

SOUTH BUCKS DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council - 14 May 2019

Present: Councillors Dr W Matthews, D Pepler, D Anthony, R Bagge, P Bastiman, M Bezzant, M Bradford, S Chhokar, D Dhillon, T Egleton, B Gibbs, P Griffin, B Harding, P Hogan, G Hollis, J Jordan, P Kelly, M Lewis, J Lowen-Cooper, N Naylor, J Read, R Reed, G Sandy, R Sangster, D Saunders, D Smith and L Sullivan

72. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of Full Council held on 16 April 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

74. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported on recent functions and events she had attended on behalf of the Council which included:

Engagements 16 April 2019 – 14 May 2019

Annual Reception – Chairman, Bucks County Council	25/04/19	Chairman attended Vice Chairman attended
Vaisakhi Celebration and Combined Cadet Force	26/04/19	Chairman to attend
Young Enterprise Bucks & Milton Keynes County Finals	10/05/19	Chairman to attend
Annual Banners Service – Girlguiding Buckinghamshire	12/05/19	Chairman to attend

The Chairman said that it was an honour and a privilege to represent the Council over the last two years and to meet all the local volunteers who kept the fabric of society together.

The Leader of the Council reported that the Structural Changes Order had been passed and therefore the date of the first meeting of the Shadow Authority would be confirmed shortly. He then thanked the Chairman of the Council for all her hard work on behalf of the residents of South Bucks District Council.

The Chief Executive reminded Members that the Planning Committee had been moved to 5 June 2019 due to the EU Elections taking place.

75. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Members noted the Minutes of Committee meetings which were included in a supplement pack separate from the main agenda.

76. QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE (ITEM MOVED DUE TO A MOTION TO CHANGE THE ORDER OF BUSINESS)

A Motion without Notice was put to change the order of business in the agenda so that these questions could be put before the draft Local Plan was considered. This was proposed by Councillor Read and seconded by Councillor Naylor. This item was taken following announcements.

Notice having been given under Council Procedure Rule 11, the following question was put by a member of the public, Mr Brooke.

The questions below from a Member of the public relate to the proposed allocation of Option 8 in the emerging Local Plan and the PACCAR Scout Camp, Chalfont St Peter (in Chiltern District). A Member asked why a question had been allowed in relation to an area in Chiltern District and the Chief Executive responded that the question related to the Joint Local Plan area and also Chiltern District Council did not allow public speaking.

1. To what extent are Members satisfied that there are no alternative and preferable sites that would not have the same safeguarding and operational harm issues available for allocation in the Plan making process?

Councillor Read (Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development) responded as follows:-

The choice of locations for future development within the Green Belt is part of an evidence based assessment of the whole Green Belt across the county – the Buckinghamshire Green Belt assessment, Part One, undertook a comprehensive assessment of the whole Green Belt in Bucks against the Green Belt purposes. From that county wide assessment the consultants recommended a number of areas that might well perform less well in Green Belt terms and which should be assessed in greater detail as part of a Green Belt part two study. Chiltern and South Bucks councils carried out an initial part two assessment of these recommended areas and other potential development sites in the Green Belt and this was published in 2016. This assessment found in particular that the option 8 area would perform poorly in Green Belt terms. The site was well located in terms of its location next to one of the main settlements of the area and was proposed for release from the Green Belt in the Green Belt Preferred Options consultation. From the overall assessment of the Green Belt only 13 sites were considered capable of release from the Green Belt and the option 8 area was considered to be one of the suitable areas. The value of the scout camp has never been disputed but we must be clear this does not form part of a Green Belt assessment. Other potential alternative sites whilst being removed from the adjacent scout camp use and any associated perceived safeguarding issues would be more harmful to the Green Belt and so be likely to fail any Green Belt assessment. Choosing to release a site from the Green Belt that has not been recommended

through the Green Belt evidence could run the risk that other site promoters would be able to pursue their own site allocations through the Local Plan process that also perform more strongly in Green Belt terms than the areas recommended in the Green Belt assessment part one and assessed in detail by the Green Belt assessment part two work..

