

AT A MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held as a Virtual Meeting on Tuesday, 28th July, 2020

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Sayonara Luxton), The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Gary Muir)

Councillors John Baldwin, Clive Baskerville, Christine Bateson, Gurpreet Bhangra, Simon Bond, John Bowden, Mandy Brar, Catherine Del Campo, David Cannon, Stuart Carroll, Gerry Clark, David Coppinger, Carole Da Costa, Wisdom Da Costa, Jon Davey, Karen Davies, Phil Haseler, Geoff Hill, David Hilton, Maureen Hunt, Andrew Johnson, Greg Jones, Lynne Jones, Neil Knowles, Ewan Larcombe, Ross McWilliams, Helen Price, Samantha Rayner, Joshua Reynolds, Julian Sharpe, Shamsul Shelim, Gurch Singh, Donna Stimson, John Story, Chris Targowski, Helen Taylor, Amy Tisi, Leo Walters and Simon Werner

Officers: Adele Taylor, Russell O'Keefe, Mary Severin, Duncan Sharkey, Andrew Vallance, Karen Shepherd, Ian Motuel, David Cook, David Scott and Adrien Waite

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

20. COUNCIL MINUTES

Councillor Baldwin requested the meeting be told the reason given by the Mayor for not accepting an urgent motion submitted by Councillor Brar. The Mayor agreed to circulate the details to all Members the following day.

Councillor Knowles proposed an amendment to the minutes to refer to the fact that the Mayor had told Councillor Hill to leave the meeting. He commented that the constitution required a vote to be taken to remove a Member. The Managing Director explained that a vote had not been necessary as Councillor Hill had left the meeting of his own accord. However, Members were able to amend the minutes as they saw fit. Councillor Davey seconded the amendment, commenting that it should also be added in that he had been removed from the meeting.

It was proposed by Councillor Knowles, seconded by Councillor Davey, and:

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 be approved, subject to the addition of the following at the appropriate point:

- 'Councillor Hill was ejected from the meeting by the Mayor for poor behaviour'
- 'Councillor Davey was ejected from the meeting by the Mayor for poor behaviour'

Minutes amendment (Amendment)	
Councillor John Baldwin	For
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Christine Bateson	Against
Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra	Against
Councillor Simon Bond	For
Councillor John Bowden	Against
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor Catherine del Campo	For
Councillor David Cannon	Against

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

Councillor Stuart Carroll	Abstain
Councillor Gerry Clark	Abstain
Councillor David Coppinger	For
Councillor Carole Da Costa	For
Councillor Wisdom Da Costa	For
Councillor Jon Davey	For
Councillor Karen Davies	For
Councillor Phil Haseler	Against
Councillor Geoffrey Hill	For
Councillor David Hilton	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	No vote recorded
Councillor Andrew Johnson	Against
Councillor Greg Jones	Against
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Neil Knowles	For
Councillor Ewan Larcombe	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	Against
Councillor Ross McWilliams	For
Councillor Gary Muir	Against
Councillor Helen Price	For
Councillor Samantha Rayner	Against
Councillor Joshua Reynolds	For
Councillor Julian Sharpe	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	Abstain
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Donna Stimson	Abstain
Councillor John Story	Against
Councillor Chris Targowski	Against
Councillor Helen Taylor	For
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Carried	

Councillor Baldwin raised a point of order with the Mayor that during a named vote, Members should only state whether they were 'for' or 'against' the proposal, or 'abstaining'. No other comment should be made. The Mayor agreed and stated that all should comply with this for future votes.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor S Rayner declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item 'Joint Central and East Berkshire Minerals and Waste Plan' as her family owned land that would be affected by the proposals in the plan. She left the meeting for the duration of the debate and vote on the item.

22. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor had submitted in writing details of engagements that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor had undertaken since the last meeting, which had been limited due to COVID-19. These were noted by Council.

23. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

a) Adam Bermange of Boyn Hill ward asked the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council:

Does the Leader of the Council believe he owes a fiduciary duty to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government in relation to the latter's powers under Schedule 1, Sub-Paragraph 2(5)(c) of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 and, if so, will he urgently write to the Ministry to disclose fully the findings of the CIPFA investigation?

Written response: *The review of financial governance that was undertaken by CIPFA and the results of that review are publicly available on our website and therefore available for anyone who wishes to view the information contained within it.*

Mr Bermange stated that he did not have a supplementary question, but would contact Councillor Johnson offline.

b) Adam Bermange of Boyn Hill ward asked the following question of Councillor Cannon, Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking

Would the Lead Member confirm the current legal and contractual basis for parking enforcement within self-administered Residents' Parking Zones and whether it is the Council's intention to withdraw enforcement in those streets that decline to become designated as Council-administered schemes? If so, when?

Written response: *The Parking Principal will be writing to all administrators of self-administered schemes during July and August advising of the 2 options which are available from April 1 2021.*

These options are:

- 1. Become a council administered scheme and apply the relevant permit fees*
- 2. Request the removal of the scheme, remove the permit parking restriction and for enforcement to cease*

Self-administered schemes form part of the Traffic Regulation Order relating to a particular area. The same order and conditions also apply to Royal Borough administered schemes. The difference between self-administered and Royal Borough schemes is that permission is granted by the Royal Borough to the administrator of self-administered schemes to set local scheme rules including the number of permits permitted per household.

In the Traffic Regulation Order the definition of permit includes the wording "any other body with Councils approval and permission". This definition is applicable and covers self-administered schemes.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Bermange thanked the Lead Member for taking the time to provide his comprehensive answer, which provided some much-needed clarity.

Having spoken with a number of residents who served as administrators for their streets Mr Bermange commented that, whilst some had fully constituted associations to assist decision making others, such the one in Laburnham Road, Boyn Hill, had only informal arrangements.

Mr Bermange asked if the Lead Member could therefore commit to providing council assistance to those schemes in consulting and holding referenda, where required, and would he also consider extending the opportunity to decide on the future of schemes to those currently under council control too?

Councillor Cannon responded that all schemes, at any stage, were subject to residents' consent. If the majority of any residents in a scheme wished to change it, that just had to be brought to the attention of the parking team and then the council would look to make the changes. Schemes were only put in at resident's request; if the majority no longer wanted a scheme it could be adjusted or removed. A formal process was not needed, it could be done easily by letter or petition.

c) Ed Wilson of Clewer and Dedworth West ward asked the following question of Councillor Rayner, Lead Member for Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor

Will the Lead Member provide details of the demise of the Legacy Leisure Trust and outline the governance arrangements of Leisure Focus.

Written response: Parkwood Leisure entered into a contract with RBWM to operate our Leisure Centres with effect from January 2015, and the day to day operation of the centres has been delivered by their charitable arm Legacy Leisure since that contract began.

Following the closure of the leisure centres across the country with effect from 21 March 2020, as the result of guidance from Government responding to the COVID19 pandemic, Parkwood Leisure gave notice to the Borough to terminate their contract with RBWM as they considered Force Majeure applied and as such they did not consider it possible for the Centres to generate the income necessary to continue to pay the contract concession fee to RBWM.

Although the Borough rejected the notice to terminate at the time it was served, after taking legal advice, and considering the wider impacts on the leisure market across the county, and the ongoing impacts on Parkwood Leisure and their operations, the Borough recognised Parkwood could give a valid termination in June, and it would be better to negotiate ad managed contract termination and transfer.

The Legacy Leisure Trust has not ceased to operate but it was agreed that the contract between RBWM and Parkwood Leisure would come to a managed end, as the alternative proposal Parkwood offered, was not considered value for money for RBWM.

A range of options were therefore investigated and reviewed and the most advantageous option identified was to create a new Charitable Incorporate Organisation (CIO) who could take on the contract to the run the leisure centres when the contract with RBWM ends. This CIO has been established and is Leisure Focus.

A managed transfer by means of a Business Transfer Agreement have been prepared to deal with the contractual issues, and a new contract will commence on 1st August when the contract with Parkwood Leisure ends on 31st July 2020.

Leisure Focus Trust is a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) which is regulated by the Charity Commission; the details for Leisure Focus Trust can be found via the link provided below.

<https://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Showcharity/RegisterOfCharities/CharityFramework.aspx?RegisteredCharityNumber=1190095&SubsidiaryNumber=0>

As a CIO, Leisure Focus Trust is completely independent from the Council.

The relationship between Leisure Focus and the Council is governed by a contract between the parties. The Contract is a concession contract where the Council has outsourced the management of its leisure facilities to Leisure Focus Trust who have the right to run the leisure centres and retain the revenue (subject to the payment of a fee to the Council).

The Contract with Leisure Focus Trust will contain various mechanisms in terms of how the Council will maintain governance in respect of monitoring and reporting of the Leisure Services, these will include:

- *Monthly review Meetings with the Council's Contract Manager;*
- *Quarterly review Meetings with the Council's relevant Director or Head of Service;*
- *Attendance by the Trust at meetings of elected Members to review contract performance and to present service development plans as part of the annual service planning process.*

This arrangement reflects the arrangements that have worked well for the last five years.

