

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**WEDNESDAY 19TH NOVEMBER 2025, AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors S. M. Evans (Chairman), B. Kumar (Vice-Chairman), S. Ammar, A. Bailes, R. Bailes, J. Clarke, S. R. Colella, J. Elledge, D. J. A. Forsythe, E. M. S. Gray, C.A. Hotham, D. Hopkins, R. J. Hunter, H. J. Jones, M. Marshall, K.J. May, P. M. McDonald, B. McEldowney, S. T. Nock, D. J. Nicholl, S. R. Peters, J. Robinson, S. A. Robinson, J. D. Stanley, K. Taylor, H. D. N. Warren-Clarke, S. A. Webb and P. J. Whittaker

Officers: Mr J. Leach, Mr. G. Revans, Mrs. C. Felton, Mrs. D. Goodall and Mrs. J. Bayley-Hill

58\25      **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S. Baxter, A. Dale and R. Lambert.

59\25      **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor C. Hotham declared an Other Disclosable Interest in respect of Minute Item 63/25 - Quarter 1 2025/26 Finance and Performance Monitoring – in his capacity as a Trustee for the Artrix. Councillor Hotham remained in the room for consideration of this report and took part in the vote thereon.

There were no other Declarations of Interest.

60\25      **TO CONFIRM THE ACCURACY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 8TH OCTOBER 2025**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025 were submitted for the consideration of Members.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025 be approved as a true and accurate record.

61\25      **URGENT DECISIONS**

The Chairman advised that there had been one Urgent decision taken since the last meeting of the Council in respect of the Appointment of the Section 151 Officer.

62\25

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION: TRANSFORMING WORCESTERSHIRE LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT WORKS FOR PEOPLE, POWERED BY PLACE AND BUILT FOR THE FUTURE - THE NORTH AND SOUTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION PROPOSAL FOR WORCESTERSHIRE**

The Leader presented the Local Government Reorganisation: Transforming Worcestershire Local government that works for people, powered by place and built for the future - The North and South Local Government Reorganisation Proposal for Worcestershire report for Members' consideration.

It was noted that the purpose of the report was to provide the Council with a proposal to be submitted to Government by 28<sup>th</sup> November 2025 for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) in Worcestershire, following 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2025 Full Council meeting where Members supported a North and South Unitary Council model be developed based at the time on what was termed Option B. This option comprised of either entirely separate Councils or a shared service model.

Working with KPMG, who were subsequently commissioned, and Mutual Ventures who had developed the options appraisal for a two Unitary model. Bromsgrove District Council, Redditch Borough Council, Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council had worked together to produce a proposal that best met the Government's six criteria for LGR based on a North and South Worcestershire footprint as directed by Members. The North being Bromsgrove and Wyre Forest Districts and Redditch Borough Councils and the South being Malvern Hills District, Worcester City and Wychavon District Councils.

The North and South two Unitary Council LGR proposal for Worcestershire was entitled "Transforming Worcestershire: Local government that works for people, powered by place and built for the future." It was noted that this was the only Worcestershire LGR proposal informed by the views of local people from across the whole of Worcestershire following the "Shape Worcestershire" survey that was supported by all six District councils in the County. This ensured that Criteria Four (see below) of the Government's specific requirements for LGR was met.

- Criteria Four - Proposals should show how Councils in the area had sought to work together in coming to a view that met local needs and was informed by local views.

It was noted that not only had local people's views been taken into account in this proposal, in addition all Members across the five commissioning Councils had been given an opportunity to further shape the two Unitary proposal for Worcestershire. This approach recognised the democratic mandate of Councillors as representatives of their community and the very people who received Council services. Further to this, key stakeholders such as partners in the health sector, police, fire, business and voluntary and community sector, including town and parish councils had been asked for their views as well. The output of all this work was a proposal for Worcestershire that was a product of true collaboration.

The vision for a thriving Worcestershire North and South was included within the report along with a number of key challenges and a pledge that should this proposal be accepted by Government and be delivered then: -

1. Public services would shift from crisis to prevention
2. Communities would feel more connected and empowered
3. Local services would respond faster to everyday issues
4. Vulnerable adults would live healthier, happier, and safer lives
5. Children and families would be supported to stay together
6. Young people would have better access to skills and jobs
7. Better housing would support healthier lives
8. People and businesses would benefit from stronger local economies

The approach to the implementation of LGR, should it be accepted by Government, was also detailed in the report.