3. Are Members actually willing to condemn the PACCAR Scout Camp to closure, the loss of a local, regional, and national community facility simply to meet housing requirements?

Councillor Read (Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development) responded as follows:-

From the scouts own assessment the site appears to be used by a mixture of scout and wider youth groups both for overnight camping or residential stays and for day trips – some of the uses such as open camping and scout camp fires etc are currently undertaken in the field known as Franks Field adjacent to the new residential development. It is accepted that there may be an impact on the site during any nearby development.

However once the development is established and associated screening /buffers are in place it is not considered that this impact would be significant. The report appears to assume that all the new residents of the adjacent development will seek to infiltrate the scout camp and or use the already available public footpath through the site and this would increase safeguarding risks. However, the public footpath already exists and anyone could already access the site without restrictions. The site is also adjacent to a public highway with little or no fencing between the road and the site/camping field as such again the site is already vulnerable to people driving along the adjacent highway and accessing the site. The scouts own Paccar website states the following in relation to security; 'The safety and security of all children on our site is paramount, anyone over the age of 18 (or that looks over the age of 18) maybe stopped and asked for information as to which group they are with. We ask everyone to cooperate. We also have CCTV cameras located throughout the campsite that are monitored.' It is likely that this level of security will continue and could be enhanced if necessary.

It is therefore not accepted that the new residents in any associated development would significantly increase the safeguarding risks to the site. Given the existing safeguarding risks to the site which the site appear to consider to be safely contained, it is not accepted that an additional housing development nearby would significantly increase those risks. Indeed potentially the erection of housing with its associated garden enclosures may reduce the number of opportunities to enter the site from across the adjacent open land.

The intention is to provide a buffer between the scout camp use and the residential development – whilst the form of development on the site has not been formally agreed at this time the councils own landscape assessment commissioned to review the impact of Green Belt sites aimed to restrict development to the northern areas of

the site and apart from the camping field where a landscape buffer is to be provided away from the other parts of the scout camp wooded areas.

5. If Members are going to approve the Plan for consultation with Option 8 included, and lead to the inevitable closure of the PACCAR Scout Camp, then will they seek an amendment which adds back in our northern field as part of the allocation so that the charity have the opportunity (having already discovered there are no alternative potential sites) to access the considerable funds which would be available as part of a residential development? This however is not the scouts preferred option as it would only occur upon the closure of the existing centre.

Councillor Read (Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development) responded as follows:-

The Scout camp field (Franks Field) is specifically excluded from the housing allocation to preserve the scout camp use. The inclusion of the scout camp field could permit housing development but whilst potentially raising funds for the scout camp - without a suitable alternative scout facility this would bring housing closer to the remaining scout camp and the loss of the camping field would reduce opportunities to hold larger events and reduce the capacity of the site so such an extent that it could well, lead to the closure feared in the scouts commissioned assessment. As such this suggestion appears counterproductive to the scouts own intentions for the site. If however the community use of the site ceased, and there was no other potential community use for the area and if the site is removed from the Green Belt there would be nothing to stop the scouts from making a planning application for a suitable development on the camping field site in the future.

77. APPROVAL OF THE PUBLICATION VERSION OF THE CHILTERN AND SOUTH BUCKS LOCAL PLAN 2036

Council received a report on the approval of a six week public consultation on whether the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 was sound and complied with legislation governing the preparation of local development plans. Members of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee were asked for their views at a meeting on 29 April 2019 and the recommendations in the report were approved for recommendation to Council by Joint Committee on 1 May 2019. The Minutes for these meetings are available on the Council's website. Following these meetings a Schedule of Proposed Changes was published as a supplementary document and appended to the reports pack for this meeting.

This was intended to be the final iteration of the Local Plan before its submission to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for independent examination. The Plan had been prepared using the outputs from previous rounds of consultation, a range of background evidence work and input from the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economic Development and the Joint Planning Policy Member Reference Group.