Mr Wilson was not present therefore his supplementary question was read out by officers:

Thank you for taking the time to reply to my question and for providing the background to the demise of the council's arrangement with Parkwood Leisure.

The Council's press release failed to mention this point or the associated action taken by Parkwood. Will the Lead Member confirm that Parkwood have agreed to meet all of their payments to the council up to the transfer to Leisure Focus?

Councillor Rayner responded that the council and Parkwood had finished their negotiations and everything had been agreed. If there were any further questions, Mr Wilson was welcome to write to Councillor Rayner and she would ensure he received a response.

d) Ed Wilson of Clewer and Dedworth West ward asked the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council:

For the sake of transparency will the Royal Borough provide the terms of reference for the review of financial governance that it requested from CIPFA?

Written response: *The document provided (see below) sets out the agreed process for the Review of Financial Governance undertaken by CIPFA.*

Mr Wilson was not present therefore his supplementary question was read out by officers:

Thank you for taking the time to reply to my question and for confirming that the Royal Borough did not issue or agree a term of reference for his report.

Given the absence of such a document how can residents be assured that the CIPFA report was comprehensive, robust and met the objectives set by the Managing Director who commissioned it?

Councillor Johnson responded that he was able to give full assurance that the document was indeed comprehensive, robust and was in line with the objectives set. The document had been considered once already by Cabinet, and also by Overview and Scrutiny the day before during an in-depth and rigorous debate. Cabinet would again consider the report including any recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny at its meeting later in the week. CIPFA was a well-regarded organisation and had been eminently helpful in uncovering historical irregularities.

e) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill ward asked the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council.

Why were Members not informed in the Council report of July 2019 that surveyors Knight Frank had, in March 2019, given an Existing Use Value (EUV) for the Nicholson Shopping Centre (excluding hope value) of £18m?

Written response: *Thank you for your question.*

This is not something the Council has had access to until recently where it was referenced in the planning information, as part of the Financial Viability Assessment.

This is an existing use valuation, commissioned by Denhead (the company set up by Arelli and Tikehau), that covers the Nicholsons shopping centre including the ownerships of Denhead relating to their freehold interest in the site and their long leasehold interest until 2135 on the whole shopping centre site which included the income producing assets, in addition to the part of freehold that the Council owns.

Denhead purchased their freehold and the long leasehold interest of the whole site from the receivers of Vixcroft (Maidenhead) Ltd.

The long leasehold (115 years remaining), also includes the ability for them to develop the whole site, without permission being unreasonably withheld from the freeholder (the council).

In regards to the Council's freehold interests they were valued via an independent valuation (a section 123 report) by Lambert Smith Hampton and the conditional contract that was negotiated with Denhead for their sale is in line with that. From the information we have seen in the Financial Viability Assessment it is also in line with that. The Knight Frank Valuation is not in the public domain, but would have been used to support the Financial Viability Assessment.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill commented that the council still owned the freehold land of 50% of the Nicholson's shopping centre. In February officers informed Council that in March 2019 all the land had been essentially considered worthless, using the technical term 'de minimus'. In the same month an Existing Use Valuation of the land by objective surveyors Knight Frank put a capital figure of £18m on the shopping centre. The land appeared to be either worthless or worth £18m. This was before anyone considered an Alternative Use Valuation when it was redeveloped as luxury flats. Did the Lead Member agree with him that it was now in the public interest that all the 2009 valuation documents be transparently published?

Councillor Johnson responded highlighted that this related to a live planning application and he did not wish to undermine any potential discussions in relation to the applicant's viability assessment or officers' analysis of that. Discussions were ongoing in the lead up to the determination of the planning application. The FVA would provide a core document in terms of its assessment of the land value and as a guide marker for discussions on other issues such as developer contributions and affordable housing.

f) Andrew Hill of Boyn Hill ward asked the following question of Councillor Coppinger, Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead:

During any pre-application meetings for major developments, is it standard protocol for officers to advise applicants that the approved tall building policy in the Maidenhead Area Action Plan (para 3.40) limits maximum building heights to 12 storeys in order "to respect the size and compact nature of Maidenhead and respect visibility from the surrounding countryside to the existing level"?

Written response: It is standard practice to reference the adopted Maidenhead Town Centre AAP, including its policy on tall buildings, if relevant to the scheme in question. It is also standard practice, for pre-application advice to refer to emerging policy, evidence base work and other material considerations. While emerging policies have limited weight at this time, they set out the Royal Borough's strategic intentions for sites within Maidenhead Town Centre and are relevant when advising on major schemes.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Hill commented that The Landing was approved despite being far higher than the local plan's maximum height of 12 storeys. Since then the unadopted 2019 RBWM Tall Buildings Policy stated that the maximum height of one landmark building would be 19 storeys. Did the words 'no more than 19 storeys' in the policy mean the LPA would not approve any building in the borough that was higher than 19 storeys?

Councillor Coppinger responded it was difficult to make statements when there was a live planning application. It was not his role to pre-empt or guess what officers would decide to do.

24. PETITIONS

Councillor Brar explained that under Part 7G, 24 of the constitution, the lead petitioner had asked her to present the petition to the Head of Service via the Petitions Officer:

Urgently introduce traffic calming measures and upgrade existing crossing point to a controlled crossing at Maidenhead Road near the railway bridge, introduce a new controlled crossing point on Switchback Road adjacent to the shops and reduce speed limit and install cameras/calming measures

This would be the last full Council for several months and this matter was too urgent to delay unnecessarily. She called upon the Head of Service to convene the earliest possible meeting including the Lead Member for Transport and Infrastructure, the lead petitioner, herself and the two ward Councillors, so that an agreement could be reached.

That 2205 residents from across the borough had signed was testament to the impact that the death of Max Simmons had upon us all. It was not possible to undo the tragic events of 21 of December 2019, nor could a beloved son be returned to a grieving family. However, the council could act with all urgency to ensure that on or before the first anniversary of his death, the safety improvements called for had been completed. The council had recently been mired in controversy and scandal. Members had been assured that fresh starts were to be made and new leaves would be turned good. Councillor Brar suggested that this should be an early example of what could be achieved when all pulled together: residents, officers, opposition councillors, majority councillors, lead members and all the way up to the Leader of the Council himself.

25. REFERRALS FROM OTHER BODIES

2019/20 Annual Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Panels

Members considered the annual reports of the four Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

Councillor Werner commented that he had raised an issue at the Overview and Scrutiny Panel the previous day that scrutiny was failing to achieve all it could do. He saw from the reports that administration control of the Panels was absolute; the choice of Chairman was whipped and the agenda was completely controlled by the Chairman so that any issues the opposition wanted to raise were squashed. The report from the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel did not include the opposition's constant requests for close monitoring of the budget. As it was the opposition in previous meetings that had challenged the finances of the council, it seemed important to give the opposition the ability to insist on items appearing on agenda. Apart from a couple of notable exceptions, scrutiny was not working well. He would like to see a root and branch review of the scrutiny process and how the independence of the Panels could be secured going forward.

Councillor Davey highlighted a number of sections from the constitution:

- A7.3 The Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Panels shall invite representations for inclusion within the Work Programme from the groups in A7.2 within 60 days of Annual Council.
- A7.2 In setting the Work Programme the Overview and Scrutiny Panels shall take into account the wishes of members & residents.

Councillor Davey questioned whether the current year's Chairmen (Councillors Hunt, Bowden and Targowski) had invited representations for inclusion as the new year had started on 26 May 2020. Councillor Singh had reached out to Members across the

floor for representation on 6 July 2020. He was aware of an announcement to residents the previous year and had been assured it would be done as a generic announcement by the Communications team.

Councillor Davey felt that residents would like to be reassured that the scrutiny panels, especially the Chairmen, did actually know and had read the rules in Part 4 of the constitution. They were after all paid for their service, the Vice Chairmen received no remuneration. It would be good to know that they were being professional in their approach and addressing the various points that had been raised.

Councillor Jones commented that Overview and Scrutiny Panels were able to instigate in-depth investigations into policy and performance issues. Topics were chosen in consultation with officers, partners and members of the public, with the view of making recommendations on a particular policy or service area. They had a scope, terms of reference, a final report and a response from Cabinet. The report from the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel under 'Topics Scrutinised' just provided a link to the meetings of the Panel. The lack of scrutiny of topics was a concern of Councillor Jones. She would like to see a page on the website listing the scrutiny reviews and their outcomes. Haringey council had a very good template.

Councillor Price welcomed the change in the constitution requiring each of the four Panels to produce an Annual Report for Council to note. This should enable Panels to improve their important role whilst ensuring all Members, as well as the public, appreciated their essential work. She welcomed that the Members' survey results had been published but was shocked that of the 20 Panel Members, fewer than 15 responded. She questioned whether Members appreciated the importance of the Panels in effective governance.

