

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

26TH JUNE 2019, 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, M. Glass, C.A. Hotham, S. A. Hughes, R. J. Hunter, R. E. Jenkins, H. J. Jones, A. D. Kent, A. D. Kriss, K.J. May, M. Middleton, P. M. McDonald, 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

13\19 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A. B. L. English, S.G. Hession and L. C. R. Mallett.

14\19 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion. However, Councillor C. Hotham questioned whether dispensations in respect of outside bodies would be covered under this item. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that this was something which would be dealt with through the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee.

15\19 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council meeting held on 22nd May 2019 were submitted.

The Chairman reminded Members that submission of the minutes was for clarification only and not an opportunity to ask questions, he asked that questions be dealt with either under the questions item of the agenda or directly to the relevant Member or officer outside of the meeting.

Councillor S. Webb asked for it to be noted that under Minute No. 1/19 she had in fact seconded the nomination of Councillor R. Laight as Chairman and not Councillor G. Denaro as stated.

Councillor S. Colella referred to Minute No. 7/19 and whether the Leader had written the letter referred to – the Leader confirmed that she had and would address this within her announcements.

Councillor S. Baxter highlighted that the meeting between Group Leaders had not taken place. The Leader advised that she would respond to this under her announcements, but advised that all those Members whose Motions had been carried forward had been contacted individually.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 22nd May 2019, subject to the pre-amble above, be approved.

16\19

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

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded Members of the Code of Conduct and Member to Member protocol. He confirmed that he proposed to be a firm but fair Chairman and hoped that there would be some good debate for those residents present to hear and for the good of the District.

17\19

TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER

The Leader advised Members that she had received a response from the Minister for Health following the motion which had been agreed by the Council in April. He had thanked her for raising the Council's concerns and the Leader advised that a copy of this response would be sent to all Members outside of this meeting. She confirmed that she was still awaiting a response from the Shadow Chancellor regarding the request for cross party working on Health concerns in the District.

The Leader went on to advise Members that Portfolio Holder briefings at Council would re-commence from September, this would allow new Portfolio Holders to gain a real understanding of their remit. She had also arranged to meet with all Group Leaders and the first meeting for this term would take place on Monday 1st July.

The Leader also took the opportunity to remind all Members to respond to the Worcestershire County Council Passenger Transport Strategy, which was currently out to consultation until 13th September 2019.

Councillor M. Thompson asked the Leader whether she shared his concerns in that Sajid Javid, MP for Bromsgrove would be unable to devote sufficient time to his constituency work in future (due to him putting his name forward for Prime Minister). The Leader responded that she had no such concerns and that he would continue to have the best interest of Bromsgrove District at the forefront of his work.

Councillor P. McDonald raised concerns around the events which were being held in respect of the Passenger Transport Strategy, as there were no events in either Rubery or Barnt Green. The Leader confirmed that she had written to Worcestershire County Council to ask for more events to be held throughout the District.

18\19 **TO RECEIVE COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OR PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

There were no comments, questions or petitions from members of the public on this occasion.

19\19 **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19**

Councillor M. Thompson as the current Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board presented the Annual Report for 2018/19 on behalf of the previous Chairman, Councillor L. Mallett. He took the opportunity to thank Councillor Mallett for his hard work and advised that he hoped that he was able to continue this work in the forthcoming year.

The Leader also took the opportunity of thanking both Councillor Mallett and Members of the Board for all their hard work which was much appreciated.

Councillor S. Baxter also commented that great progress had been made with the Overview and Scrutiny Board in recent years and that some excellent work had been carried out.

Councillor Thompson thanked everyone for their comments.

RESOLVED that the Overview and Scrutiny Board Annual Report 2018/19 be noted.

20\19 **AUDIT, STANDARDS & GOVERNANCE ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19**

Councillor S. Colella, the Chairman of the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee present the Annual Report for 2018/19. In so doing he highlighted the wide work programme of the Committee and the areas that had been covered during its meetings. He also highlighted the positive feedback from the External auditors and that the Council had received an unqualified opinion for value for money and financial statements. The improvements which had been made were acknowledged and the Section 151 Officer, Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services Officers were thanked for their support.