It was stated that the case for two Councils in Worcestershire was clear and that changes needed to take place. If the County services were merely rolled into a County Unitary Council, this would result in the same outcomes. In addition, to ignore the challenges and potential disruption caused by aggregating District services into a large one size fits all model was naive. The proposal allowed services to provide focussed delivery and leadership at a local level and focussed delivery and leadership at a Countywide level where it made sense to do so. This approach acknowledged that one size did not fit all. This was an opportunity to take forward a new operating model for local government in Worcestershire by supporting a proposal that demonstrated flexibility, collaboration and the ability to navigate complex challenges in a rapidly changing environment.

Further detail was provided in respect of the North and South model and it was noted that it supported long-term financial sustainability through prevention-led reform and neighbourhood-based services. The North and South unitary model would save approximately £9 million a year whilst delivering services people wanted, as opposed to perhaps saving more money but delivering services people did not want through a remote, large, digital by default one size fits all council.

In addition to this the north and south model reflected the strong and consistent preference of residents, staff, and partners across the County and incorporated the views of the 62.5 per cent of people who took part in the Shape Worcestershire survey and had stated a preference for a north and south model. That survey showed more residents believed that two unitary councils would better improve services, support local identity and strengthen community engagement. In contrast, the one-unitary model was seen as remote, less representative and more likely to dilute local priorities.

The proposed model delivered stronger local accountability and decision-making, with Councillors closer to the communities they served and enabled tailored service delivery and planning that responded to the distinct needs of North and South Worcestershire.

Members were also informed that the North and South model embraced the opportunity for genuine transformation and that it was the only option shaped by genuine engagement, backed by evidence – both qualitative and quantitative - and designed to deliver better outcomes for Worcestershire.

Following the presentation of the report Members considered the proposal in detail. In doing so the following areas were highlighted:

- The collaborative nature in which the Councils involved in the North and South Unitary proposal had worked together. This included the way in which local residents had been included and consulted with to understand their needs and requirements for the future. It was noted that Officers had informed Members of the process and progress at every opportunity and this had been gratefully received by Members.
- The North and South Unitary model was the best option for Bromsgrove and its residents and that the data and consultation information gathered had helped to substantiate this. This model

also provided long term financial sustainability and had been prepared following consultation with residents.

- Members expressed the importance of local champions with local accountability who understood their local places, their identity, strengths, and how to harness them. All these areas had been included in the Devolution White Paper provided by Government at the beginning of the LGR process. The North and South unitary model also ensured that the Councils would not cover too large an area ensuring deeper understanding of the needs of local people and would retain the identity of the local area. This had happened in other Councils and Members were extremely keen to avoid this for Bromsgrove.
- What was meant by the term 'powered by Place'? – It was confirmed that this term described the local nature of the governance in the future including neighbourhood committees and decision making at a more local level. It was hoped that this type of governance would enable local communities to flourish. The proposals included in the report emphasised the importance of localism and this would enable improvements to take place in areas such as connectivity and transport.
- It was a requirement that each authority had a separate directorate for both Adult Social Care and Children's Services.
- Would a Cabinet Member with specific responsibility for LGR be appointed? It was confirmed that as previously agreed there would be a Cabinet Member appointed with specific responsibility for LGR.
- The pressures on Council Tax for the financial years 2026-2027 and 2027-2028.
- The liability of assets contained within the District and how future authorities would take on debts and Capital Reserves in the future.
- That the decision for the future governance model for Worcestershire lay with central Government.
- Members expressed that although it seemed unlikely there still needed to be some awareness of the other local authorities that lay on the boundary of the County.
- Consideration of the establishment of a Town Council in the future for Bromsgrove, to ensure that assets were maintained and decisions could still be made at a local level.

A Member expressed that they were in favour of the One Worcestershire approach in the future. In particular in terms of the expenditure on Adult and Social Care Services which were a significant proportion of local government budgets and a huge pressure on local authorities. Members

raised that there would be savings made if the One Worcestershire approach was taken.