Councillor Price wanted to highlight some points, drawing on the four individual reports, the survey results and her year's experience of being a Panel Member and attending and speaking at other Panels. She highlighted the importance of receiving all necessary paperwork in good time to allow Panel Members to consider issues robustly. This should happen without exception, but it had not, and has thus prevented the Panel from discharging its responsibilities in an effective manner. To receive key documents merely hours before a meeting was unacceptable.

She agreed that the Task and Finish Groups should focus on policy creation rather than simply receiving briefings. There was a wasted opportunity highlighted in the Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Panel regarding the Homeless project, which was set up to look at good practice elsewhere but only received briefings from officers.

She strongly supported improving chairing skills. This was key for the Panels to operate effectively, and she believed such training should be compulsory, including a clear understanding of the terms of reference, and the importance of following the agenda. She had been shocked at a Panel Chairman allowing a Lead Member to make a political speech of many minutes. Chairmen needed to understand the role of and who were their co-optees.

Councillor Price welcomed a Scrutiny Handbook so that best practice could be identified and followed. She had formed the impression some Panel Members just did not understand the scrutiny process and seemed reluctant to ask questions or challenge. Scrutiny training needed to be delivered alongside the Handbook. Training on local government/council finances was also needed. She noted that not one Panel

appeared to have considered its constitutional responsibility in “assisting the Cabinet in the development of the Council’s annual budget and to review and scrutinise budgetary management”. She urged Panels to consider this in the current year’s programme and report back. She supported the proposal for an exclusive meeting to discuss the Budget Report, together with the need to schedule more than four meetings a year.

Councillor Price supported the recommendation for a separate Audit Panel, and if the Chairman/Vice Chairman did not have a financial background then training would become paramount to ensure they discharged their duties effectively. The Chairmen and Vice Chairmen were voted in every year. She had not realised that there would be so many changes; only one Chairman was now the same Chairman as the previous year. Rather than relinquish responsibilities once the outgoing Chairman was informed they would not continue she recommended that the outgoing Chairman continued responsibilities until the new Chairman was elected, to ensure a smooth transition from one municipal year to the next.

In conclusion, Councillor Price commented that the Constitution laid down an excellent overview and scrutiny process; a ‘Ferrari’. However, just like a Ferrari required a well-trained and experienced driver and a team of support, the council was bumping along a bit like driving an ‘old banger’. Training and a willingness to be self-critical was needed. She questioned whether the council would have ended up in such a dire financial situation if the Panels had been operating effectively over the previous years.

Councillor Hunt explained that she was now Chairman of the Adults, Children and Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel. She referred Members to pages 91-122 of the constitution clearly stated everything to do with the Panels. As Chairman she would automatically send this to all Members before the next meeting as a refresh. This was something that had been done in the past.

Councillor Johnson commented that the role of Overview and Scrutiny was taken very seriously in the authority, especially in the post-CIPFA age. The CIPFA report and its recommendations, including those from the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel, would be discussed by Cabinet later in the week. As Chairman of Cabinet he would reserve some of his responses to that meeting. Overview and Scrutiny had two key functions: to hold the administration to account and to develop policy ideas. He had seen some sparks of good ideas but he had not seen all that many thought provoking and innovative suggestions come forward. There was an opportunity collectively for Members to raise their game so that the council would be on the front foot and able to respond to the huge challenges that lay ahead in the post-pandemic world. The notion of training, which he was discussing with the other Group Leaders, was something that should be explored for all Members in terms of process and the duty to uphold the correct guidance to residents, particularly in relation to public health.

Councillor Baldwin commented that the point about training came up each year in the surveys that Members were asked to take. He was delighted to hear that the Leader of the Council was taking the issue seriously. He had attended Panels that had clearly demonstrated that all participants could be better trained.

Councillor Johnson responded that he was happy to speak with the other Group Leaders and the Managing Director in relation to what additional support could be put

in place, including from the Local Government Association and other associated bodies.

Councillor Sharpe commented that he had attended Panel meetings in which there had been robust and challenging debate. He welcomed further training so that all understood the role of Overview and Scrutiny

It was proposed by Councillor Targowski, seconded by Councillor Sharpe, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That full Council notes the 2019-20 annual reports of the four Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

Counterparty List Addition

Members considered the addition of Leisure Focus Trust to the Council's approved Counterparties list as recommended by Cabinet at its meeting on 25 June 2020.

Councillor Hilton explained that the maximum loan value would be £350,000. He commented that Members would be aware that Parkwood would cease to manage the borough's leisure centres; all details were included in a Part II report to Cabinet on 25 June. That report proposed that management should be taken over by a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) to be named Leisure Focus. The initial contract was on a 2-year plus 1-year basis. Detailed advice was taken at the time on the structure and a council officer would sit on the board.

The proposal of a loan of £350,000 for one year would provide the trust with sufficient working capital. It would be subject to a legally binding loan facility and monitoring by the S151 officer and would be subject to interest charges.

Councillor Del Campo commented that given the council was asked to agree a new credit line, it would be good to understand the governance arrangements. The governing documents allowed for a maximum of six trustees with only one appointed by the council and five community trustees appointed by the charity. There was therefore room for three more. It would be helpful if Members could be advised on plans for recruitment of additional trustees, especially those with a strong background in finance.

Councillor Knowles asked if the buffer fund had been based on previous cashflow and was it economically sufficient given very little income would be forecast.

Councillor Rayner explained that four trustees had been appointed to the trust including Sue Anstis who was prominent in the world of women's sport, Adrien Moorhouse, a well-known athlete who also ran a management consultancy, Toby Wheeler, a local resident and the Director of Place. The trustees had a range of expertise to take the project forward. The sum of £350,000 was based on the cashflow projection by the trust.

Councillor Baldwin commented that the administration was placed in a near-impossible situation by circumstances entirely beyond their control. Officers in a very short period of time did an incredible job on behalf of residents. He commended their work.

Councillor Johnson thanked Councillor Baldwin for his positive comments. Officers and Lead Members had indeed done fantastic work to turn the situation around. He hoped the new entity would be a success. In the long term he believed it would be but commented that the duty fell on everyone to encourage people to use the facilities, within public health guidelines.

Councillor Hilton wished all leisure centres well; he hoped the prospect of Braywick on the horizon would encourage people to use the facilities. He thanked Councillor Baldwin for his kind words that were very apt. He also thanked Councillor Rayner who had demonstrated that she was on top of her brief.

It was proposed by Councillor Hilton, seconded by Councillor Rayner, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council notes the report and endorses the actions proposed:

i) Approves the addition of Leisure Focus Trust to the list of the Council's approved Counterparties with a maximum sum to be lent of £0.35m.

26. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS - AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Members considered a proposal that the audit oversight functions currently undertaken by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel be transferred to a separate Audit and Governance Committee.

Councillor Price commented that she supported the proposal. She asked what were the necessary skills of the Chairman and Vice Chairman?

Councillor Johnson responded that the core skills were financial ones, with the ability to robustly and accurately challenge and without fear or favour, hold the council to account, and also to propose and initiate suggestions to strengthen the council's overall position of robust governance. It was for exactly this reason that his recommendation included a Vice Chairman who was a leading member of the opposition.

Councillor Bond commented that CIPFA had recommended the potential of an independent Chairman, however he acknowledged that getting in that sort of expertise would be a challenge. Other authorities with a separate audit function had Chairmen appointed from the majority party. The proposal was part of wider changes. The financial controls covered governance and people so for example an officer capital programme board had been established. He believed the council now had the right people in place in the roles of S151 officer and Head of Finance.

Councillor Jones commented that she had been part of the Constitution Review Working Group and had at that time spoken against merging the audit functions with Overview and Scrutiny. She had also been advocating the return to a separate committee for some time. She was therefore pleased with the proposal. She commented that the final recommendation read as though the Monitoring Officer could

update the constitution when they wished and how they wished and she felt that the wording should be tightened.

Councillor Johnson confirmed that the delegation referred expressly to the changes detailed in the report and he was therefore happy for the recommendation to be amended to clarify this point.

Councillor Price commented that she had been unable to find the completed Equality Impact Assessment on the website. The Managing Director confirmed that it had been published to the website and a link would be sent to Councillor Price.

Councillor Rayner commented that she felt it was a great idea to separate the audit function out. The Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel was doing a fantastic job but the workload was very heavy.

Councillor Johnson referred to the CIPFA report; it had been clear that this was one of their key recommendations. His personal view was that, in hindsight, it was perhaps not the best thing to have removed a separate Audit Committee.

It was proposed by Councillor Johnson, seconded by Councillor Rayner, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That full Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves amendments to the constitution detailed in Appendix A to establish an Audit and Governance Committee.**
- ii) Appoints Councillor Bateson as Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee and Councillor L. Jones as Vice Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- iii) Meeting dates for the remainder of the municipal year be set as:**
 - 14 September 2020**
 - 9 November 2020**
 - 16 February 2021**
- iv) Notes the terms of reference of the Cabinet Transformation Sub-Committee detailed in Appendix B.**
- v) Delegates authority to the Monitoring Officer to update and publish the council constitution in line with the recommendations in the report.**

27. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - WINDSOR TOWN COUNCIL

Members considered approval of a Terms of Reference for a Community Governance Review for the unparished areas of Windsor.