Full Council was further advised that post-publication of the main Agenda reports pack and the Supplement Agendas 1 and 2, Members had been emailed prior to the meeting further important components of the evidence base for the draft Local Plan, namely the Viability Study, the Sustainability Appraisal report, the Habitats Regulations Assessment report and the Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances report which had been published and could be viewed at <https://www.chiltern.gov.uk/planning/localplanevidence>

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Read and seconded by Councillor Sullivan.

The Director of Services gave a presentation on the Plan which is a supplement to the agenda. He informed Members that there was a statutory duty to produce a Local Plan and the current Plan had some policies which no longer reflected current circumstances and increased the risk of uncontrolled development. It was important to have a Plan in place which could be adopted by the new Unitary District Council in 2020, otherwise it could be another five years before a new Plan came into existence - planning decisions would continue to be made on out of date policies and planning appeals would be more difficult to refuse.

The main points were as follows:-

Spatial vision

The Plan would be a blueprint for the future of Chiltern and South Bucks until 2036 to meet the development needs of all local communities.

Strategic Context

Consideration needed to be given to major projects such as the Oxford-Cambridge Arc (Government ambition for 1 million new homes by 2050), Heathrow Airport third runway, Western Rail Link to Heathrow, Crossrail, HS2 and the Wider Area (Slough) Growth Study (which was not relevant to this Plan).

Housing Numbers

- 15,260 new homes needed 2016 – 2036 (763 homes per year)
- 5,687 homes needed from the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan
- 5,200 homes to be provided on new sites
- 3,658 homes from completions and commitments
- 1,791 homes from HELAA sites
- 450 homes from 'windfalls' (90 homes per year for years 1-5)
- 16,786 total proposed supply (allowing for 10% buffer)
- (Balanced housing strategy 1/3 completed homes and brownfield sites - 1/3 Local Plan allocations – 1/3 Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan)
- Strategy for providing 85 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 4 plots for travelling showpeople

Economic and retail development

- Projected need for 40,000 square metres of office and R&D floorspace
- Projected need for 48,000 square metres of warehouse floorspace
- Probable need for 1 new supermarket in Amersham / Chesham and 1 in Beaconsfield (need for 6,500 square metres convenience / 1,800 square metres comparison goods)

Site allocations for homes had been included in the plan on page 189 of the agenda pack as follows:-

- BP2 – Chesham (500 homes)
- BP3 – Holmer Green (300 homes)
- BP4 – London Road West, Amersham Old Town (40 homes)
- BP5 – South-east of Whielden Street, Amersham Old Town (50 homes)
- BP6 – Little Chalfont (700 homes)
- BP7 – Chalfont St Peter – north-east (360 homes plus retirement homes)
- BP8 – Chalfont St Peter – south-east (200 homes)
- BP9 – Beaconsfield (1,600 homes / 20,000m² employment)
- BP10 – Iver Heath (360 homes)
- BP11 – North of Iver Station (1,000 homes / 12,000m² employment)
- BP12 – East of Ridgeway Business Park, Iver (90 homes / 4,000m² employment)
- BP13 - North of Denham Roundabout (16,000m² employment)
- BP14 - Land adjacent to Taplow Station (4,000m² employment)

Proposed changes to Green Belt boundaries

- 13 sites to be removed from Green Belt
 - 12 villages* currently 'washed over' by the Green Belt to be removed
 - Mill Lane, Taplow and Pinewood Studios currently 'washed over' by Green Belt to be removed
 - Removal of some anomalies through IGBBR
- * Botley, Denham, Dorney Reach, Higher Denham, Hyde Heath, Jordans, Ley Hill, Little Kingshill, South Heath, Tatling End, Wexham Street and Winchmore Hill

Affordable homes

- 4,340 affordable homes needed over the Plan period
- Equates to 28% of the overall housing requirement
- [AVDC target is 25% for 'our' 5,750 homes]
- 40% target for housing developments of 10+ homes
 - At least 10% for affordable home (shared) ownership
 - Minimum of 25% for social rent
 - Remainder for affordable rent
- Financial contributions from sites of 5-9 homes