It was also raised that the number of responses received as part of the consultation process only equated to six per cent of residents within the County. It was felt that there should have been more face-to-face meetings with residents in order for them to understand the options being proposed as part of the consultation.

It was felt by a Member that Worcestershire County Council (WCC) had been criticised in the proposal considered at this meeting and that WCC were operating under extreme financial pressures and with a particular financial burden of Adult and Children's Services.

In response to the areas raised in support for the One Worcestershire approach to local government it was explained that Members at Bromsgrove District Council had a free vote on this matter and as such could support the model they wished to. It was noted that WCC had spent £320,000 on the One Worcestershire proposal which was to be submitted to central Government. However, there had been no engagement with the politicians at County level and the proposal had been prepared solely by Officers. Members explained that there needed to be some changes made in the way in which local government was structured, and this was an opportunity to make the necessary changes to improve localism in the future and in turn improve the services for the residents within the North of Worcestershire. Again, the area of Adult Social and Children's Services were highlighted as an area where it was hoped would see a significant improvement particularly in light of the aging population within Worcestershire. The North and South model of governance would align these services more effectively and help to deliver a sustainable care system tailored to demographic. It was acknowledged that the One Worcestershire approach would deliver initial savings however the two unitary approach would offer resilience and be locally rooted and compassionate to residents' needs in the long term.

Following the detailed discussion, it was noted that the Minister for Housing Communities and Local Government would ultimately make the decision of the future governance model for Worcestershire. It was hoped that whatever the decision was, Bromsgrove could continue to thrive and build on the work that had been carried out and was currently underway.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor K. May and seconded by Councillor P. Whittaker.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 18.3 a recorded vote was taken in respect of the Local Government Reorganisation report.

Members voting FOR the resolutions:

Councillors S. Ammar, A. Bailes, R. Bailes, J. Clarke, S. Colella, J. Elledge, S. Evans, E. Gray, D. Hopkins, C. Hotham, R. Hunter, B. Kumar, M. Marshall, K. May, P. McDonald, B. McEldowney, D. Nicholl, S. Nock, S. Peters, J. Robinson, S. Robinson, K. Taylor, H. Warren-Clarke, S. Webb and P. Whittaker (25).

Members voting AGAINST the resolutions:

Councillors D. Forsythe, H. Jones and J. Stanley (3).

Members voting to ABSTAIN on the resolutions:

No councillors (0).

Therefore, on being put to the vote, the resolutions were carried.

**RESOLVED to NOTE**

- 1) the matters set out in the Local Government Reorganisation Transforming Worcestershire proposal: Local government that works for people, powered by place and built for the future - The North and South Local Government Reorganisation Proposal for Worcestershire attached at Appendix 1; and

**RESOLVED**

- 2) To adopt the Local Government Reorganisation Transforming Worcestershire proposal: Local government that works for people, powered by place and built for the future - the north and south Local Government Reorganisation Proposal for Worcestershire, as the Council's final submission to the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government ("MHCLG") on the issue of Local Government Reorganisation.
- 3) That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive and the Assistant Director of Legal Democratic and Procurement Services

to make any final amendments to Appendix 1 following consultation with the Group Leaders and thereafter to submit the document to the MHCLG by the deadline of Friday 28th November 2025.

63\25

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET**

### **Quarter 1 2025/26 Finance and Performance Monitoring**

The Quarter 1 Finance and Performance Report was previously brought to the Council meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025.

At that meeting, Members requested that Officers double checked the figures in respect of the projected deficit and the report be rescheduled for consideration at this meeting. A revised report had therefore been brought back to this meeting.

Members were asked to note the following points:

- The Full Year Variance of £173,361 on the 'Totals Line' remained the same as the report brought to Council previously.
- The Full Year Projected Forecast has been amended from £587,360 to £173,361 on the 'Totals Line'.
- The Narrative within the report had been reviewed and improved, with a view to ensuring that full explanations were given for all variances.
- There were two areas within the report where the narrative had been materially adjusted:
  - Paragraph 4.4.6 which stated that In the previous report it seemed that the Artrix costs were unbudgeted. However, it was clarified that these were budgeted as part of the 2025/26 Medium Term Financial Plan however, the budget was not within Legal, Democratic and Procurement Services.
  - Information included in the previous report stated that there was a shortfall in income of £220,000 which related to carparking revenue and was as a result of the first two hours being free. This should have stated that £82,000 of



the £220,000 related to carparking was the result of the first half hour being free.

