

NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

COUNCIL

10th June, 2019

An Extraordinary meeting of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council was held at the Town Hall, Nuneaton, on Monday, 10th June, 2019.

PRESENT

The Mayor (Councillor J. Tandy)
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor W.J. Hancox)

Councillors J.B. Beaumont, D. Brown, S. Croft, G. Daffern, S. Doughty, P.M. Elliott, K. Evans, D. Gissane, J. Glass, C. Golby, , S. Gran, J. Gutteridge, L. Hocking, J.A. Jackson, K.A. Kondakor, A. Llewellyn-Nash, I.K. Lloyd, B.J. Longden, B. Pandher, N.J.P. Phillips, G.D. Pomfrett, M. Rudkin, A. Sargeant, J. Sheppard, T.E. Sheppard, R.T. Smith, R. Tromans, H. Walmsley, C.M. Watkins and K.D. Wilson.

Apologies were received from Councillors J. Sargeant and K. Brindley-Edwards.

CL12 Declaration of Interests

Councillor J.B. Beaumont requested that his interests on the schedule attached to the minutes, be amended as they were not correct. He has never been a Member of the Police and Crime Panel.

RESOLVED that the Declarations of Interest for this meeting are as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes, as amended above.

CL13 Public Participation

1. Mr Allen Gilbey presented the following statement:

“The Borough Plan has come under much criticism during its development and many of the points already raised by concerned residents remain.

“The Inspector may have ruled that it is compliant with planning regulations but this does not mean that it meets the needs of the borough or its residents.

“The Plan admits that Nuneaton and Bedworth is already the most densely populated borough in Warwickshire – somewhere approaching 6 times the number of residents per hectare than the Warwickshire average – yet an overspill of over 4000 houses from Coventry was unnecessarily agreed to. This should be renegotiated urgently.

“The Plan also acknowledges the existing traffic concerns, which extend way outside the central area covered by Transforming Nuneaton, yet nothing positive appears in the Plan to overcome this. I refer to areas such as Heath End Road, Midland Road, Weddington Lane, Long Shoot and the roads leading to the double mini in Whitestone.

“With the lack of job opportunities, the borough will increasingly become a dormitory or commuter town – again leading to more traffic. Compared to Hinckley, Rugby and Coventry, Nuneaton and Bedworth appears to be a new job desert.

“It is significant that, despite the alleged pressure on building houses, 3 recent major planning applications in Weddington and Long Shoot were refused due to the affect on traffic so perhaps the message is at last getting through.

“There are insufficient plans for upgrading already overstretched doctors, schools or hospital to support the proposed population explosion.

“Where will all these new residents go shopping? The town centre has lost many significant ‘anchor’ stores such as M&S and the Coop and is about to lose Topman/Topshop and Currys PC World. Surely Debenhams will soon follow them.

“Many of the sites in the Plan are on green field or, more importantly green belt, most of which is prime productive agricultural land providing the food we need to survive. Green belt can only be built on under exceptional circumstances which do not exist here. Reducing the housing numbers will protect these important sites.

“Too many large sites will lead to extended build out times and unfinished estates which might allow developers to avoid paying infrastructure contributions.

“As our elected representatives you are here to protect and improve our borough and not surrender it over to developers with no interest in what they will destroy for ever.

“This is not a party political issue – it is one that will affect our borough for ever and will be seen as your legacy.

“Do the right thing by your electorate and review this plan before adoption to reduce the excessive housing numbers, protect the environment and make Nuneaton and Bedworth a better place to live, work and shop.”

2. Mr Lubs Cvetkovic presented the following statement:

“Today this Council will vote on the adoption of the Borough Plan. I hope that Councillors will not just vote blindly to adopt the plan without considering some of the implications of this decision. If adopted this plan will certainly be the biggest decision that this generation of Councillors will ever make. In adopting this plan you will change this Borough beyond recognition and I hasten to add not for the better.

“A vote to adopt the Borough Plan means uncertainty in the deliverability of much needed infrastructure and amenities from Doctors surgeries, to primary and secondary schools. There is no guarantee that S106 money will be spent where it is most needed or that the amount negotiated will be sufficient to meet the costs, you have no control of the statutory bodies who will be expected to provide roads, schools, hospitals, drainage and sewage leaving many with a lack of essential infrastructure and amenities.

“A vote to adopt the Borough Plan also does not offer long term protection from further development applications the plan as it stands provides a 5.4 year housing land supply. Once it drops below 5 years we are once again exposed to the mercy of developers putting in further applications for even more land.

“A vote to adopt the Borough Plan is a vote for an extra 15000 plus houses, which will add tens of thousands of extra cars to the roads of the Borough causing widespread traffic congestion issues and a reduction in air quality across the Borough. Do not be surprised when there is an increase in respiratory issues particularly amongst our oldest and the youngest in the community. Not forgetting the extra burden this will place upon health care providers and the reduction in quality of life for local residents.

“A vote to adopt the Borough Plan, will not deliver on the affordable housing that is required. Looking at many of the newer developments going up 2 bedroom homes are being marketed in excess of £200,000. Social housing that will be delivered by the Borough Plan will be insufficient to meet the demands of the Borough. Please remember developers are in the business of making money and a healthy profit. They will not do anything out of the goodness of their hearts to improve this Borough or help it's people.

“A vote to adopt the Borough Plan means we will accept a huge overspill from Coventry. In the region of 4000 additional dwellings. Coventry City Council would rather pocket vast sums of money from the University as they sell of their own land supplies. I would suggest that the true cost of Coventry's economic dominance and the University expansion is being paid for by the people of this Borough. We are being forced to take on additional unwanted and unneeded housing which we will struggle to sell. ONS data shows that the numbers are to high and that the population explosion which we have been told needs to be factored in is in reality not going to happen.

“If you vote to adopt the Borough Plan today you will be going against the wishes of the majority of people in this Borough. All the Polls show that approximately 80% of residents do not support this plan. It has been badly thought out, the plan is already out dated and it does not represent either the needs or the wishes of those who elected you as the guardians of this Borough.

“I would therefore ask you to think very carefully about the wishes of the electorate that you all claim to represent. This is not about party politics this is about doing the right thing for the people of this Borough. Please do not vote to adopt this third rate Borough Plan.”

3. Isobel Jacques presented the following statement:

“Thank you Mayor. I'm Isobel Jacques from Ash Green Exhall and here to represent the majority of Ash Green residents of Nuneaton and Bedworth and their views on the Inspector's Report of the Local Borough Plan 2017 before the full Council makes its final decision to commend or not, the Plan, to the Secretary of State tonight.

“Since 2009, I and others have liaised with many residents groups and professionals throughout the whole ongoing progress of the Local Borough Plan. A lot of this was to try and secure all Green Belt throughout the Borough was, and is preserved for our future generations.

“All Green Belt is precious wherever it is and whatever the grade is. That said a lot of the opposition to the Plan is to the number of houses and industrial sites to be built on Green Belt.

“The theme throughout is: build on Brownfield first, look at reducing housing numbers and why have we had to accept Coventry's overspill? Figures which no doubt others will, and have presented to you show that housing and industrial units are in decline migration, housing numbers, NPPF government changes, ONS figures all point to this, yet developers still want to use Green Belt land.

“It is often pointed out to campaigners who are against building on Green Belt that Green Belt has to be built on. Indeed the Inspector has also stated this in his report. If this premise is correct, and you the Council do vote to adopt the Plan I would also like to remind the Council, Green Belt had been taken away from communities prior to the Plan. We feel this should be taken into account in any future reviews.

“Small strips of Green Belt - as in Ash Green and Exhall - are all that are left after building the M6 and the surrounding infrastructure on the Green Belt land, in the 1960s, in fact modifications are still going on today.

“How the officers can sort out reducing housing and unit numbers' is going to be a thankless task, but hopefully fairness, openness and transparency to all, will be shown, whatever methodology is chosen.

“Thank you for this opportunity to speak again and put forward the views of Ash Green, Exhall and other groups as expressed in the 6600 petition against building on Green Belt land and the excessive housing numbers, and presented to the Council December 2018 on behalf of the Residents Action Group, many who will and have spoken again tonight or at previous meetings.”

4. Michele Kondakor presented the following statement:

“After years of responding to consultations, attending meetings etc., I am finally at a meeting that might adopt the Borough Plan. But when I look at the document presented, it is far from a blueprint that I and, I believe, most residents of the Borough would want for the area. In recent meetings it seems to have been acknowledged by all sides that the numbers are too high and not appropriate and yet, it is still being brought forward as a final draft and without the numerous Supplementary Planning Documents necessary to support it. As a member of the public, it is hard to know exactly what was happening behind the scenes and how much was driven by officers and how much by politicians from the ruling group. What is clear is that the public were not listened to.

“This is a quote from the Issues and Options Consultation summary from 2009:

‘High levels of disagreement were recorded in relation to the amount of future growth proposed in the document. 10,800 new homes was viewed as too many’.

“If only the people had been listened to 10 years ago.....

“With the number now standing at over 14,000, this cannot be a fit and proper Borough Plan for the people of the Borough and should not be adopted.”

5. Brian Walmsley presented the following statement:

“So everyone is aware, I have a housing development at the bottom of my garden, where there once was a farmers field, there are approximately 150 houses in various states of build, which included ripping out the hawthorn hedgerow boundary, however I am not here to blame NBBC for allowing that development, I am not here to blame the landowners for selling their land to developers, however I do blame the conservative government; their National Planning Policy Framework, allowing development on green belt and I do blame the conservative party accepting multi-million pound donations from developers and builders.

“We are gathered tonight to see if NBBC adopt the borough plan or not...

“I thank the NBBC officers for their compliance with very difficult tasks: -

- Having to comply with ever-changing government guidelines and legal requirements.
- Having to satisfy the conservative government’s newly created “Duty to co-operate”, forcing additional housing numbers on the borough.
- Having to see conservative controlled Warwickshire County Council actively proposing selling and building on Nuneaton land they owned.
- Having to see conservative controlled Warwickshire County Council abdicate concerns about traffic and school places in our borough in favour of developer lobbying pressure.
- Having to generate a plan in which they were never allowed to reduce local targets.

“I also congratulate NBBC on taking a lower figure of ‘Coventry overspill’ than some other Local Plans; I note Warwick have taken 5976 ^[1]. (Although we, as a borough, should still look to reduce our figure).

“I noted with interest that the conservative government’s inspector directed an increase to housing allocation numbers ^[2].

“The major issues of this evening are... will these Conservative Councillors vote against adoption of The Local Plan?...

- effectively voting against the conservative government policies and conservative NPPF guidance?
- effectively voting against the recommendation of their conservative government inspector?
- that they abstained from having any dialogue into?
- that they offered absolutely zero alternative to?
- which will force major, wholly unnecessary, costs onto the council tax payers of our borough?
- which would give developers free access to build where and how they like (yet again part of their conservative government rules)?

“I hope not, we need to move forward, as unpleasant as it may feel to some people in the borough, I hope we see this Local Plan adopted and, as has been stated by our Labour Council, we look to review it immediately, to reduce the overall numbers.

“To take a quote from Teddy Roosevelt, a ‘republican’ aka ‘conservative’; “Complaining about a problem without posing a solution is called whining”, so hopefully, as these local conservatives posed no solutions and no alternatives, they stop whining and vote to adopt this Local Plan.”

References: -

[1] Warwick District Local Plan, “Local_Plan_POST_COUNCIL.pdf”, accessed 3 Jun 19.

[2] Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications April 2019, “INS42_Schedule_of_MMs__amended_1_May_2019_.pdf”, accessed 3 Jun 19.

6. A representative of Woodlands Action Group presented the following statement:

“The reason why we are all here tonight is to see whether this labour council will accept the 4000 extra houses from Coventry in an over spill, and adopt a plan that even the inspector said in his report is 40% higher than the boroughs actual need. Since this plan was put together in around 2015 I and many other residents have come along to meetings such as this, we have also participated in all the dodgy consultations for what, to be ignored by the ruling labour group. It is quite clear this plan has been officer lead with certainly no input from councillors, the portfolio holders job just seems to be to read out prepared answers/statements given to him by planning officers.

“The 4000 extra houses accepted by NBBC from Coventry which according to the inspector and the law of the land did not have to be accepted. This compiled with their three year stance that it was the Governments fault surely puts doubts into any councillors minds about the fairness of the over spill on this boroughs residents. Any Labour councillor and especially ones from Bedworth voting for its adoption tonight which

obviously includes Coventry's over spill will be campaigned against at every election in which they stand by the Woodlands Action Group it must be pointed out the Action Group election campaigns have been a great success thus far with a four out of four 100% success rate.

"Councillors Glass, Beaumont, Doherty and Daffern really need to vote with their residents thoughts in mind given the mass damage to the environment and biodiversity this plan with the over spill will cause in their wards. Councillor Glass on the front page on the Bedworth Echo some years ago said about building at the woodlands " Nicholas Chamberlaine would be turning in his grave " well councillor Glass what will it be tonight your " Principles " or " political hypocrisy ".

"This plan will be a disaster for the borough, the housing numbers are miles to high which is due again to the 4000 extra houses over spill accepted by NBBC from Coventry which by law they did not have to. There are no new jobs locally to warrant such high development targets, plus the infrastructure is not there in any certainty. What this plan will do is turn this Borough into England's biggest commuter car park with even worse traffic gridlock and pollution for decades.

"Do it for the insects and Bats and not the any deal is better than good deal attitude, and vote against adoption."

7. Zoe Mayou asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Health:

"I understand that we all have points and concerns about this plan, and no plan will be 100% satisfactory to all councillors and residents. However, I understand that the Borough Plan has followed the Conservative Governments Policy Framework, sanctioned by our own Conservative MPs. It has also been viewed and signed off by a Conservative Government appointed planning inspector, who has come out and visited the Borough. In view of this, what will happen if we do not adopt the plan this evening and what are the implications?"

Councillor N.J.P. Phillips, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Health, responded as follows:

"What are the implications of withdrawing the emerging Local Plan? The existing adopted Local Plan 2006 has an end date of 2011 which is plainly out of date. This means that planning applications would be determined in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as per the National Planning Policy Framework irrespective or not that there is a five year housing supply. Another problem will be there will be development pressure on the edges of all settlements, large or small, particularly those outside the Green Belt. This may lead to more development which does not accord with the Council's preferred strategic pattern of development set out in the emerging Local Plan.

“Also Madam Mayor, there is likely to be more ‘planning by appeal’ which will be a drain on Council financial resources, much needed affordable housing will be delayed with adverse social consequences, and economic regeneration will be delayed.

“That didn’t come from a Council Officer, Madam Mayor, that came from a legal barrister on whether or not our plan is legal and the implications of not adopting the plan.”

8. A representative from Campaign to Protect Rural England, Warwickshire Branch, asked the following questions of the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Health:

“Will the Council defer adoption of the Local Plan while it commissions an independent review of the population and household projections, using the most up-to-date statistics available, including the claimed Coventry overspill requirement?”

“If the Council resolves to adopt the Plan on 10 June 2019, will it resolve now that the independent review proposed in Question (1) be undertaken and if the review shows that land being removed from the Green Belt under the new Local Plan is not required for housing or employment use, the Plan will be amended to return these areas of land to the Green Belt.”

Councillor N.J.P. Phillips, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Health, responded as follows:

“The choice is to adopt or withdraw. Withdrawing the plan would mean starting again, with revised evidence base that would require the agreement of the other Warwickshire districts, and Coventry, under the duty to cooperate and as all the inspectors of local plan examinations have accepted that Coventry and Warwickshire is in the housing market area. So we would have to bring all these together. I have said time and time again we will review this plan, but to review it you’ve got to adopt it otherwise you’re putting all residents and giving a free hand to developers.

9. Mr David Parr presented the following statement:

“Thirty seven years ago, in January, there were deep snowdrifts in Ash Green. I put my small son in a carrying sling on my chest and we tramped across the fields between Ash Green and Wilson’s Lane, rolling about in the snow piled up against the hedges and marvelling at the Artic-like wilderness. The experience was magical for both of us. A few years later both my sons were old enough to accompany me on the footpaths, picking blackberries from those same hedgerows – they learned about nature and I learned that some things are beyond price.

“Now I’m not going to bombard you with yet more figures illustrating what’s wrong with this Local Plan, heavens knows there have been enough of those throughout the examination process. And as logical as those figures may have been, and as convincing as they should have been, none of them had much effect, or we would not be here today discussing this plan in its current form.

“Instead, I’d like to appeal to you all, whatever party you represent, and feel obliged to support, to pause and consider the people your decision is going to affect, and to show you care. I’m one of those people, and I’ve been caring about the area since those days of snow blackberries. So I’ll talk about this one area because it illustrates what’s wrong with this plan.

“After the A444 by-pass was built there were applications to develop the fields on the eastern side for industrial units. There was a lengthy public inquiry, conducted by 2 inspectors, who listened attentively to all the evidence.

“Inspector Lacey dismissed the appeal, to avoid the loss of this (quote) “attractive stretch of countryside” and said he concurred with “more than one inspector in the past ... who have remarked on the high amenity value of the area, even to the extent that it should be permanently safeguarded as Green Belt.

“Inspector Platts said the area had (quote) “value as an accessible and pleasantly-secluded retreat for nearby residents” and it had “particular importance as a break between the Coventry and Bedworth built-up areas.”

“They were wise men.

“Until now nothing has been built on this area but today we have Inspector Spencer’s report, which states “This is not a tranquil area or readily interpreted as part of a wider area of countryside. It performs poorly in terms of the purposes of Green Belt”, he says, quoting the Joint Green Belt Study. And if ever there was a textbook example of manipulating evidence to achieve the desired result, that study was it.

“As I see it, there are two possible explanations for his recommendation:

1. firstly, that the issue was decided beforehand, regardless of the evidence, in which case the whole exercise has been a colossal waste of time and money
2. or alternatively, the man is a fool.

“I ask councillors to show they are not fools, and they will not be remembered for environmental vandalism in destroying so much Green Belt, but take responsibility to pass on our natural inheritance to future generations.

“Thank you.”

CL14 **Recommendations from Cabinet – 22nd May 2019**

On 22nd May 2019, Cabinet considered a report and appendices in connection with Examination in Public into the draft Borough Plan. Councillor N.J.P. Phillips, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Heath, reported on the recommendations made at Cabinet on 22nd May, 2019, in respect of the above.

Councillor Phillips moved a motion to approve the recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor J. Jackson.

Councillor W.J. Hancox moved a friendly amendment to add a fourth recommendation as follows:

“All Members be provided with mandatory training on the adopted Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan.”

Councillor Phillips seconded the friendly amendment.

A vote was taken on the friendly amendment which was carried.

[Councillor K. Kondakor requested that it be recorded that he abstained from voting. Councillors K. Evans and H. Walmsley requested that their vote against accepting the friendly amendment be recorded.]

[Councillor D. Gissane left the Chamber.]

A recorded vote was taken on Councillor Phillips' motion, as amended:

For: Councillors J.B. Beaumont, G. Daffern, S. Doughty, P.M. Elliott, J. Glass, W.J. Hancox, L. Hocking, J.A. Jackson, I.K. Lloyd, B.J. Longden, N.J.P. Phillips, G.D. Pomfrett, M. Rudkin, J. Sheppard, T.E. Sheppard, J.A. Tandy and C.M. Watkins.

Against: Councillors D. Brown, S. Croft, K. Evans, C. Golby, S. Gran, J. Gutteridge, K.A. Kondakor, A. Llewellyn-Nash, B. Pandher, A. Sargeant, R.T. Smith, R. Tromans, H. Walmsley and K.D. Wilson.

Abstentions: None.

The motion was carried.

RESOLVED that:

1. the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan published in January 2017 as amended by:
 - (i) the Inspectors final report (Appendix B);
 - (ii) the schedule of Main Modifications recommended by the Inspector (Appendix C); and
 - (iii) the schedule of minor modifications (Appendix D)be adopted;
2. subject to 1. above, as soon as reasonably practicable, the Council:
 - (a) make available in accordance with regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) —

- (i) the Borough Plan;
 - (ii) an adoption statement;
 - (iii) the sustainability appraisal report; and
 - (iv) details of where the Borough Plan is available for inspection and the places and times at which the document can be inspected;
- (b) send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption of the local plan; and
- (c) send a copy of the adoption statement to the Secretary of State; and delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Development and Health to make further minor modifications to the Plan prior to final publication, where these modifications correct typographical errors, amendments to numbering or cross referencing;
3. delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development to make further minor modifications to the Plan prior to final publication, where these modifications correct typographic errors, amendments to numbering or cross referencing; and
4. all Members be provided with mandatory training on the adopted Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan.

(Mayor)

Council - Schedule of Declarations of Interests

	Name of Councillor	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest	Other Personal Interest	Dispensation
	General dispensations granted to all members under s.33 of the Localism Act 2011			Granted to all members of the Council in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing matters - Statutory sick pay under Part XI of the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992 - An allowance, payment given to members - An indemnity given to members - Any ceremonial honour given to members - Setting council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 - Planning and Licensing matters - Allotments - Local Enterprise Partnership
	J. Beaumont		Board member of Bulkington Community Library CIC in addition to an unpaid Manager of the library. Board member of Bulkington Village Centre	
	K. Brindley-Edwards	Teacher and Head of 6 th Form at Beauchamp College		
	D. Brown	Employed by H.M Land Registry		
	S. Croft	Employed at Holland & Barrett Retail Ltd	Deputy Chairman Nuneaton Conservative Association	
	G. Daffern	Cover Supervisor and teacher at Sidney Stringer Academy, Coventry; Teacher at Stoke Park School Coventry	Co-opted Governor at Newdigate Primary School	
	S. Doughty	People in Action Cherville Limited	Unite the Union	
	P. Elliott	Employee of CW Mind ASD Support	Governor at Stockingford Nursery	

		Service Mentor		
	K. Evans	Student at De Montford University; Officer Cadet at Birmingham University Royal Navy Unit.	Officer at the North Warwickshire Conservative Association	
	D. Gissane		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	C. Golby		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	S. Gran		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	J. Gutteridge	Startin Tractors		To speak and vote on any matters involving the Borough Plan related to land at Leyland Road Bulkington
	W.J Hancox	None	Hammersley and Orton	
	L. Hocking	Employed by Openreach	Unite the Union	
	J.A Jackson	Any matter relating to the employment policies and procedures of Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council or any matter relating to the contractual arrangements with Sport & Leisure Management Ltd.		Dispensation to speak and vote on matters that do not relate specifically to her husband's contract of employment.
			Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited	Dispensation to speak and vote
	K.A. Kondakor		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	A. Llewellyn-Nash	Employee of BMI Healthcare		
	I. Lloyd	Employee of Jaguar Land Rover	Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited.	Dispensation to speak and vote
	B.J. Longden		Daughter and son-in-law work in the NHS	
			Member of the Stockingford Community Centre	
			Ex-Officiate of the Veterans Contact Point Board	
	B. Pandher	Manager of the Indian Community	Member of Warwickshire County Council	

		Centre Association, Coventry	Treasurer & Trustee of Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple; Coordinator of Council of Sikh Temples in Coventry; Secretary of Coventry Indian Community; Trustee of Sikh Monument Trust Vice Chair Exhall Multicultural Group	
	G.D Pomfrett	None	None	
	N. Phillips	Employee of DWP	Member of: - A5 Sterling Group (Council Representative) - Nuneaton Labour CLP - The Fabian Society - The George Eliot Society - The PCS Union - Nuneaton Credit Union	
	M. Rudkin	Employee of People in Action	Unite the Union	
	A. Sargeant		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	J. Sargeant	SATCOL Charity Project Manager		To speak and vote on any matters related to the Salvation Army Charity (SATCOL) or related bodies, unless the matter directly affects the contract of employment of the Councillor
	J. Sheppard		Partnership member of the Hill Top and Caldwell Big Local.	
			Director of Wembrook Community Centre.	Dispensation to speak and vote on any matters of Borough Plan that relate to the Directorship of Wembrook Community Centre
			Member of the Management Committee at the Mental Health Drop in.	
	T. Sheppard	Employee of Dairy Crest		

	R. Smith		Director of Volunteer Friends, Bulkington; Board of Directors at Bulkington Village Community and Conference Centre	
	J.A. Tandy		Partnership member of the Hill Top and Caldwell Big Local. Member of Warwickshire Police & Crime Panel.	
	R. Tromans	Director of RTC Ltd		
	H. Walmsley	Chief of Staff to Julian Knight MP Self-employed Public Relations Consultant.	Chartered Institute of Public Relations	
	C.M Watkins	Employee of Hermes	Member of Labour Group	
	K.D Wilson	Employee of the courts service	Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited	Dispensation to speak and vote