Councillor Rayner explained that the area of Windsor in question included part of Eton and Castel, part of Old Windsor, Clewer & Dedworth East and Clewer East. The total electorate was 22,493. An e-petition to undertake a review had been started in September 2019. To require a council to undertake a review required a petition by 7.5% of the electorate of the area. At its close, the e-petition had 36% of the necessary 7.5% of signatures, but hard copy signatures had yet to be submitted. The council recognised there was an appetite for a review to take place therefore it was

proposed that a Working Group be established to submit final recommendations to full Council by July 2021.

Councillor Johnson commented that it gave him great pleasure to second the report. At the end of May he had given a very firm statement of intent that such a report would be brought forward. It would be improper of him to load the device by giving his own views on the merits of the proposition but he looked forward to seeing the recommendations from the Working Group. He confirmed that the Working Group would be chaired by Councillor Shelim. He understood that the time scales were longer than some may have wished, if possible the council would look to compress them.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa stated that he was honoured to speak wholeheartedly in favour of the motion to set up a governance review with the ambition to create a Windsor Town Council. The campaign had been led by a steering group of local residents from across the whole town, from the town centre, to the ancient boroughs of Clewer, Dedworth and Spital, all united by a common ambition to bring more localised representation to the historic town.

Town or parish councils were the tier of local government that were closest to the electorate. In total there were some 10,000 parish or town councils in England alone. Windsor had a proud history of local representation since 1172 when a council was formed to discuss matters arising between the town and the crown, this representative body stood in various forms until the Local Government Act of 1972. This Act replaced Cookham Rural District Council, Eton Urban District Council, Windsor Borough Council and Windsor Rural District Council. Of the many towns within RBWM, now only central Maidenhead and the whole of Windsor were left without town or parish representation. The council must address the inequality of democracy.

Most parish councils lacked the capacity to undertake the provision of public services and therefore concerned themselves with local environmental, community and amenity issues. In 2018 the National Association of Local Councils submitted a report entitled 'Points of Light'. Should the motion be successful, he suggested all members of the governance review committee familiarise themselves with the report, as it highlighted the work Parish and Town councils had undertaken.

There were some 270 more parish and town councils than in 2005, supported by the current Conservative Government and the preceding coalition and Labour Governments. This included town councils established in Weymouth and Christchurch in 2019.

The challenge when discussing a new council was the issue of funding. There were 32000 residents in Windsor, each paying a levy called a parish precept, despite having no such representation of where this money was spent. The current levy was on average £36 a year which amounted to a total of circa £650,000. This should be earmarked for the town, however it went into the central pot, with no tracking of how the money was spent. There was also the extra income, often in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, by way of S106 and CIL contributions from building developments in the town, which should be spent on Windsor, but which were lost to non-parished areas.

When setting up a town council there were running costs, such as the provision of a town clerk and other operational costs. These needed to be mitigated against the income streams to ensure the viability of the project. The proposed Governance Review committee should liaise with the Windsor Town Council steering group to understand in more detail their plans for generating increased revenue streams through the formation of a Town Guild, an idea that would bring philanthropy to the modern age, to run alongside the Town Council, generating funds for local charities in addition to supporting the local ambitions of residents and businesses.

Councillor Da Costa wanted Members to consider a number of issues:

- To familiarise themselves with the national guidance, so they could engage with the principal authority with an understanding of the process it must follow and the criteria that should inform its decisions;
- To reciprocate a working relationship with all impacted ward Councillors during a review.
- To produce a definitive list of groups to be consulted, from across Windsor;
- To involve the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) and the County Association of Local Councils (CALC), for advice and guidance on the process.

Councillor Davies stated that she was delighted to support the motion to set up a community governance review to consider the formation of a new town council for Windsor. Creating a town council for the unparished parts of Windsor would restore local governance, something that the town previously enjoyed for over seven hundred years and the value of which the existing parish and town councils across the borough continued to ably demonstrate.

Liberals had always believed power should be devolved to the lowest practical level and believed establishing a Town Council would provide a clear and distinct voice for Windsor. As both Councillor Rayner and Councillor W. Da Costa had alluded to, residents from across the whole town had come together to further this aim, including Councillor Tisi and herself who promised to ask residents if they wanted a Windsor Town Council in their election pledges.

She paid tribute to the collegiate spirit in which the Windsor Town Council Steering group had proceeded, led by Richard Endacott and initially chaired by the late Dee Quick, also a former mayor of the Borough. In this spirit, she looked forward very much to working with the Community Governance Review Working Group to shape a future Town Council for Windsor and she urged Members to support the motion.

Councillor Coppinger commented that, as Lead Member for Maidenhead, many councillors and residents had asked him why he was not following in parallel. This was very much new territory for the council and mistakes may be made along the way. He wanted to learn from them. He hoped that in due course he would be able to make a similar presentation for Maidenhead.

Councillor Rayner commented that the Windsor community was very proud and passionate; it was now an opportunity for everyone to have their say on its democratic future.

It was proposed by Councillor Rayner, seconded by Councillor Johnson, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Full Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves the Terms of Reference document set out as Appendix A which will formally commence the community governance review process considering the formation of a new town council for Windsor.**

28. JOINT CENTRAL AND EASTERN BERKSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE PLAN - PROPOSED SUBMISSION

Members considered approval of the Proposed Submission Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan.

Councillor Coppinger explained that it had been some years since work had commenced on the plan, but it was now ready for the final stage. It did not form part of the Borough Local Plan but it was critical to the council's ability to meet future demand for building.

Councillor Coppinger commented that the council was on track with the responses to the Inspector on the Borough Local Plan and he was confident that in the Autumn the final stage of examination in public would take place, possibly in a virtual capacity, with adoption by next spring or summer.

The council was required to produce a Minerals and Waste Plan. The council had been working with neighbouring authorities to produce a joint plan supported by Hampshire Council. The plans had been through four rounds of public consultation. A further round of consultation was now required on the proposed final submission, for six weeks from 3 September 2020. The plan would run until 2036. It did not override the normal planning process which could still override or change a future application.

Within the borough a number of sites were promoted for sand and gravel and two had been assessed for allocation. These were Horton Brook and Poyle Quarry. Several others had been rejected including Ham Island and Bray Village; Water Oakley had already received planning approval. It was unfortunate that two areas, Bray and Horton/Wraysbury, because of geological factors would always be the 'go to' places for sand and gravel. This did not meet the expected requirement so the plan proposed a broader process called an 'area of search' across the whole area of the plan so that other suitable sites could be brought forward over time.

Councillor Coppinger explained that waste was equally as important, and three sites had been identified:

- Berkyn Manor for recovery of dry recyclables
- Horton Brook for aggregate recycling
- Stubbings compound for green waste transfer

Star Works in Knowl Hill, albeit in Wokingham, was put forward but had not been allocated although of course it could be put forward in future via a planning application. There were other possible options going forward such as industrial estates. It was also recommended that the sites are reserved for waste so that they could not be used for anything else. The last proposal was to take an operator's previous performance into account when future applications were made. All four authorities would be running the process in parallel and it was expected that the final

plan would be submitted to the Secretary of State towards the end of the year, followed by an examination in public and adoption in Spring 2021.

Councillor Werner highlighted that the Hindhay quarry in Pinkneys Green was on the safeguarding list for waste processing and concrete crushing. The noise and dust created was very antisocial. The number of lorries travelling to the site also affected local residents. Complaints were made to Summerleaze on a periodic basis after which things improved for a while, but it always returned back. He asked whether further planning permission would be needed as a result of the site's inclusion in the report and if so, would that allow the council to be stricter on issues of noise, dust and lorry movements or were they covered for concrete crushing until 2036.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa commented that there were lots of good things in the plan but he had a number of concerns in his role as Co-Deputy Chairman of the Climate Change Working Group. On page 10 of the report, there was no mention or inclusion of RBWM's aim to achieve net-zero carbon by 2050. Carbon emissions and methane emissions from the permafrost in the arctic continued to increase and would accelerate climate change. None of these things were reflected in the plan. He therefore suggested the review date be amended, to include the possibility of an annual review in relation to some of the severe factors.

The section on Strategic Plan Objectives talked about striking a balance, which he felt was right. However as with the NPPF, Members needed guidance on what was the preferential balance and the default position. He agreed with the creation of high quality, resilient habitats and ecological networks. When looking how to help mitigate the causes of and adapt to climate change, it was great to see recognition of the need to build in resilience to climate change but it was missing the key objective of demonstrating net zero emissions by a target date, whether that was 2030 or 2050. There needed to be an agreement on metrics to enable assessment of all assets and from a financial, carbon emissions and biodiversity perspective.