Infrastructure and CIL

- CIL would be used as main funding stream for infrastructure for sites up to 400 homes / 10 hectares

- Larger sites above 400 homes / 10 hectares would be CIL-exempt and infrastructure to mitigate impacts would be secured through S106 regime
- Affordable homes would be delivered via S106 obligations in all cases
- The consultation on the CIL draft charging schedule would be in advance of the Local Plan

Development management policies

There would be an emphasis on place-making and good design with houses being built to Building for Life 12 design standard. In addition there would be:-

- 20% renewable energy target for schemes of 10+ homes (cheaper energy bills and less fuel poverty)
- Reduce reliance on private vehicles – cycle parking required
- Access to electric vehicle / bicycle charging points

The timetable for the Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy had been included in the previous item.

Following the presentation Members discussed the draft Local Plan and made the following comments:-

Sustainability Appraisal Report

A Member asked a question in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal Report (14.1) which referred to the increased emissions of greenhouse gases and how the Council would mitigate this. The Report stated that it was likely that the large quantity of development proposed within the Local Plan would increase the Plan area's carbon footprint by 21% or more which would result in increased carbon emissions and exacerbate the impacts of climate change.

The Head of Planning and Economic Development reported that in order to help mitigate the potential residual adverse impacts of development on climate change sustainable approaches were being developed, for example promotion of non car modes, promotion and support of electric cars and bicycles, 20% renewable energy (which in itself will encourage higher insulation). As some of the housing requirement had been moved into the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan there was a concern that this would increase car usage for families, which was why there was an incentive to provide affordable housing as close to home as possible.

Releasing Green Belt/Site Allocation and Housing Mix

A Member made reference to his previous comments at Joint Overview and Scrutiny which were as follows:-

- The draft Local Plan needs future proofing – he referred to finding 10,000 homes in a relatively small area, which included a significant amount of green belt land. However, as the Councils would become a new Unitary District Council in April 2020 there was an opportunity to look at the future needs of

Buckinghamshire as a whole where there was 25 times as much land to contain 5 times the housing growth, which would reduce the pressure on releasing green belt land (45,000 new homes) and the need to build new infrastructure. He had proposed that the decision on the draft Local Plan be delayed whilst a new survey was commissioned by independent consultants to determine the housing need and impact on the green belt for the new unitary planning authority and that the results of the survey be reported back to the two District Councils to consider whether the emerging plan should be amended accordingly.

- He also referred to Policy DM LP2 and 3 – Affordable Homes from Major and Minor Developments with 40% on allocations and 30% for other developments and releasing green belt land only in exceptional circumstances. He commented that having 25% of 4 bedroomed homes in his area was not in his view exceptional. He commented that it would be better to have one/two bedroomed properties which would be more affordable for young people.

Due to these two reasons he concluded that he would be unable to support the current draft Local Plan. Another Member agreed with him that a new survey should be commissioned by independent consultants to see if the draft Plan was sound.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development responded that the housing need across Buckinghamshire was much higher than 45,000 (60-70,000) and therefore it was important that all District Councils looked at housing needs for their local areas. He referred to the Inspectors comments on the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan who had insisted on modifications to reassess the balance of housing in local areas. The Portfolio Holder stated that there was a need for a housing mix of one to five bedroomed houses to meet the needs of families. With the proposed Oxford – Cambridge Arc there could be three to six new settlements in the north of the County but it was still important to address local need.

Another Member made reference to the Beaconsfield area and expressed concern about releasing green belt and the site allocation of 1,600 homes in this area which could mean an additional 3,000 cars in a town where there was already bad traffic congestion and the additional pressures on infrastructure. She commented that the draft Local Plan should be considered by the new Unitary District Council where they could take a more holistic view of the Plan, rather than a number of smaller Plans.