- Reference should have been to £0.191m overspend rather than £0.170m overspend stated in the previous report.
- The total savings should be £725,000 in the 2025-26 column and £488,000 in the adjusted 2025-26 column.

Members were reminded that there was also a query at the previous Council meeting in respect of rent revenue relating to Nailers Yard. For information, GJS Dillon had received several enquiries for office space and two enquiries for the GF food and beverage unit. The service charge schedules had also been prepared for the commercial building. Heads of terms were due to be issued to an incoming tenant that wished to let one and a half floors. The next stage was to instruct Bruton Knowles to undertake the property management role of the commercial building.

Following the presentation of the report, Members queried some areas further. These included the following:

- The costs of Bed and Breakfast (B&B) Accommodation – Members highlighted that there were differing spends included in the report on the costs for B&B accommodation. The Interim Section 151 undertook to provide Members with the correct amount following the meeting.

Members were reassured that the errors contained within the report were one off and that the finer details were being looked at by the Finance Team to ensure that the reports such as these were accurate going forward. Some Members requested that Internal Audit be involved in looking at the areas where errors had been identified within this report previously in order to ensure that this did not happen in the future. The Chairman of Audit, Standards and Governance Committee suggested that this be an area looked at by this Committee.

It was noted that should Members wish to be involved in these areas in the future they could volunteer to sit on the Finance and Budget Working Group when reports such as these were pre-scrutinised prior to being considered by Cabinet and / or Council. There were currently three vacancies available on this Working Group.

Some Members raised that there were a number of items that had not been included in the Quarter One report, nor had any commentary been

provided including Play Area investment across the whole District and 'legacy' projects for the Council prior to Local Government Reorganisation. This had been an area that Members had been asked to provide suggestions on previously. However, to date, no further information had been provided. It was noted that in terms of the Play Area Investment the Strategy was to be implemented as planned and that a new Cabinet Member would be appointed to this portfolio in the near future.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor K. May and seconded by Councillor P. Whittaker.

**RESOLVED** that

- 1) the Balance Sheet monitoring position for Quarter One be noted;
- 2) the Treasury performance for Quarter One for the financial year 2025/26 be noted;
- 3) the position in relation to the Council's Prudential Indicators be noted.

**Expansion of Commercial Waste Collection Service**

The Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Community Safety presented the Expansion of Commercial Waste Collection Service for Members' consideration.

Members were informed that the existing commercial waste service had been successful in growing its customer base and delivered a sustainable income for the Council. The service had delivered and exceeded the returns forecast since the service was previously expanded with additional investment in 2019.

However, the existing service now had no capacity to take on additional customers and required full availability of staff and vehicles to operate each week as there was no surplus staffing to give resilience to the service. The service faced both opportunities such as increased demand following Dudley Council's exit from the market and further legislation that required businesses to ensure they were recycling all of their waste. Alongside this, pressures had arisen from vehicle shortages, staffing constraints, and limited capacity to accept new business.

The report outlined the need to expand the commercial waste collection service to support generation of further income with investment required to fund three key elements.

Firstly, capital funding of £489,760 was required in order to purchase two additional waste collection vehicles to expand and secure the service. Secondly, two ongoing capital funding amounts of £35,000 annually to procure waste containers to support new customers and deliver the service. Thirdly, revenue funding of £334,342 for the recruitment of staff and associated costs of operating the expanded service was needed.

This investment was forecast to generate a related net surplus from 2026-2027 onwards allowing the Council to support more businesses to meet their statutory obligations, whilst also strengthening the resilience of the existing service.

In essence, these proposals were concerned with securing compliance, protecting income, and ensuring the Council's commercial waste service was able to continue to provide the high standards of service that has attracted over two hundred local businesses to trust the Council with their waste management arrangements to date.