Mineral extraction would require transportation by road. Nationally, transport caused 40% of Carbon emissions but, there was no discussion of decarbonising the vehicles transporting minerals. Nationally land use comprised 10% of Carbon emissions therefore there was a need to demand Carbon offset. There was a need to move away from landfill because Methane from landfill was 80 times more powerful than Carbon Dioxide on a 20 year timescale. Councillor Da Costa asked whether it was a legal requirement to focus on sand, gravel, chalk and clay. He believed the government would produce a green plan at some stage therefore there was a need to move to plant based resources. He asked if the plan should be flexed to include water as a resource, or land or plant based resources as the country moved to a green economy.

Councillor Larcombe commented that he felt his ward of Datchet, Horton and Wraysbury was being victimised. Datchet already had one quarry due for landfill and Horton had two working quarries. Wraysbury had gravel pits that had been taken over by leisure facilities. Where one gravel pit was filled with waste it was a disaster zone for years. There was also a waste handling site in Wraysbury that brought in hundreds of lorries each day. Now more quarrying and waste handling operations were being proposed. He was not happy and nor would his residents be; he felt that six weeks was not long enough for the consultation, particularly for parish councils.

Councillor Brar commented that she had received emails from residents of Bray ward about the noise and traffic issues from the gravel plant in that ward.

Councillor Bateson commented that if sufficient dwellings were to be built to meet the needs of the growing population, both the land and materials were needed. The report was critical to ensure sufficient sand and gravel was available with waste processing facilities for a growing population.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that there was no conflict of interest for Members of the Development Management Panel in taking part in the vote as it related to the consultation document, not any application that would come to the Panel.

Councillor Cannon commented that he was another ward councillor for Datchet, Horton and Wraysbury, along with the Deputy Mayor. Ward Councillors were engaging with the parish councils who were very well sighted and in a good position to put their representations forward within the six week period.

Councillor Baldwin commented that Councillor Cannon had been referring to the ability of residents in his ward to make a contribution. He pointed out that Councillor Cannon had been a principal factor in denying Councillor Larcombe the opportunity to contribute to the discussion on the Horton and Wraysbury Neighbourhood Plan a few weeks previously.

Councillor Carole Da Costa suggested that the country and the borough should be looking at different types of building materials that were more ecologically sound.

Councillor Coppinger commented that he was happy to take up the planning issue raised by Councillor Werner outside the meeting. He explained that the plan was due to be reviewed every five years. As the climate change strategy developed, the plan could be changed. The plan included the fact that transport methods other than lorries were being looked into. The plan also included a robust monitoring framework. The council wished to move away from landfill. In response to Councillor Larcombe's comments, he highlighted that he had stated at the start that his ward, alongside Bray, got a poor deal. However there was a need to build houses for the children of the future and unfortunately those areas contained large mineral reserves. He was aware of the concerns in Bray ward referred to by Councillor Brar. The planning permissions were already granted and as they replaced another site there was no increase in vehicle movements. Innovative material use was developing over time, for example there was a cork house in Eton. The plan would be reviewed every five years; up until then every tonne of sand and gravel would be needed to build houses.

It was proposed by Councillor Coppinger, seconded by Councillor Bateson, and:

RESOLVED: That Council notes the report and:

- i) Approves the Proposed Submission Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan at Appendix A (along with the supporting documents and revisions to the Policies Map) for publication for a statutory six-week representations period to commence on 3 September and close on 15 October 2020;**

- ii) Approves the formal submission of the Proposed Submission Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan and all supporting documents to the Secretary of State for independent examination; and
- iii) Delegates authority to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead, to make any minor amendments necessary to the Proposed Submission Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan and supporting documents prior to the commencement of the representations period.

Councillor Rayner declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item and took no part in the debate or vote.

Joint Central and Eastern Berkshire Minerals and Waste Plan (Motion)	
Councillor John Baldwin	Abstain
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Christine Bateson	For
Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra	For
Councillor Simon Bond	Abstain
Councillor John Bowden	For
Councillor Mandy Brar	Abstain
Councillor Catherine del Campo	Abstain
Councillor David Cannon	For
Councillor Stuart Carroll	For
Councillor Gerry Clark	For
Councillor David Coppinger	For
Councillor Carole Da Costa	Against
Councillor Wisdom Da Costa	Against
Councillor Jon Davey	Abstain
Councillor Karen Davies	Abstain
Councillor Phil Haseler	For
Councillor Geoffrey Hill	Abstain
Councillor David Hilton	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	For
Councillor Andrew Johnson	For
Councillor Greg Jones	For
Councillor Lynne Jones	Abstain
Councillor Neil Knowles	Against
Councillor Ewan Larcombe	Against
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	For
Councillor Ross McWilliams	For
Councillor Gary Muir	For
Councillor Helen Price	Abstain
Councillor Samantha Rayner	Conflict Of Interests
Councillor Joshua Reynolds	Abstain
Councillor Julian Sharpe	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	For
Councillor Gurch Singh	Abstain
Councillor Donna Stimson	For
Councillor John Story	For
Councillor Chris Targowski	For
Councillor Helen Taylor	Abstain
Councillor Amy Tisi	Against
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Simon Werner	Abstain

Carried

29. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

a) Councillor Larcombe asked the following question of Councillor Rayner, Lead Member for Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor

What procedural changes will be made to ensure that Members are able to put their questions (including a supplementary if required) and receive answers at Council Meetings?

Written response: At the last Council meeting in June 2020, Members debated a number of changes to the constitution, including amendments to procedural rules at full Council. It was agreed that all Member questions would be dealt with by way of a written answer, published the day before the meeting. Written responses allow for fuller answers to be given as they are not time limited, and for more questions to be dealt with in an efficient way, assisting agenda management.

Publication of the written response in advance also gives the questioner significant time in advance of the meeting to review the response and consider a suitable supplementary question; time that was not previously available when questions were answered in person at the meeting. The right to ask a supplementary question remains, with the caveat that a maximum time of 30 minutes is available for supplementary questions to be dealt with. Any supplementary questions not dealt with after 30 minutes will be dealt with by way of a written response. All written responses will be published alongside the minutes of the meeting so a full public record is maintained. In exceptional circumstances, the Mayor retains the right to extend the time period.

However, Members do not need to wait until a full Council meeting to ask a question of a Lead Member. I, along with my Cabinet colleagues, am happy to receive questions from Members from across the political spectrum at any time on my portfolio areas.

In response Councillor Larcombe commented that he only brought questions to full Council to get straight, honest answers put to Members

b) Councillor Larcombe asked the following question of Councillor Cannon, Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking:

When did the Flood Liaison Group last report to the Council?

Written response: The Terms of Reference for the Flood Liaison Group were refreshed and unanimously approved at their meeting on 31st July 2019. The Terms of Reference do not include any provision to report to Council.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Larcombe commented that there was a channel in Wraysbury that had not had water running in it properly for over a year because it was filled with builders' rubble. He had reported it a year ago but nothing had been done. On the basis that the council had a Flood Liaison Group meeting in a couple of weeks' time he would save his questions for the Chairman of that meeting.

c) Councillor Hill asked the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council:

On Saturday 14th March 2020 at the Weir Opening you gave a public commitment that the Waterways project would be completed., A4 Underpass, Chapel Arches access and boat storage, Chapel Arches lowering the hard invert, Library Boat Launching Ramp & GWR Sewer Crossing are yet to be scheduled. Can you inform council when these matters will be addressed.

Written response: *Thank you for your question to me in relation to the future of the Maidenhead Waterways Project. As you are undoubtedly aware the council has long been a strong supporter of the project and its long-term objective to fully restore water flow and accessibility within both channels. In addition to that support, the council has also facilitated significant capital investment into the scheme, culminating most recently with the aforementioned weir opening back in March.*

As I believe I stated in my speech that day, the project as delivered to date has resulted in the creation of a fantastic asset for the town, and one it can rightly be proud of. I also stated that it still remains our long-term aspiration to complete the circular route through the restoration of the Moor Cut as and when future funding sources become available.

As I'm sure that you are further aware, this is very closely linked to the unlocking of future regeneration opportunities which can be used to partially fund the work. However, these opportunities are very much dependent upon broader economic factors, as well as planning policy, and as such I am unable to give any indication as to likely dates.

With regards to Chapel Arches and the boat storage, this is a commitment we have previously made and one I am keen to see delivered. The lowering of the hard invert is still open for discussion, however, as with all of this we must be mindful of the new economic reality we find ourselves in post COVID and ensure that every penny of taxpayers' money is spent wisely, reflective of the fact that it must be underpinned by a sound business case.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Hill commented that Councillor Johnson had only replied to three elements of the question. Three points that still required an answer were: the flooded footpath under the A4, the library boat launching ramp and the GWR sewer, all of which needed to be fully operational before York Stream could commence. He also asked if the Lead Member realised that the planning consent was granted in 2015 with 5 years to complete. If this could not be done, it would require fresh planning consent for more cut and before other funding could be unlocked.