Councillor M. Thompson questioned the omission of a number of words on the report at page 30 of the agenda pack and Councillor Colella confirmed that this was his error, as he had been unable to provide the information due to being on holiday. He advised that this should read as "an unqualified opinion for value for money and financial statements".

The Leader thanked the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee for its work throughout the 2018/19 municipal year.

RESOLVED that the Audit, Standards and Governance Committee Annual Report 2018/19 be noted.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET

Recommendations from the Cabinet meeting on 10th April 2019

Response from the Council on the Solihull Draft Local Plan Supplementary consultation

Councillor A. D. Kent, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services, proposed the recommendation in respect of the Council's response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan Supplementary consultation. This was seconded by Councillor K. May.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Kent advised that the report was clear and concise so he did not intend to go into detail when presenting the report. This was the Council's response to the consultation from Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, completed by officers.

Members discussed the report and highlighted the following areas:

- That Cabinet had endorsed the officer response and that it had already been sent to Solihull.
- Concerns were raised in respect of the impact that developments in the Solihull area could have on particular parts of the District.
- Reference to the Hearn Report in respect of future developments. It was suggested that the Council should be more forceful in its response to ensure that it did not "miss out" when suitable sites for future developments were on the border with another authority. Councillor Kent highlighted the covering letter to the consultation response, as detailed on page 79, which addressed some of these concerns.
- It was noted that the letter was dated 15th March 2019 and referred to meetings with Solihull and Members questioned whether any meetings had as yet taken place. Councillor Kent advised that as far as he was aware these had not. He took on board the concerns raised and assured Members that these would be taken into consideration at any future meetings and added that there were a number of other concerns, for example appropriate infrastructure which would continue to be raised.
- The delay in the matter coming to Council and consideration be given to this in any similar responses. Again, the concern was that as other authorities brought forward potential sites for development this Council would be left behind.

Councillor Kent advised Members that he had taken on board the comments made and would be discussing the points raised in detail with officers in due course.

RESOLVED that Council approve the officer response to the Solihull Local Plan Review supplementary consultation as its formal response and that this is confirmed with SMBC.

Recommendations from the Cabinet meeting on 12th June 2019

High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor A. D. Kent, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services, proposed the recommendation in respect of the High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document. This was seconded by Councillor K. May.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Kent thanked all those who had commented on the document which had been amended to take account of those comments. This was a live document which would be continually revisited and updated as necessary.

Members considered the report in more detailed and made the following comments:

- Members thought it to be an excellent document which had been well put together.
- Reference to electric car charging points and the need for this to be more robust and that future documents needed to have much more detail in regarding renewable energy. Councillor Kent assured Members that he would ensure that this was addressed in future documents.
- The importance of holding developers to account in respect of such matters.

RESOLVED that the revised version of the High Quality Design SPD be adopted.

Statement of Common Ground and Plan Making Process

Councillor A. D. Kent, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulatory Services, proposed the recommendation in respect of the Statement of Common Ground and Plan Making Process. This was seconded by Councillor K. May.

In proposing the recommendation Councillor Kent explained to Members that this was a legislative requirement. It was also noted that all three recommendations, as detailed on page 169 of the agenda pack should be considered by Members and apologised for the error.

During discussion of the item it was suggested that there should be a small, but significant, amendment to the third recommendation to ensure that Members made the final decision in respect of cross boundary decisions for any key planning issues. Councillor Kent confirmed that he was happy for such an amendment to be included.

RESOLVED:

- a) that Members note officer attendance is required at DtC/SoCG meetings where cross boundary issues and draft SoCG agreements are discussed and prepared;
- b) that Council delegates to the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Planning to sign off all relevant SoCG where cross boundary growth is not included; and
- c) that all Statement of Common Grounds which include agreements on cross boundary housing, employment or other development needs or any other key planning issue are reported to Council for consideration prior to signing.

22\19

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY BOARD TRANSPORT PLANNING REVIEW
FINAL REPORT**

In the absence of Councillor L. Mallett, the former Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board, Councillor M. Thompson, presented this report. As he had not been involved in the detailed investigation he said he did not propose to go into detail, but was happy to propose the recommendations en bloc and invited any other Members who had been involved in the report to comment. Councillor S. Colella seconded the recommendations.