Following the presentation of the reports, Members requested further clarification on several areas. These were as follows:

- Staffing Levels – Members queried the number of extra staff required to operate the two additional waste collection vehicles and whether the correct amount of revenue funding had been allocated. Members were informed that the revenue funding did include the appropriate amount of funding to provide two new crews for the additional waste collection vehicles along with a coordinator role in order to provide greater resilience for the service.
- Biofuel and Electric Fleet Vehicles – Members queried whether the Council was close to replacing its fleet with Biofuel or Electric vehicles. It was noted that electric vehicles were not suited for use with the heavy vehicles for commercial and domestic waste. Currently the Council used Hydrogenated Vegetable Oil (HVO) in thirty per cent of its fleet. When smaller new vehicles were purchased for the fleet electric vehicles were to be considered.
- Members expressed that this service had been a success since its introduction and the commercial nature of this service should be a model used in the new structure of local government.
- The VAT treatment of anticipated revenues from the expanded commercial waste service and clarification of what VAT should be charged. It was noted that VAT was not applicable for commercial

waste collections within Bromsgrove but was for collections outside the District.

- The presentation of the risk contained within the report was clear and concise.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor P. Whittaker and seconded by Councillor K. May.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) Capital Funding of £489,760 be added to the Capital Programme for 2026/27 to purchase two Refuse Collection Vehicles (RCVs)
- 2) The Council allocates Capital funding of £35,000 annually in the Medium-Term Financial Plan from the 2025/26 financial year to fund wheeled bins for Commercial Services.
- 3) The Council allocate £334,342 Revenue Funding in the Medium-Term Financial Plan to fund operational costs of providing the expanded service from 2025/26.
- 4) The Council allocate £100,000 Revenue Funding in the Medium-Term Financial Plan across 2025/26 and 2026/27 for interim vehicle hire.

**Business Rates Retention (BRR) Pool 2026-2027**

The Chairman informed Council that this report had been withdrawn and would therefore not be considered at this meeting.

64\25

**MOTION ON NOTICE**

Councillor J. Robinson presented a Motion on Notice for Members' consideration. In doing so, he highlighted that he was altering the wording of the Motion that he had submitted, and which had been included in the agenda to read as follows:

"The A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme has been an unmitigated disaster for our town.

Hundreds of trees have been felled, and the project will not resolve the issues of traffic in our town.

The Council resolves to ask the Leader of the Council to urgently write to the Leader of Worcestershire County Council placing on record

Bromsgrove District Council's opposition to the project and call for a full review and consultation with the community."

Councillor Robinson clarified that he had decided to remove reference to placing schemes that had not started on hold as circumstances had changed since the Motion was first submitted for Council's consideration in July 2025.

The Motion was proposed by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor R. Hunter.

In proposing the Motion, Councillor Robinson commented that in his view the A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme (BREP) had not worked well. Councillor Robinson had attended consultation events with the public and in doing so had heard from local residents about their concerns regarding the scale of the project. Members were asked to note that many trees had been felled during the works which had been opposed by many residents. Reference was made to the intention of BREP and it was suggested that these works had been launched to address traffic congestion in Bromsgrove. However, Councillor Robinson suggested that BREP was unlikely to resolve problems with traffic congestion in the town.

In seconding the Motion, Councillor Hunter commented that there was a need to learn lessons from the BREP works and to ensure that the current situation was not repeated once a new unitary authority was serving Bromsgrove. Councillor Hunter expressed concerns about the impact that BREP had had on residents' lives and the delays to traffic caused by the works. The suggestion was also made that an opportunity had been missed to undertake a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport in the town.

Members subsequently discussed the Motion and in doing so expressed concerns about the impact of the works on traffic congestion in the town. It was noted that the Leader had previously been asked at a Council meeting to write to Worcestershire County Council regarding this matter and that she had done so. The suggestion was made that in this context, as the issues causing concern had persisted, Members needed to continue to raise this matter with the County Council.

Clarification was provided regarding the background to the BREP works. Members were asked to note that the Department for Transport (DfT) had provided enhancement funding. In addition, the Midlands Engine was driving forward the project. Concerns had been raised with the DfT

that the works were unlikely to resolve challenges relating to traffic congestion.

During discussion of this item, consideration was given to the potential for an action plan to be provided for the BREP works. The suggestion was made that this might be made available by Worcestershire County Council to the County Councillor representing the division within which the works were taking place. A request was made for such a plan, should it be provided, to also be shared with Bromsgrove District Councillors.

Concerns were raised about the disruption that had been caused to residents, businesses and visitors to Bromsgrove during the time in which the BREP works had been taking place. Members commented that people were having to follow detours over lengthy periods of time in order to reach their destinations. It was noted that forthcoming public consultation events, organised by County Councillors, might help to provide further clarity on arrangements moving forwards.

During consideration of this item, a request was received from Councillor K. May to alter the Motion to refer to a letter being sent on behalf of political Group Leaders, rather than just the Leader, to Worcestershire County Council regarding this matter.

The Motion would then be altered to read as follows:

“The A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme has been an unmitigated disaster for our town.

Hundreds of trees have been felled, and the project will not resolve the issues of traffic in our town.

The Council resolves to ask *Group Leaders* to urgently write to the Leader of Worcestershire County Council placing on record Bromsgrove District Council’s opposition to the project and call for a full review and consultation with the community.”

This alteration was proposed as it was suggested that this would help to demonstrate the strength of feeling at the Council regarding this matter.

Councillor Robinson, as the proposer of the Motion, indicated that he would be happy to accept this amendment and this therefore became the substantive Motion.

Consideration was given to the number of trees that had been felled during the BREP works. Members noted that plans had been announced to plant 3,000 new saplings in the town in mitigation.

Concerns were raised about the impact that the BREP works had had on other public sector infrastructure projects and developments in Bromsgrove. Members noted that, until the A38 works had been finalised, it would not be possible to introduce a new roundabout on Worcester Road. This would impact on residents living in the area, at least in the short and medium-term.

The funding that had been provided for the BREP project and the intention of this funding was discussed. Some Members commented that they had been under the impression that part of the funding had been allocated to enhancing pedestrian and cyclists' routes in the town.

Questions were raised about how any consultation proposed under the terms of the Motion would be organised as well as about the sources of funding required to pay for the consultation. Members also queried whether a letter to Worcestershire County Council would have any impact on the works. However, it was also noted that a letter would help to highlight the strength of feeling amongst Members regarding this matter.

During the debate in respect of this item, there was an adjournment between 20.20 and 20.39.

Following the adjournment, an amendment was proposed to the wording of the Motion by Councillor H. Warren-Clarke. The amended Motion read as follows:

“The A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme has been an unmitigated disaster for our town.

Hundreds of trees have been felled, and the project will not resolve the issues of traffic in our town.

The Council resolves to ask Group Leaders to urgently write to the Leader of Worcestershire County Council placing on record Bromsgrove District Council's *concerns* and call for a full review and consultation with the community.”

The amendment was proposed by Councillor Warren-Clarke and seconded by Councillor P. Whittaker.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 18.3, a recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to the Motion.

Members voting FOR the amendment:

Councillors A. Bailes, R. Bailes, S. Colella, J. Elledge, D. Forsythe, E. Gray, D. Hopkins, C. Hotham, H. Jones, B. Kumar, M. Marshall, K. May, P. McDonald, B. McEldowney, S. Nock, J. Stanley, K. Taylor, H. Warren-Clarke, S. Webb and P. Whittaker (20).

Members voting AGAINST the amendment:

Councillors S. Ammar, J. Clarke, S. Evans, R. Hunter, D. Nicholl, J. Robinson and S. Robinson (7).

Members voting to ABSTAIN on the amendment:

No Councillors (0).

(Councillor S. Peters had left the meeting prior to this recorded vote taking place.)

Therefore, on being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

The amended Motion thereby became the substantive Motion and on being put to the vote it was

**RESOLVED** that

The A38 Bromsgrove Route Enhancement Programme has been an unmitigated disaster for our town.

Hundreds of trees have been felled, and the project will not resolve the issues of traffic in our town.

The Council resolves to ask Group Leaders to urgently write to the Leader of Worcestershire County Council placing on record Bromsgrove District Council's concerns and call for a full review and consultation with the community.



**BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, CONSIDERS TO BE OF  
SO URGENT A NATURE THAT IT CANNOT WAIT UNTIL THE NEXT  
MEETING**

There was no Urgent Business on this occasion.

The meeting closed at 8.45 p.m.

Chairman