Councillor Johnson responded that it was a difficult situation. The world had change immeasurably since 2015. The flooded footpath under the A4 was a valid point which would continue to be addressed. The GWR sewer was slightly out of the control of the council but needed to be addressed. The sticking point was the boat ramp provision and the cost of it given the potential impact on the council's own development scheme. He was awaiting a detailed impact assessment. If the planning consent expired this was a reality that would have to be faced as every penny of taxpayer money had to be spent wisely.

d) Councillor Davey asked the following question of Councillor Coppinger, Lead Member for Planning and Maidenhead:

With finances under incredible pressure, if all the projects in Maidenhead town centre were generating CIL and S106 revenues, what would the future revenues for those properties given planning permission be? Also the Nicholson Centre, should it be given permission?

Written response: *We of course seek to maximise contributions from developments in Maidenhead town centre to fund infrastructure but this needs to be balanced with other requirements such as affordable housing. We are only able to collect CIL and S106 based on the CIL regulations and guidance on planning obligations. Each S106 agreement must be negotiated on a case by case basis by officers taking into account viability of the development and the tests set out in the regulations which state that planning obligations must be:*

- *necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- *directly related to the development; and*
- *fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*

As you are aware, the council's adopted CIL Charging Schedule has a zero rated CIL for Maidenhead Town Centre. This decision was taken as a result of the advice prepared by the council's viability consultants and following a public examination determined by an independent inspector. A CIL charge can only be levied if there is evidence that development would generally still be viable if CIL was charged and the assessment assumes all other policy requirements (including full affordable housing) are met.

The council cannot just make a decision to charge CIL and apply it immediately. We would need to go through the process of developing and consulting on a new evidence base and charging schedule then appoint an independent examiner to hold an examination in public. As context for the timescales, the council agreed its draft charging schedule in November 2015 and it was adopted in September 2016 which demonstrates the timescales involved.

The recent changes in the CIL regulations in September 2019, allows more flexible use of S106. Officers are seeking to use this approach to secure developer contributions on a site by site basis and we will be seeking appropriate contributions from all sites coming forward in the town centre.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Davey commented that he had spoken to Councillor Coppinger the day before about gravel. He asked if Councillor Coppinger was saying that, like Spaghetti Junction, the estimate of £24m cited by numerous sources was about right?

Councillor Coppinger responded that he did not know.

e) Councillor Davey asked the following question of Councillor Stimson, Lead Member for Environmental Services, Climate Change, Sustainability, Parks and Countryside:

How much extra is it costing RBWM each month to go back to weekly bin collections and how does this fit with the aims of the climate strategy?

Written response: *The council temporarily moved to alternate week collections for waste and recycling directly in response to the coronavirus crisis, including the impact on resources and the supply chain, to ensure that a core service could operate. The contract payments have been made in full during that period even though the service delivered was adapted to suit the situation. This was as a direct instruction from government and applies to all RBWM contracts and those for councils across the country. This was set out in the Cabinet Office Procurement Policy Note - Supplier relief due to COVID-19 - Action Note PPN 02/20 - March 2020.*

The council's policy is to deliver a weekly collection for waste and recycling, which is how the contract is set out and priced. We do not have a mandate to continue with alternate week collections once it is deemed sensible and low risk to return to the normal service. During lockdown we have seen residents recycling more as a percentage of their overall waste. We hope to continue and build on this positive behavioural change for the environment.

Going forward we will look at all aspects of the climate change agenda including waste collections and disposal, however any changes considered in the future would need to be subject to a clear process, including consultation and decision making.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Davey highlighted that the Lead Member had said residents had been recycling more as a percentage of their overall waste. It would be interesting to see the actual report when available as to how much of this so-called recycling was rejected by the recycling plant as it was contaminated with general waste, sending the actual disposal costs through the roof.

There was an understanding in the world of psychology that it took three months to change behaviour. Would it not have been better to run the programme for longer so as to help with the education of residents? They were asking questions of how can we do things better; now they could simply forget and go back to easy street ensuring RBWM remains middle of the road on 44% .

Councillor responded that Serco put in a bid based on the Target Operating Model for weekly collection. They could not be held to account until that model was in place.

f) Councillor L. Jones asked the following question of Councillor Rayner, Lead Member for Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor:

Can the Lead Member clarify the role of the 'Chair' of Full Council (the Mayor) in ensuring 'full and effective debate and decision making by the Council with the overriding aim of promoting confidence in the council by the public.'

Written response: *I would like to begin with the full wording in the constitution from which the excerpt you have quoted is taken, as this adds context:*

The Mayor or any person presiding as Chairman over a meeting shall conduct and make decisions in relation to the business of the meeting always in an objective, non-political and reasonable manner with the intention of achieving the efficient and orderly conduct of the meeting, facilitating full and effective

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

debate and decision-making by the Council with the overriding aim of promoting confidence in the Council by the public.

However, it is incumbent on all Members, not just the chairman or Mayor, to ensure their conduct during all types of council meetings promotes 'full and effective debate and decision-making.....with the overriding aim of promoting confidence in the Council by the public'.

The public see us as councillors collectively, they don't differentiate poor behaviour and as we are elected by residents we should set an example in our behaviour worthy of their trust they put in us. The Mayor has to ensure the meeting is conducted to this high standard, it is incumbent upon us all to behave in a respectful manner during the meeting and debate.

As many Members will know, chairing any meeting can be difficult and there needs to be understanding from all those participating in a meeting that it is also their responsibility to assist those chairing a meeting by being polite, addressing their remarks to the chair – it's not a conversation – and respecting the decision of the chair.

The constitution states:

The Mayor may consult any officer present with the aim of compliance with Rule C7.2 and the Members in attendance shall not speak during such consultation. The Mayor or any person presiding as Chairman shall (subject to Rule C27) have the final decision on any rule or procedure in this Part including compliance with Rule C7.2.

At full Council the Mayor is supported by the Managing Director, Monitoring Officer and Head of Governance who will all provide advice and guidance on interpreting the constitution, but ultimately the Mayor's decision is final and that should be respected by all Members.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Jones asked if the Lead Member believed that closure motions on agenda items where no debate has taken place and Members wished to hear others views before voting restricted the full and effective debate and decision-making and confidence in the council.

Councillor Rayner responded that she believed each debate and each motion had to be taken on its own merits and could not give a generalised answer that would be appropriate in every circumstance. Members had to follow procedure and the Mayor's ruling was final under the constitution.

g) Councillor Knowles asked the following question of Councillor Clark, Lead Member for Transport and Infrastructure:

In 2019 the then Leader of the Council announced a trial of streetside EV charging points involving 3 units which were to be placed on Alma Road in Windsor along with a number of free trial EV for use by residents. When can we expect the results of this trial to be published?

Written response: *The electric vehicle charging points in Alma Road, Windsor were installed in partnership with 'Connected Kerb' who also provided three electric vehicles to local residents on a short-term free 'trial' basis to promote use and awareness.*

I have recently received an evaluation report from 'Connect Kerb' which is encouraging and shows levels of usage significantly higher than the industry average. In addition, three of the six drivers who took part on the short-term vehicle trial have now elected to lease electric vehicles.

As you will be aware we have committed through the draft Climate Strategy to increase electric vehicle charging capability in the borough. As part of this we will be adopting standards for electric vehicle charging in new developments as well as identifying a partner and funding model to deliver sufficient charging points to meet demand.

I am happy to share the results and the case study information with Councillor Knowles which will be part of our future thinking on electric vehicles.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Knowles commented that it was interesting the borough had so few EV points considering it was an affluent society, to encourage more use. He would be glad to receive the results and asked if they could be shared with Councillor Stimson and the Climate Change Working Group so it could have a bearing on future strategy.

Councillor Clark responded that the council was doing its best to encourage the further uptake of green vehicles in the borough, and it was looking hard at the technology and infrastructure needed to deliver against targets. They would be ambitious and would liaise with both environmental and planning strategies.

h) Councillor Bond asked the following question of Councillor Johnson, Leader of the Council.

Will the pension fund governance review mentioned in the CIPFA report and 2019/20 audit plan be made available in advance of an action plan (as has happened with the CIPFA report itself) to help RBWM's Pension Fund committees comply with s106 (1) (b) of the LGPS (Amendment) Regulations 2015 to "ensure the effective and efficient governance ... of the Scheme"?

Written response: *The pension fund governance review is still being finalised but will be shared with relevant committees prior to a finalised action plan being agreed as well as engaging with broader members of the pension fund overall.*

The 2019/20 audit plan has already been considered by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Panel at their May meeting alongside the audit plan for the main RBWM accounts. They are the committee who hold the responsibility for considering the external audit of the accounts. That plan details the scope and remit that our external auditors (Deloitte) have and how they carry out their work. The paper is available on the public website here:

<https://rbwm.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s31644/Royal%20County%20of%20Berkshire%20Pension%20Fund%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Bond commented that given the recognition that everything was not right elsewhere, it would be good to crack on with the governance review. If CIPFA had taught the council anything about financial review it was that governance was important. He asked if the relevant committees he had in mind the Berkshire Pension Fund Panel and Board as they had an obvious interest in good governance and Cabinet at the end of August. The Pension Panel should itself be accountable to full Council as the administering authority.