The Leader asked that the recommendations be taken individual as detailed below:

Recommendation 1

- a) That Worcestershire County Council's Highways Team consult with the relevant County Councillor, when consulted in respect of any planning applications. This should be done as a matter of course, as they may have more detailed local knowledge of a particular area.
- b) BDC Members will continue to receive the weekly list of all planning applications.

This recommendation was noted.

Recommendation 2

That as part of the response to a planning application the Worcestershire County Council's Highways Team should include a full breakdown of the costs of any infrastructure work which needs to be carried out and provide details of how this work would be funded.

This recommendation was noted.

Recommendation 3

That it is recognised that the relationships between Worcestershire County Council and this Council and its parish councils and residents has not been positive and that although the journey to improvement has begun, the improvements to the culture and ways of working need to be ongoing to ensure that the improvements continue.

This recommendation was noted.

Recommendation 4

That Worcestershire County Highways Team recognises that there is no “one size fits all” approach. They should remain open minded and flexible in considering the approach to the analysis of planning applications before reaching any conclusions.

The Leader advised that it was not possible for this Council to agree recommendations relating directly to another authority and she assured Members that officers and the Cabinet would continue to work closely with the County Council to ensure that the lines of communication remained open and positive.

Recommendation 5

At the earliest possible stage of the Strategic Transport Assessment the Project Officers from Worcestershire County Council and this Council arrange a briefing for Members in order to provide details of the scope of the Strategic Transport Assessment, the process and relevant timelines.

New dates in respect of the Strategic Planning Steering Group would be circulated to Members and information in respect of the Strategic Transport Assessment would be channelled through this group.

Recommendation 6

That this Council is fully represented on the Project Team of the Strategic Transport Assessment to be undertaken, by both officer and Member representation.

The Council was already represented at these meetings by the Head of Planning and Regeneration and the Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager.

Recommendation 7

That, throughout the process of the Strategic Transport Assessment, the Strategic Planning Steering Group holds regular meetings dedicated to this with representatives of Worcestershire County Council in attendance, in order to provide updates and listen and taken on board the views of this Council’s Members.

The Leader confirmed that this was the existing forum for communicating strategic planning matters and had been for some time.

Recommendation 8

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board recognises the current need for the additional transport support from Mott MacDonald. However it requests that the Leader and Cabinet make every effort to seek reimbursement of those costs from Worcestershire County Council.

This recommendation was noted.

Recommendation 9

That the Overview and Scrutiny Board formally writes to the Chairman of the Worcestershire Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board requesting that the report be included on its agenda for future consideration to ensure that Members and Officers at Worcestershire County Council are aware of the issues and concerns of this Council.

This recommendation was noted.

RESOLVED that the Overview and Scrutiny Board Transport Planning Review Report be noted.

23\19

TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET HELD ON 10TH APRIL AND 12TH JUNE 2019

During the consideration of the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 12th June 2019 Councillor C. Hotham asked for clarification in respect of Minute No. 9/19 and the mention of an expression of interest for funding from Central Government. The Leader confirmed that this was in respect of funds for high street improvements.

The Minutes from the Cabinet meetings held on 10th April and 12th June 2019 were submitted for information and noted by Members.

24\19

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE (TO BE CIRCULATED AT THE MEETING)

Question submitted by Councillor M. Thompson

“Please can the leader or new portfolio holder update the council on what they are doing to enact the motion the council passed on the active kitchen?”

Councillor S. Webb, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Health and Wellbeing responded on behalf of the Leader, confirming that a full report was to be presented to Cabinet in early July to enable Members to make a decision on the role of Active Kitchens. This had taken a little longer than anticipated in order to ensure the relevant data could be

included within the report. In the meantime activities in Sidemoor and Charford would continue during the summer holidays and if approved, other proposed areas would commence in October 2019.

Question submitted by Councillor H. D. N. Rone-Clarke

“How many trees has Bromsgrove District Council cut down in the last 5 years?”

The Leader responded that over the last five years the Council had planted approximately 200 specimen trees (large trees) on its own land for example in Sanders Park and approximately 4,000 to 5,000 small hedgerows all over the District.

In addition, as part of the planning consent processes all new developments must include the planting of trees. Over the last five years with the amount of new developments in the District this could mean that up to 200 to 300 specimen trees and several thousand hedgerows had been planted at each new development.

Question submitted by Councillor A. D. Kriss

“Following the successful application for funding for Ultra low emission charging points, could the Cabinet Member for the Environment advise whether Rubery will be receiving any charging points and what the timescales for implementation are?”

Councillor M. Sherrey, the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services responded that the Council had recently been successful in an Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) bid where £300k had been granted for the installation of dedicated electric taxi charger points. A condition of this funding was that it must be spent by 31.3.20.

As part of the bid, officers had identified Rubery, Wythall and Bromsgrove Town as suitable locations for these dedicated electric taxi charger points. General site locations had been identified in conjunction with a wide range of stakeholders including Taxi drivers, operators, Licensing, WRS & Economic Development. Actual locations will be firmed up once a charge point operator had been identified. These locations would be dependent upon a range of factors including accessibility, land ownership and grid constraints.

While the charging points funded under the OLEV grant would be specifically for taxis, the Council would seek to develop a public charging network to sit alongside the taxi charge points, maximising the financial efficiency of the grant funding as much of the installation costs would be shared.

A report would go to full Council on 31 July when it would be recommended that the submitted BDC Ultra low emission vehicle strategy (ULEV) and action plan be adopted and that the OLEV funding committed to assist taxi's

to transition to electric vehicles (EV's) and that the Head of Service had delegated authority in application of and administering future funding in line with the ULEV strategy. The strategy also contained wider aspirations for a comprehensive charge point network across the district.

Officers anticipate tendering for a charge point operator at the earliest possible opportunity following approval of the recommendations in the report.

25\19

MOTIONS ON NOTICE (TO FOLLOW IF ANY)

Living Wage

Members considered the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor P. McDonald:

"This Council ensures in future that all contractors, agencies and any organisation or body carrying out work or research on behalf of this Council, pay its employees/workers at least the 'Living Wage.'"

The Motion was proposed by Councillor McDonald and seconded by Councillor S. Douglas.

In proposing the Motion Councillor McDonald reminded the Chamber that his Group had ensured that no members of staff received less than the living wage. The motion put before Members was an extension of that and would ensure that any contractor employed by the Council did not pay their staff below the rate of the living wage. To not do this would be a double standard for the Council. Councillor McDonald highlighted the struggle of some families to meet the cost of living and how the payment of the living wage would help support them. He saw no excuse for contractors not to meet this requirement. He also referred to the problems of young people, aged 18-20 years, who received a lower rate of pay and needed to work extra hours in order to make ends meet. Councillor McDonald believed that all working age people had a right to a decent standard of live and should not have to rely on food banks for example in order to make ends meet. He therefore put forward the motion for all contractors, agencies and organisations carrying out work on behalf of the Council to be paid the living wage.

Councillor G. Denaro, as Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling responded that through this motion Councillor McDonald was trying to restrict the Council's choice when employing outside contractors. When a nearly identical motion had been put forward in 2012 by Councillor McDonald it had been referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Board, who had undertaken a full enquiry into all areas, including the mechanism which could be put in place to encourage contractors to pay the Living Wage, the finance cost to the Council in monitoring contracts and what duty, if any, the Council had to ensure its contractors paid the Living Wage. The conclusion of that investigation had been that no further action be taken in respect of the Living Wage. Councillor Denaro

confirmed that that conclusion stood today and whatever people may think morally, it was not for the Council to force any view on to its contractors.

In responding to the motion Members made the following comments:

- Including the suggestion as part of the procurement process and the implications of this.
- It was a legal requirement to pay the minimum wage, but not the living wage.
- Why there should be a difference in the rate of pay paid to staff and to contractors, the Council should lead by example and insist on the same for all.
- The lower rate of pay for young people and the reasoning behind this, it was suggested that some would not have the experience or knowledge that an older person might have and any increase in pay may lead to higher levels of youth unemployment.

Councillor S. Baxter suggested that an amendment be put forward for the matter to be further reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Board as the Council had a responsibility to its residents and any financial impact could have a detrimental effect on them. The amendment was seconded by Councillor S. Colella.

Councillor McDonald did not accept the amendment and the amendment was therefore lost.

Further debate took place when Members discussed a number of areas including:

- The inclusion of the Living Wage for contractors was a positive way in which the Council could demonstrate that it was addressing poverty and supporting some of the most vulnerable in the District.
- Research which had been carried out by the Living Wage Foundation and that £9 per hour was not unduly ambitious and the Council should make a commitment to increase it.
- How the contractors would be monitored and whether imposing such a restriction would put off some contractors from carrying out work for the Council.
- The use of zero hour's contracts.

In summing up Councillor McDonald expressed his disappointment at the negative comments from some Councillors and did not think it was unreasonable for people in employment to receive a decent wage for a week's work and not to have to rely on food banks and have to worry about paying bills. These pressures often led to poor health which did not help them. The Council was not a commercial enterprise and it should not be exploiting people, it should pay the acceptable rates of pay. He believed that currently a number of other authorities had been

able to do put this in place. People of all ages were entitled to a decent proper wage.

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

For the motion: Councillors Baxter, Colella, Douglas, Hotham, Hughes, Hunter, Jenkins, McDonald, Rone-Clarke, Thompson, Van der Plank (11)

Against the motion: Councillors Beaumont, Deeming, Denaro, Glass, Jones, Kent, Kriss, May, Middleton, Sherrey, Spencer, Thomas, Till, Webb, Whittaker (15)

Abstentions: (0)

On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

Community Gardens

Members considered the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor M. Thompson:

“This council recognises the excellent work achieved by local volunteers, such as the community garden in Charford. Council resolves to work with its partners, such as BDHT, to identify potential green spaces upon which communities can create similar initiatives.”

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

In proposing the Motion Councillor Thompson paid tribute to Councillor S. Douglas who had started off this project in Charford. It allowed communities to come together and take responsibility and pride in their area whilst also bringing generations together and helped people to up skill whilst enhancing the work of the voluntary sector, who were sometimes taken for granted. It also addressed other areas, such as isolation and mental health and empowered people in their own homes. These projects helped to rebuild people’s confidence and were positive for all concerned. The community garden in Councillor Thompson’s Ward could not stress enough the difference it had made to the people in the community by bringing them together.

The Leader was pleased to support the motion and highlighted that this had been supported in the past through the New Homes bonus Community Grants Scheme. She also highlighted that Councillors S. Webb and J. Till had done something similar in their wards and such initiatives could only enhance the district environment and the lives of the residents.

In discussing the motion in more detail Members were supportive of it and highlighted a number of schemes within their own Wards and identified areas where such projects could be undertaken, this included BDHT land in Councillor Baxter's Ward. The benefits to both young and old were also discussed and how such projects brought all age groups together for the good of the community.

Councillor Thompson thanked everyone for their support with this motion.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried

Assessing the need for a bypass

Members considered the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor R. Hunter:

“Increasing traffic congestion on Bromsgrove's road network is a threat to the health and wellbeing of residents and the prosperity of local businesses. Future housing development will likely exacerbate this problem without appropriate new transport infrastructure. Previous attempts to assess the viability of a Western by-pass to address this issue have not concluded satisfactorily.

Council is grateful for the important work of members and officers in seeking solutions to this problem; and welcomes their commitment to working with Worcestershire County Council to undertake a Strategic Transport Assessment that will support the production of a robust Local Development Plan.

Council resolves that this project must include an adequate assessment of the viability of a range of different options when considering locations for future growth, one of which should be a western by-pass. This assessment will model not just existing traffic flows, but also the likely impact of increased volumes of traffic resulting from new developments, ensuring the shortcomings identified in the 2015 feasibility assessment of the bypass, as identified by Mot McDonald are not repeated.”

The Motion was proposed by Councillor Hunter and seconded by Councillor S. Baxter.

In proposing the Motion Councillor Hunter provided Members with information around the road networks and the constant problems which blighted Bromsgrove. He made reference to the A38 and School Lane and that there was not a day when part or all of the M5 was closed and the impact that this had on Bromsgrove and its residents. All these problems were frustrating for everyone and restricted them from being able to go about their daily business. A quarter of all journey times account for the delays which in turn impacted on the hours that people spent on the roads. This further impacted on air quality and people breathing in toxic fumes on a daily basis. It was noted that there was

investment being made to the A38 and huge amount being put into a southern relief road in Worcester. Councillor Hunter was grateful for the Overview and Scrutiny Board Strategic Transport Review Report but it was important that this Council continued to make Worcestershire County Council (WCC) aware of the problems it faced on a daily basis.

Councillor Hunter made reference to the JNP Consultants report, which was at a technical level but did not contain any detail around how the problems needed to be addressed. It was important for Members to ask the right questions to the right people to ensure that Bromsgrove got the investment it deserved to address the ongoing problems.

Councillor Thompson responded to the motion by suggesting that it was very similar to one previously put forward by his own Group. He was of the view that everyone would be in agreement with the content and the ongoing infrastructure problems in the District. Councillor Hunter responded that it was not about politics but about working together and he understood it was some time since such a motion had been put forward and that it was an important issue which needed to remain high on the Council's agenda.

The Leader responded that there was £50m investment in the A38 and that WCC were working on a Strategic Transport Assessment, which would address the issues discussed. She believed therefore that this motion was premature and that the Council needed to wait and see the outcome of that Assessment before lobbying for specific actions to address the problems. She also highlighted that the Council was working proactively with the GBS and Worcestershire LEPs.

Councillor A. Kent responded to the motion by stating that as the new Portfolio Holder for Planning, he was unable to support it as there were a number of options which needed to be explored before a decision was made as to what was the best way forward. As referred to by the Leader, the WCC Strategic Transport Assessment was not yet complete and the Council's own Local Plan was currently under review, so it was premature to suggest a particular route to go down at this moment in time. It was imperative that the Council got it right and did not exacerbate the situation by making a hasty decision.

Councillor Baxter responded that it was clear that a solution needed to be found for both residents and visitors as the current position was very frustrating and there seemed to have been lots of promises made through various consultations and plans, the issues which had occurred in respect of LTP4 and those Members who were "dual hatters" had not helped matters. The important issue was that the problems needed to be resolved for the health and wellbeing of its residents; investment in the A38 would not achieve this. She believed that the Overview and Scrutiny Board Strategic Transport Review Report was an agenda for the leading group to keep the matter open for discussion and to enable it to be brought back to the Chamber.

The Leader responded to Councillor Baxter's comments by advising that there were a number of strategic policies underpinning LTP4 which would provide the "hooks" to address these issues.

Councillor Colella also spoke in favour of the motion and highlighted the problems within his ward, making particular reference to the traffic congestion and the air quality and its impact on the health of residents. This was an opportunity to go back to WCC and hold further in depth discussions to enable them to understand the problems that were faced by this Council. The matter had been going on far too long and it had taken nearly two years for the Overview and Scrutiny Board's report to be brought before Council and it was important that Members came together to resolve the traffic congestion and all the problems it brought to the District.

In summing up Councillor Hunter assured Members that he was not using this motion to make a political statement, but merely wished the Members to work together to address the problems faced by residents and therefore asked for Members support.

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

For the motion: Councillors Baxter, Colella, Douglas, Hotham, Hughes, Hunter, Jenkins, McDonald, Rone-Clarke, Thompson, Van der Plank (11)

Against the motion: Councillors Beaumont, Deeming, Denaro, Glass, Jones, Kent, Kriss, May, Middleton, Sherrey, Spencer, Thomas, Till, Webb, Whittaker (15)

Abstentions: (0)

On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

The Chairman announced that the allotted one hour timescale had expired and therefore the remaining motion would be carried over to the next meeting.

Councillor H. Rone-Clarke asked for an extension of the time allocated and this was seconded by Councillor M. Thompson. The Chairman agreed to put this to the vote and in doing so the extension of time was lost.

Council
26th June 2019

Playing our part in stopping climate change

The Notice of Motion from Councillor S. Hughes would be carried over to the next.

The meeting closed at 7.55 p.m.

Chairman