In terms of site allocations a Member expressed concern that the allocation of housing between Chiltern and South Bucks District Council was not evenly distributed and that 59% of new housing was in the South Bucks District. He also referred to 1,600 homes in Beaconsfield and 1,450 homes in Iwer and the increase in traffic, with the added complication of Heathrow expansion and Crossrail. He commented that he was not in favour of the draft Local Plan which would have an adverse impact on the local area which would be irreversible.

A Member who was in favour of the draft Local Plan commented that the site allocations were fair for South Bucks District and that all new housing would be sustainable and environmentally friendly. The District would benefit from Section 106 funding and the Community Infrastructure Levy to help provide infrastructure. The draft Plan also had a sound approach to housing mix. There were current issues on providing affordable housing in the area which the draft Local Plan should address.

In relation to housing mix another Member commented on the need to increase affordable housing particularly because of the high house prices in this area of the Country.

Regulation 19 Consultation

Following a question regarding the consultation process, the Director of Services reported that there would be a Regulation 19 consultation where residents could make comments on the Plan which would be considered by the Planning Inspectorate rather than the Council who would examine the Plan to see if it was sound. The Portfolio Holder reported that Aylesbury Vale and Wycombe District Councils were post Regulation 19 and in order for the new Unitary District Council to have a holistic view it was important for Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils to proceed with their joint plan to provide an overall picture.

<https://southbucks.gov.uk/article/7085/Emerging-Chiltern-and-South-Bucks-Local-Plan>

Evidence base/ Examination process

In response to this another Member commented that officers had spent a number of years working on this draft Local Plan which was evidence based and that the proposals for site allocations had been put forward according to local need. Brownfield sites were no longer available and therefore other alternatives had to be explored, which included transferring up to 5,750 homes to Aylesbury Vale Local Plan. Another Member made reference to the need for the appropriate infrastructure to support the various proposed developments and the Portfolio Holder reported that the Plan supported this.

A Member also commented that the Plan had not been updated since 1999 and therefore needed to be updated otherwise planning appeals were more likely to succeed if out of date policies were still in place. He referred to development in neighbouring authority areas and development generally which had increased the number of HGVs, therefore it was important to protect South Bucks District. In relation to previous comments if traffic in other areas would increase so significantly as to bring a town to a standstill because of additional housing the Inspector would not consider the Plan sound. The Examination in Public would put the draft Local Plan to the test and if considered sound would protect the Green Belt and safeguard all local communities.

A Member then complimented officers on the Plan which was design led and had a place making approach to building homes for life to address the needs of future generations. He expressed concern that currently developers could make applications for piecemeal development which would not provide for any additional infrastructure. The Plan would ensure that homes were built of a suitable size rather than large houses no one could afford.

In response to comments Councillor Read stated that the test for soundness of the Local Plan would be at the Examination In Public, where the public could put forward their views but reassured Members that officers had been obtaining evidence to support the draft document for the last 5 years where an analysis had been undertaken on the best options for the District area taking into account sustainability. The Head of Planning and Economic Development reported that the Examination should take place in September and would be run by an Independent Inspector who would consider all the objections and test the Plan for its soundness. There would be a number of Hearing Days where representations would be considered and the Inspector would hold some round table events so that people could present their case for or against the Plan.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee thanked officers for their hard work on preparing the draft Local Plan. He commented that the majority of people were passionate about defending the Green Belt but that the Council needed to have regard to local and national policies. The draft Plan would also go through a process of challenge with the consultation process and the Examination. He commented that the evidence basis was a rigorous process and with Government policies there was very little flexibility in relation to housing need and the Government expected Councils to meet their target. The Plan would be considered unsound by the Inspector if there were any concerns.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development concluded that this Plan would increase the quality of life for residents and support local communities with the right infrastructure in place. The District areas were slightly unique with the Area of Outstanding Beauty including the Colne Valley and the Green Belt.

