that there was a distributor road in Worcester, between the north and south M5 junctions, which set a precedent for towns in the county to have distributor roads. Councillor Mallett commented that the introduction of a distributor road would also help to address problems with congestion in the town centre, the issues arising from vehicles using residential streets, such as All Saints Road, to travel through the town, the impact of high traffic volumes on air pollution, which impacted on the health of local residents and would have a beneficial impact on economic growth in the town.

When sites to the west of Bromsgrove were designated as suitable for development in 2004, Bromsgrove District Council had requested that a Western Relief Road should be considered. However, Councillor Mallett commented that no assessment appeared to have subsequently been undertaken by Worcestershire County Council in respect of this matter. Consequently, since then, a number of developments had been approved, though without the mitigating action that had been intended when those sites were first earmarked for development.

In 2014 Councillor Mallett had proposed a Motion which had resulted in the Council agreeing unanimously that a relief road should be

considered. This decision had ultimately triggered the JMP report, commissioned by Worcestershire County Council. Councillor Mallett questioned the appropriateness of the brief that had been provided to JMP for this report and he commented that it did not give proper consideration to local road infrastructure and traffic volumes, did not assess the economic benefits arising from easing congestion and did not take into account the potential contributions that could be made by developers, either in the form of land or a financial contribution.

Councillor Mallett suggested that if a Western Relief Road had been incorporated into plans in 2014 it would have been a more sensible solution to resolving traffic issues on the western end of Bromsgrove than further investment in the A38. Partly, this was because traffic needed to travel through the town centre to reach the A38 and this was where he suggested the main traffic problems were located.

In 2018, Mott Macdonald, consultants that had been commissioned by Bromsgrove District Council, concluded that the report issued by JMP could not be relied upon when determining whether a Western Relief Road was needed in Bromsgrove. Mott Macdonald had concluded that a full feasibility study should be carried out to answer any outstanding questions on this subject. In the meantime, the Western Relief Road was added as a scheme for future consideration to Local Transport Plan 4. Councillor Mallett suggested that by 2021 it would be timely to undertake this feasibility study, prior to further development taking place.

In seconding the Motion, Councillor Rone-Clarke thanked Whitford Vale Voice for their grassroots organisation in respect of this matter. Councillor Rone-Clarke commented that Bromsgrove was a growing town, and the Western Relief Road would be vital to the future development of the town and would help to address issues with air pollution. A Western Relief Road would also help to relieve congestion in the town centre, which would potentially provide greater capacity to focus on measures that would have a beneficial impact on the local environment, such as the introduction of more cycle lanes in the town.

During the debate in respect of the Motion, the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services commented that in June 2019 Members had considered a Motion which proposed that the Council should seek solutions through a strategic transport assessment. This assessment would have been difficult to undertake over the previous 12-month period, due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In particular, Members were advised that it would not have been appropriate to conduct such an assessment at that time, as traffic volume was significantly reduced during the lockdowns and would have made the assessments unrepresentative.

However, Members were advised that in April 2021 Bromsgrove District Council and Worcestershire County Council had commissioned a strategic transport assessment. This assessment would take into account the transport needs of the whole district, not just the town of

Bromsgrove and would be completed in 3 parts, starting with a focus on cycling and walking. As part of the assessment process, consideration would be given to the potential for alternative forms of transport to be explored further in the District, such as walking, buses and cycle lanes as well as vehicular access requirements. This would help to offer greater flexibility moving forward. Members would be kept informed about the assessment process and there would be briefings, at meetings of the Strategic Planning Group. It was anticipated that the strategic transport assessment would be completed by December 2021.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services acknowledged that there was a need to address traffic congestion where this arose. In addition, there was a need to encourage a reduction in reliance on use of cars for journeys in the District whilst embracing new ways of working that had been introduced during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Members subsequently discussed the Motion in detail and in so doing commented on the following points:

- The announcement of the strategic transport assessment for Bromsgrove, which was welcomed by some Members.
- The need for the strategic transport assessment to take into account the potential for future housing growth and the impact that this could have on traffic in the District.
- The financial implications of introducing a Western Relief Road.
- The number of people who had signed the petition, at approximately 5,000 by the date of the meeting, and the strength of feeling in the community demonstrated by this petition.
- The previous improvement works that had been undertaken on the A38 and the extent to which this had impacted on traffic and congestion in Bromsgrove town centre.
- The impact that the reopening of schools in March 2021 had had on traffic in the District.
- The potential for the strategic transport assessment to identify whether a Western Relief Road was needed.
- The timeframes for the completion of the strategic transport assessment.
- The potential for houses to be built in the location where a Western Relief Road might otherwise be situated.
- The potential for lessons to be learned from other recent housing developments when reaching a decision on the possible introduction of a Western Relief Road.
- The issues with air pollution arising from traffic congestion. Members noted that there were three Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in Bromsgrove District.
- The Council declaration of a climate emergency and the need for action to be taken, including action that would encourage use of sustainable forms of transport, to help reduce carbon emissions in the District.

- The potential impact that the introduction of an additional road might have on carbon emissions in the District.
- The timeframes involved in commissioning the strategic transport assessment and the delays that would occur should an alternative feasibility study or assessment be required.
- The timeframes in which the work to commission the strategic transport assessment had been completed.
- The financial costs involved in commissioning strategic transport assessments and feasibility studies.
- The availability of new modelling data to enable the Council to assess the impact of developments on traffic in Bromsgrove.
- The potential for there to be a reduction in car ownership in the long-term and the impact that increasing demand for electric vehicles would have on carbon emissions. Alternative views were provided that car ownership was likely to increase.

In summing up, Councillor Mallett commented that there was a need to take action soon in order to avoid losing the opportunity to introduce a Western Relief Road. Councillor Mallett questioned why the strategic transport assessment had taken time to be commissioned. Concerns were raised that the strategic transport assessment might conclude that a Western Relief Road was needed but that this proposal would be too late to shape the development of the west of the town.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 18.3 a recorded vote was taken and the voting was as follows:

Members voting FOR the Motion:

Councillors S. Colella, S. Douglas, A. English, C. Hotham, R. Hunter, R. Jenkins, J. King, L. Mallett, P. McDonald, S. Robinson, H. Rone-Clarke, K. Van Der Plank (12)

Members voting AGAINST the Motion:

Councillors A. Beaumont, R. Deeming, G. Denaro, M. Glass, S. Hession, H. Jones, A. Kent, A. Kriss, R. Laight, K. May, M. Middleton, M. Sherrey, C. Spencer, P. Thomas, M. Thompson, J. Till, S. Webb and P. Whittaker (18)

Members ABSTAINING in the vote:

No Councillors (0)

On being put to the vote the Motion was lost.

Other Motions

The debate in respect of the Western Relief Road lasted for 57 minutes. Suggestions were made that the remaining Motions should be debated at the following meeting or that the next Motion on the agenda should be

debated before the meeting closed. However, concerns were raised that it would be unfair to only debate some Motions.

During consideration of this item Councillor R. Hunter proposed that the debate in respect of the Motions should be extended by an hour to provide time to debate them all. This was seconded by Councillor P. McDonald.

On being put to the vote this proposal was lost.

The meeting closed at 8.02 p.m.

Chairman