Councillor Johnson responded that comments were very valid and he agreed with the first part of the supplementary question. On the latter part he would come back with a written response, but felt it was definitely worthy of consideration.

Written response: *tbc*

30. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Motion a)

Councillor Werner introduced his motion. He hoped that it would be debated in the same spirit shown by residents in their response to the COVID-19 crisis: no thought of political advantage, personal prestige or winning and losing. There was much the council could learn from their example. From every corner of the borough there had been a surge in volunteerism and offers of help: personal, financial and material. New organisations had sprouted up at every level. In his own ward he had seen many examples of generosity and neighbourly support and he was sure this was the case across the borough. If all that Members did was consider the past, this would be a betrayal of that selflessness. The challenge was to harness and nurture this spirit of community and build on the hard work of officers. It was an opportunity to open every aspect of council policy to newcomers. If the legacy of COVID-19 was allowed to be a body count, recriminations and scapegoating the council would have failed to learn the lesson. He asked the Leader of the Council to second the motion. He had been shown an amendment, which he was happy to accept.

The amendment to recommendation iii) was confirmed as:

Also publicly recognises the skill, dedication, professionalism, and tenacity with which our officers, partners including Optalis and Achieving for Children, those across the wider health and social care sector, teachers, and other public bodies, including the police, army and various response units, have co-ordinated these efforts for the benefit of all of our residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Councillor Johnson thanked Councillor Werner for putting forward the motion and reaching across the political divide to seek consensus. He thanked all Members for their support, dedication, tenacity, hard work, endurance and approachability during the COVID-19 crisis. All councillors had stepped up to play a leadership role in their respective communities. He also thanked all officers, partners and volunteers. To capture that legacy would be one positive out of an awful situation. The council's attention must now turn to recovery and rebuilding the borough both in economic and societal perspective. In his role as Lead Member for economic development he stated that it was vital the council did all it could to secure people's jobs and create new opportunities.

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

Councillor Baldwin welcomed the note of genuine shared interest and co-operation for the benefit of residents. His own small role was mostly around directing traffic in and out of Queen Street. One morning he had met with the Leader of the Council who had been very welcoming and supportive of the efforts on behalf of Foodshare Maidenhead. The council had seen thousands of acts of selflessness, courage and fortitude by community leaders in the many organisations.

Councillor Davey stated that he would like to support the motion and simply asked people to be kind to each other, especially as the new normal for most people, with traffic flow back to 70-80% pre-COVID-19, was to head for the shops and quickly put on a mask for 20 minutes, do their shopping and get back home to their loved ones.

For those that had been isolating for the last 3-4 months, watching their support networks move on so now they had to go it alone. Added to the stress of being locked up for so long, they were now dealing with impatient strangers wearing masks who just wanted them to hurry up, doubling and trebling their stress levels. At 48 it was no big deal but at 84 it was; he saw it every day at work. Councillor Davey asked all to think on and be kind.

Councillor Stimson commented, in the spirit of volunteerism, she wanted to thank officers and the community for their extraordinary efforts. The climate change strategy would be calling for volunteers. She had agreed to 'pay it forward' with 150 days of no alcohol to support Maidenhead United's charity appeal.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa commented that the West Windsor Hub had spent over £18,000 on food shopping, including for some who could not afford to pay for it themselves. Volunteers included those on furlough, the unemployed and the retired. It had been good to see the community come together. Officers had been fantastic, in particular the Head of Communities, the Managing Director and the Director of Adults, Health and Commissioning and their teams.

Councillor Carole Da Costa commented that the COVID-19 virus had been awful but she had seen some amazing things as a result. When it came to the community, there was no place for political parties. She had worked with members of the administration including Councillor Rayner. Councillor Da Costa wished to raise the profile of the community wardens who had been phenomenal.

Councillor Carroll commented that the level of volunteering had been awesome to see. In his Lead Member role he had had the privilege to work with colleagues in the NHS, Public Health England, Children's Services and Adult Social Care. He sincerely thanked the Director of Adults, Health and Commissioning and her team in Adult Social Care for their work including co-ordinating PPE equipment and testing with the NHS. He also thanked the Director of Children's Services and his team for their remarkable job in co-ordinating with all the schools and keeping at-risk and vulnerable children safe.

Councillor Brar commented that in Cookham 38 groups were supporting the vulnerable and elderly. She felt it had brought the community together.

Councillor Knowles explained that he had been a telephone mentor for an elderly neighbour who had also been shielding. He had said that the sense of community reminded him of wartime. Old Windsor had had practice at dealing with natural

disasters so the village hub was quick to move into action. Councillor Jones and Jane Dawson, the Parish Chairman, had been outstanding in community leadership.

Councillor Singh highlighted three groups in his ward: Maidenhead Magpies, the Islamic Trust and Maidenhead Mosque and the Shanly Foundation.

It was proposed by Councillor Werner, seconded by Councillor Johnson, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: This Council;

i) Offers a vote of thanks to the residents of the Royal Borough, the vast majority of whom, whilst facing very difficult personal sacrifices and restrictions to liberty, have diligently followed both letter and the spirit of the emergency legislation brought in to protect public health during the Covid-19 global pandemic;

ii) Acknowledges the extraordinary courage and commitment to community shown by many thousands of residents, individually, through neighbourhood groups and with our charitable partner organisations, throughout this terrible time;

iii) Also publicly recognises the skill, dedication, professionalism, and tenacity with which our officers, partners including Optalis and Achieving for Children, those across the wider health and social care sector, teachers, and other public bodies, including the police, army and various response units, have co-ordinated these efforts for the benefit of all of our residents, businesses and visitors alike.

The meeting was adjourned for a comfort break at 8.48pm; Members returned at 8.53pm.

Motion b)

Councillor McWilliams explained that he was withdrawing his motion and would be resubmitting a new one to the next meeting to focus on the third point about tackling racism in the borough.

Motion c)

Councillor Knowles introduced his motion:

This Council amends the calendar of council meetings to establish monthly full Council meetings from this meeting forward until further notice. If there is insufficient business to transact those monthly meetings may be cancelled if required.

He explained that there had been a disrupted schedule of council meetings due to the COVID-19 crisis. He felt that as the situation had changed since the calendar of meetings was set earlier in the year, it made sense to review it. It would be better to have more meetings that could be cancelled if they were not needed. It would also give a better spread of business.

Councillor Hill seconded the motion.

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

Councillor Baldwin commented that he was confident that the motion would pass given the letter he had read on 9 July from the Chief Whip that pointed out the justification for his closure motions at the previous meeting had been the pressure of business and a crowded agenda.

Councillor Davey commented that he had not been impressed when he had attended his first Overview and Scrutiny meeting and the Chairman had said he wanted it to be over by 9.00pm.

Councillor Johnson explained that the administration was not able to support the motion. In terms of full Council meetings this municipal year, the council was about even in terms of catching up with meetings, putting aside Annual Council. However, he announced his intention to convene an Extraordinary full Council meeting in September 2020 to discuss the issue of Maidenhead Community Centre.

In response to Councillor Baldwin, Councillor Bhangra commented that in his role as Chief Whip he did not tell Councillors how to vote.

Councillor Jones commented that she found it difficult when meetings were added in at the last minute therefore she would prefer if they were scheduled in advance.

Councillor Reynolds commented that it made sense to increase the number of full Council meetings to ensure each meeting did not go on to a late hour. The latest meeting he had attended was 11.45pm. Many councillors had full time jobs. He felt it important not to restrict people in becoming councillors because of late meetings. It was also important not to quickly rush through items because they happened to be late on the agenda.

Councillor Clark commented that it was important to have proper debates and to be seen to be holding them. There was a need to limit the number of meetings in terms of giving access to the public. If Members were careful and precise in their debates business could be transacted more efficiently. It was important to stick to the point and not grandstand. It was self-control that was needed rather than additional meetings.

Councillor Carole Da Costa commented that for someone who was registered as disabled, to sit through meetings that lasted four or five hours could be uncomfortable and painful. It was important that all types of people could be councillors; long meetings were not very inclusive.

Councillor Haseler commented that the key thing was good time management. The last meeting was appalling with the questions that were not succinct. There were now time slots allotted which would help.

Councillor Wisdom Da Costa commented that more people should have the opportunity to be a councillor; by scheduling more meetings it would be possible to ensure they ended at a reasonable time to encourage all types of people to put themselves forward as candidates.

Councillor Singh supported the idea of more frequent but shorter meetings. He welcomed the idea of an extraordinary meeting to discuss the Maidenhead Community Centre as the organisation was in limbo and had been promised a seamless transition.

Councillor Price commented that long meetings were difficult at the end of a very busy day. Members were asked to keep to the business on the agenda but it does not always happen as people wanted to be seen to be speaking even if they were repeating what had already been said. That was a reality that had to be accepted. She supported the proposal on the grounds of equality.

Councillor Tisi commented that it would be lovely if the business could be raced through in one or two hours but this would mean there would be no effective opposition or right of reply.

Councillor Johnson commented that he was happy to discuss the issue with Group Leaders.

Councillor Baldwin raised a point of order in relation to the right of reply. Earlier he had been referred to twice by the Leader of the Council and Chief Whip. Neither of them satisfactorily addressed the issues he had raised.

It was confirmed that the Mayor would allow personal explanations if they were brief and pertinent to the points raised. Councillor Baldwin reiterated that he did not feel that his question had been answered.

Councillor Hill commented that the issue being discussed was about democracy, not about time or getting through meetings efficiently. It was about democracy being done and being seen to be done by residents. Members needed to be able to debate freely without time constraints. There were two choices: work late into the night as Members had done in the past, or hold more frequent meetings. There had been uproar in the public domain at what happened at the last meeting, for which he had played a part. He urged the use of closure motions be stopped because it was infuriating and did no-one any good in the public eye. He welcomed the announcement about the Maidenhead Community Centre.

Councillor Knowles concluded that it was common sense to schedule more meetings to allow better programming of business and better debate. For all the reasons stated including equality and inclusion he proposed the motion.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion fell.

Motion c (Motion)	
Councillor John Baldwin	For
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Christine Bateson	Against
Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra	Against
Councillor Simon Bond	For
Councillor John Bowden	Against
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor Catherine del Campo	For
Councillor David Cannon	Against
Councillor Stuart Carroll	For
Councillor Gerry Clark	Against
Councillor David Coppinger	Against
Councillor Carole Da Costa	For
Councillor Wisdom Da Costa	For

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

Councillor Jon Davey	For
Councillor Karen Davies	For
Councillor Phil Haseler	Against
Councillor Geoffrey Hill	For
Councillor David Hilton	Against
Councillor Maureen Hunt	Against
Councillor Andrew Johnson	Against
Councillor Greg Jones	Against
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Neil Knowles	For
Councillor Ewan Larcombe	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	Against
Councillor Ross McWilliams	Against
Councillor Gary Muir	Against
Councillor Helen Price	For
Councillor Samantha Rayner	Against
Councillor Joshua Reynolds	For
Councillor Julian Sharpe	Against
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	Against
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Donna Stimson	Against
Councillor John Story	Against
Councillor Chris Targowski	Against
Councillor Helen Taylor	For
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Leo Walters	Against
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Rejected	

Motion d)

Councillor Taylor introduced her motion. She explained that she wished to amend her motion to remove recommendation iii as she understood it would not be appropriate.

Councillor Taylor explained that on 23 March 2020 the UK had followed its European neighbours into lockdown. It was an unprecedented move and came with a great cost, but it was necessary to protect people from greater harm. Now, as the borough headed into the recovery phase, it was important to be mindful that things would take time to get back to any kind of normality in daily lives and in town centres. There was a need to adapt.

It was known, from previous experience that the farmers market, street markets and events like Maidenhead Festival brought a wonderful variety of stalls to the high streets. There was enough space for social distancing and being outside would give shoppers confidence whilst creating a unique shopping opportunity to bring people back into the town centre.

The market would be based around crafts: jewellery, cushions, candles, bags etc. so would offer something different to the existing markets and the majority of stores. During lockdown many people turned to arts and crafts to give themselves something to do whilst on furlough. Councillor Taylor explained that her full time job was at a fabric wholesaler and she heard every day retailers talking of the increase in business that was ongoing. This market could both cater for crafters as well as the finished

products. The space in the pedestrian area could be used. The council already had an excellent team who did an incredible job organising town events. As the borough headed into the regeneration phase, the market would continue to bring footfall into the town centre. It was within the council's gift to make the town shine.

Councillor Stimson commented that as the ward councillor for St Mary's with a town due to be demolished in a large part on the western side, it would be wonderful to use the space better. During COVID-19, a lot of people had used crafts as both for fun and to earn an income. She had spoken to the Town Centre Manager about location. It would not be complicated or take income away from others. If it worked in Maidenhead it could be transported to other areas.

Councillor Hill supported the motion as he represented Maidenhead. It would help to give the town an identity.

Councillor Haseler thanked Councillor Taylor for bringing the motion forward as it was a great idea. He hoped it would bring people into the town centre.

Councillor Bowden commented that he was grateful for the removal of the reference to Windsor which already had three markets: a food market, a framers market and a crafts market.

Councillor Shelim agreed that there was a need to promote local businesses and look at how the town centres could receive increased footfall. Some suggestions included varying the opening times of businesses including late opening. This would even out the spread of people for social distancing. It would also give the chance for those who worked 9-5 to shop at other times rather than just shopping online. There was a need to rethink the strategy of parking in town centres. If free parking was allowed after 6pm it would encourage people to come to the town centre and relieve illegal parking. The main focus should be to support existing business and he was unsure how this motion would achieve this. All were behind increasing footfall but based on this concern he would abstain.

Councillor Sharpe commented that this was one small step for Maidenhead. Business clearly were right down in many areas of the borough and the council would need different strategies to attract people back. More actions would be needed to support businesses throughout the borough.

Councillor Davey commented that he understood why the third recommendation had been withdrawn. Windsor already had markets although he thought the one on the railway station was closed at the moment. The council needed to be looking to support local businesses so the first recommendation was very relevant for everywhere. He had been promoting the museum and the petition that had been opened. There would be many things the council could do, small or big. The council needed to look at how businesses could raise the levels of money they need to pay the rent. He did not see the sense in closing down the tourist office.

Councillor Carole Da Costa supported the motion as she had been a crafter for a long time. She had had a lot of discussions with entrepreneurs and therefore she felt that pop up shops and markets were the way to go forward in the recovery period.

Councillor Reynolds commented the motion was getting at the importance of bringing people back to the high street and supporting local business. Maidenhead already had a lot of markets and events that brought people into the town centre. He also highlighted the work of Craft Co-op bringing craft people together and showing them how to commercialise their skill.

Councillor Price highlighted that local business were not just in the town centres. She had read a tweet earlier from Councillor Singh that was helpful as it talked about the £10 government incentive to eat out. She felt there was more the council could do to promote government schemes rather than just focussing on town centres.

Councillor Bateson commented that she felt the motion was good for the whole of the borough not just Maidenhead as markets brought people in to the town centre so they would also visit the shops.

Councillor Singh stated that he supported the sentiment of supporting local businesses. Established businesses in the town had been struggling therefore government incentives were welcomed. It would have been nice to have been consulted on the motion as one of the ward councillors. He highlighted that another area for focus was King Street.

Councillor Davies commented that she was disappointed that Windsor had been taken out of the motion because she did not think there was room to be complacent post-COVID-19. Residents had approached her with a good idea to combine online and high street shopping. The Windsor Town Forum had discussed a Christmas market which would be a big draw alongside the castle projections. She would like to discuss the idea further with Councillor Taylor.

Councillor Taylor responded that she would be happy to speak to Councillor Davies about her resident's ideas. She confirmed that the reason the third recommendation had been removed was that she had been advised that retailers in the town would not have been in favour.

In advance of the vote, the Mayor reminded all that when voting they should only state 'For', 'Against' or 'Abstain'; no other comments should be made.

It was proposed by Councillor Taylor, seconded by Councillor Stimson, and:

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- i) Recognises the need to promote local businesses and think of inventive ways to help them as well as bringing much needed footfall into our Town Centres.**
- ii) Agrees the possibility of a new Artisan Street Market will be pursued, with the view to holding quarterly if successful. This will include local businesses from around the borough.**

Motion d (Motion)	
Councillor John Baldwin	No vote recorded
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Christine Bateson	For
Councillor Gurpreet Bhangra	For

COUNCIL - 28.07.20

Councillor Simon Bond	For
Councillor John Bowden	Abstain
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor Catherine del Campo	For
Councillor David Cannon	For
Councillor Stuart Carroll	For
Councillor Gerry Clark	For
Councillor David Coppinger	For
Councillor Carole Da Costa	For
Councillor Wisdom Da Costa	For
Councillor Jon Davey	For
Councillor Karen Davies	For
Councillor Phil Haseler	For
Councillor Geoffrey Hill	For
Councillor David Hilton	For
Councillor Maureen Hunt	For
Councillor Andrew Johnson	For
Councillor Greg Jones	For
Councillor Lynne Jones	For
Councillor Neil Knowles	For
Councillor Ewan Larcombe	For
Councillor Sayonara Luxton	For
Councillor Ross McWilliams	For
Councillor Gary Muir	For
Councillor Helen Price	For
Councillor Samantha Rayner	For
Councillor Joshua Reynolds	For
Councillor Julian Sharpe	For
Councillor Shamsul Shelim	Abstain
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Donna Stimson	For
Councillor John Story	For
Councillor Chris Targowski	For
Councillor Helen Taylor	For
Councillor Amy Tisi	For
Councillor Leo Walters	For
Councillor Simon Werner	For
Carried	

Motion e)

Motion e was not debated as it was no longer required.