Following a request by more than a quarter of Members present a recorded vote was taken as follows:-

For (18): Councillors: D Anthony, R Bagge, M Bezzant, M Bradford, T Egleton, B Gibbs, P Hogan, G Hollis, J Jordan, P Kelly, M Lewis, W Matthews, N Naylor, D Pepler, J Read, R Sangster, D Smith and L Sullivan

Against (5): Councillors: P Griffin, B Harding, J Lowen-Cooper, R Reed and G Sandy

Abstained (3): Councillors: P Bastiman, S Chhokar and D Saunders

Note: Councillor D Dhillon left the meeting at 7.30pm which was prior to the recorded vote taking place.

RESOLVED that

1. Subject to the finalisation of the Sustainability Appraisal report, the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Exceptional Circumstances report, the Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 is published for public consultation under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).
2. Subject to the finalisation of the Sustainability Appraisal report, the Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Exceptional Circumstances report, the Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 is submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)
3. Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development to request that the Planning Inspectorate recommends main modifications where necessary to make the Local Plan sound.
4. Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economic Development, to make minor changes and corrections to the Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 prior to publication.
5. Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economic Development, to produce a schedule of minor amendments to the Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 in the light of the responses to the public consultation and prior to its submission for examination, and to submit this list with the Plan.
6. Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economic Development, to suggest to the examination Planning Inspector during the public examination process any necessary modifications to the Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 to secure its soundness, in accordance with the findings of the examination Planning Inspector and subject to any necessary public consultation.
7. The Publication version of the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan 2036 be endorsed as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
8. Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Economic Development, to deal with and sign Statements of Common Ground and Memorandums of Understanding under the Duty to Co-operate.

9. If there were any significant delays to the draft Local Plan timetable as set out in the Local Development Scheme, the draft Local Plan should be brought back to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

At this point of the meeting the following Councillors left at 7.40pm: Councillors Harding, Reed, Lowen-Cooper, Sandy. A number of Members expressed their concern at these Members leaving the meeting at this time before the Annual Meeting.

78. CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no recommendations from the Cabinet – the last meeting was held on 13 March 2019 and these recommendations were considered at the Council meeting on 16 April 2019.

79. VERBAL REPORTS FROM THE LEADER, CABINET MEMBERS OR CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE

There were no verbal reports.

80. MOTIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12 the following Motion was proposed by Councillor Bezzant and seconded by Councillor Kelly as follows:-

“This Council recognises the hugely positive societal and economic impact that the thousands of European Union (EU) citizens living in South Bucks have on our local area; welcomes the reciprocal agreement between the United Kingdom (UK) and the Kingdom of Spain allowing EU citizens to retain voting rights for local elections in the UK if the UK leaves the EU; notes that citizens of the Republic of Ireland will retain voting rights in the UK if the UK leaves the EU; and calls on the Leader of the Council, in advance of elections to a new unitary authority in Buckinghamshire in 2020, to write to the Secretary of State for the Home Department to request that all other EU citizens resident in the UK retain their right to vote in local elections in the event that the UK leaves the EU before May 2020.”

Following clarification Members noted that citizens of the Republic of Ireland would retain voting rights if the UK left the EU. A number of Members commented that EU citizens should have a democratic right to vote in the UK and at local elections. A Member referred to the democratic right of citizens who had made their life in the UK and were paying taxes, including providing vital jobs such as NHS staff should be supported. A Member raised concern about those EU citizens who had committed a crime in the UK being able to vote but noted that some prisoners had a right to vote in the UK e.g persons remanded in custody.

The Member who proposed the Motion stated that all EU citizens (3000 in South Bucks) should retain their democratic right to vote which should not be taken away if a decision was made to leave the EU. These citizens were of great benefit to the

economy and local communities. 63,000 EU citizens work in the NHS which benefited the health and wellbeing of all. If they lost the vote they would not be able to have a say on vital services for their family. It was important to show that UK citizens value their EU counterparts.

Following a vote being taken it was

RESOLVED that the Motion be carried.

81. **MEMBERS' REPORTS**

The meeting received the following members' reports:

Bucks Health and Social Care Select Committee – 19 March 2019

Buckinghamshire Healthcare Trust – 27 March 2019

The meeting terminated at 7.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank