Brown, John Burns, Jason Crooks, Paula Fox, Betty McLatchy, Ivor McLatchy, David Roach, Barry Robbins and Anthony Williams declared local non-pecuniary interests as Members of Haverhill Town Council. Councillor Tony Brown declared a local non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Suffolk County Council for Haverhill East and Kedington Division. All of the aforementioned Members remained in the meeting for the consideration of this item.)

(Councillor Sarah Broughton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Appendix B: Issue 3 (Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'North East Bury St Edmunds') as her husband owned an area of land located within this strategic site allocation. Councillor Broughton left the meeting during the consideration of and voting upon this particular Issue.)

Council considered Report No: COU/SE/16/009, which sought approval for several recommendations emanating from the meeting of the Democratic Renewal Working Party held on 23 May 2016, following phase 2 of the consultation on the Community Governance Review (CGR).

Councillor Patsy Warby, Chairman of the Democratic Renewal Working Party, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that the initial evidence gathering, which had formed the first phase of the review, had taken place between September and November 2015 to inform the Council's recommendations, and these had been agreed by Council in December 2015. Phase 2, and the final consultation stage, was the publication of those recommendations, and the consultation had run from February 2016 to April 2016. The Working Party had made recommendations on each Issue, which were summarised in the various appendices attached to the report, as follows:

Appendix A: statutory final recommendations affecting all Issues. These were generic and were required to be adopted under the CGR legislation.

Appendix B: After two stages of consultation, this appendix contained 10 Issues where there was still no consensus. The final recommendations of the Working Party were presented, together with a short summary setting out its reasoning. Members also noted that in light of consultation evidence, and as detailed in this appendix, the Working Party had recommended that the Council did not adopt two of the final recommendations agreed in December 2015, which were in connection with Issue 14, Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'Hanchett End (Haverhill Research Park)' and Issue 19, Elm Farm and associated cottages, Assington Green, Stansfield.

Appendix C: final recommendations in respect of 13 Issues, of which no new and/or significant issues were raised during the phase 2 consultation.

Appendix D: updates on Issues which were determined at the Council meeting in December 2015 (for noting only). This included the impact of the CGR on the Borough and County Council's electoral arrangements and the timing of any Electoral Review for the Borough Council.

Subject to the Council's decisions upon whether to implement changes associated with the respective Issues in the review, Members noted the three broad categories of implementation date for the Issues (excluding issues 15,

23 and 26 which were not in the Borough Council's powers to change), as set out in paragraph 1.1.9 of the report.

Additional matters arising from the CGR also required consideration, the detail of which were provided in Sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 of the report, and the decisions required on these specific matters were set out in Recommendations (6), (7) and (8).

As the Mayor had been made aware prior to the meeting that some Members may wish to separately debate and propose amendments on Issues where there had been no consensus following phase 2 of the consultation, as contained in Appendix B, she requested that Appendix B be divided into individual agenda items to assist the management of the debate. These 10 Issues would therefore be considered separately first and the remaining recommendations contained in Report No: COU/SE/16/009, would then be debated collectively, as usual practice.

Due to the significant and technical nature of the proposals, the Mayor then invited Alex Wilson, Director to contribute to the discussions to assist Members with the debate.

Each of the 10 Issues contained in Appendix B, were then considered in turn.

# Issue 3: Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'North East Bury St Edmunds'

On the motion of Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger, seconded by Councillor Terry Clements, and duly carried it was

#### RESOLVED:

That the 'North-East Bury St Edmunds' Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Great Barton Parish within a newly created parish ward. The electoral arrangements of the Parish be changed as follows:

- (a) the growth site be represented by 2 parish councillors elected to a 'Severalls' parish ward with a boundary as shown on consultation map C of Appendix B to Report No: COU/SE/16/009; and
- (b) the remaining electors in the Parish be represented by 9 councillors elected to a 'North' parish ward.

## Issue 4: Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'Moreton Hall'

Councillor Sara Mildmay-White proposed the recommendations of the Working Party relating to this particular Issue, as contained in Appendix B, which was duly seconded by Councillor Terry Clements.

Councillor Andrew Speed considered that the eventual residents of the new homes intended to be built in this location should be given the opportunity to decide whether they felt part of Rushbrooke with Rougham or Bury St Edmunds (or a new Moreton Hall) Parish. He subsequently moved an amendment to the substantive motion, which was to add the following third recommendation to Recommendations (1) and (2):

23 and 26 which were not in the Borough Council's powers to change), as set out in paragraph 1.1.9 of the report.

Additional matters arising from the CGR also required consideration, the detail of which were provided in Sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 of the report, and the decisions required on these specific matters were set out in Recommendations (6), (7) and (8).

As the Mayor had been made aware prior to the meeting that some Members may wish to separately debate and propose amendments on Issues where there had been no consensus following phase 2 of the consultation, as contained in Appendix B, she requested that Appendix B be divided into individual agenda items to assist the management of the debate. These 10 Issues would therefore be considered separately first and the remaining recommendations contained in Report No: COU/SE/16/009, would then be debated collectively, as usual practice.

Due to the significant and technical nature of the proposals, the Mayor then invited Alex Wilson, Director to contribute to the discussions to assist Members with the debate.

Each of the 10 Issues contained in Appendix B, were then considered in turn.

### Issue 3: Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'North East Bury St Edmunds'

On the motion of Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger, seconded by Councillor Terry Clements, and duly carried it was

#### RESOLVED:

That the 'North-East Bury St Edmunds' Vision 2031 growth site be retained in Great Barton Parish within a newly created parish ward. The electoral arrangements of the Parish be changed as follows:

- (a) the growth site be represented by 2 parish councillors elected to a 'Severalls' parish ward with a boundary as shown on consultation map C of Appendix B to Report No: COU/SE/16/009; and
- (b) the remaining electors in the Parish be represented by 9 councillors elected to a 'North' parish ward.

### Issue 4: Vision 2031 Strategic Site 'Moreton Hall'

Councillor Sara Mildmay-White proposed the recommendations of the Working Party relating to this particular Issue, as contained in Appendix B, which was duly seconded by Councillor Terry Clements.

Councillor Andrew Speed considered that the eventual residents of the new homes intended to be built in this location should be given the opportunity to decide whether they felt part of Rushbrooke with Rougham or Bury St Edmunds (or a new Moreton Hall) Parish. He subsequently moved an amendment to the substantive motion, which was to add the following third recommendation to Recommendations (1) and (2):