

MINUTES of the meeting of COUNCIL held at The Shire Hall, Hereford. on Thursday, 4 September 2008 at 10.30 a.m.

Present: Councillor J Stone (Chairman)
Councillor JB Williams (Vice Chairman)

Councillors: PA Andrews, WU Attfield, LO Barnett, DJ Benjamin, AJM Blackshaw, H Bramer, ACR Chappell, ME Cooper, PGH Cutter, SPA Daniels, H Davies, GFM Dawe, PJ Edwards, MJ Fishley, JP French, JHR Goodwin, AE Gray, DW Greenow, KG Grumbley, KS Guthrie, JW Hope MBE, MAF Hubbard, B Hunt, RC Hunt, TW Hunt, JA Hyde, JG Jarvis, P Jones CBE, MD Lloyd-Hayes, G Lucas, RI Matthews, R Mills, PM Morgan, AT Oliver, JE Pemberton, RJ Phillips, GA Powell, PD Price, SJ Robertson, A Seldon, RH Smith, RV Stockton, JK Swinburne, AP Taylor, DC Taylor, AM Toon, NL Vaughan, WJ Walling, PJ Watts, DB Wilcox and JD Woodward

Prayers

The Reverend Christine Mundell led the Council in prayer.

The Chairman and Council stood in silent tribute in memory of Councillor Dick Burke, Member for Leominster South, who had died since the last meeting of Council.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors CM Bartrum, WLS Bowen and TM James.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor PJ Edwards declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 as Cabinet Member for the Environment in the previous administration of 2003/07.

Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman asked Council to join with him in support of Councillor Lloyd-Hayes who would be taking part in a charity sheep drive over Tower Bridge in London. The Chairman also informed Council of the launch of the Extra Care Facilities which was taking place at the Rose Gardens in the afternoon and thanked those Members involved in the work leading up to the launch.

3. FORMAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS TO THE CABINET MEMBERS AND CHAIRMEN UNDER STANDING ORDERS AGENDA ITEM 5

Councillors may ask questions of Cabinet Members and Chairmen of Committees so long as a copy of the question is deposited with the Assistant Chief Executive, Legal and Democratic Services at least 3 working days prior to the meeting. A list of questions, set out in the order in which they had been received, was circulated at the beginning of the meeting. Councillors may also, at the discretion of the Chairman, ask one supplementary question on the same topic. The questions and summary of the answers are set out below.

Question from Councillor MAF Hubbard

Please list all meetings between members of the Cabinet and representatives of JS Bloor Ltd from January 1st 1998 to the present day

Answer from Councillor RJ Phillips, Leader of the Council

There are no records of any formal meetings taking place between Cabinet and representatives of JS Bloor Limited from 1 January 1998 to the present day. It has not been possible to access the diary of the previous administration from 1998 to May 2003, though it is understood that a number of informal meetings did take place. Since May 2003 there has been three informal meetings involving Cabinet Members on 1 May 2003, May/June 2007 and on 12 August 2008. I have also met with JS Bloor Ltd., on 25 June 2003 with a B Morgan and I Green and one on 21 November 2007. The Leader was not aware of any other contacts between Members of the Council and representatives of JS Bloor

In response to a further question, Councillor Phillips advised that formal records of any meetings between Council officers and the developers would have been recorded but that meetings between Members and the developers would not have been.

Questions from Councillor AT Oliver

Would you please advise what the current position is with the planning application by Bloor Homes Ltd for 300 houses at Bullinghope.

The letter from Boyer Planning of 21/01/2004, on behalf of Bloor Homes Ltd, to the Chief Planning Officer of Herefordshire Council appears to dictate to our Planning Department the conditions under which they would get planning permission for the Bullinghope site, and also to outline the way it could be included in the revised UDP under the appropriate strategic policy context. Does the Cabinet Member for the Environment believe it is appropriate for a developer to be instructing this Council's planning officers on how to run their department, or is this the normal way that forward planning is developed within this Council?

Answer from Councillor JG Jarvis, Cabinet Member Environment and Strategic Housing

Given the current legal proceedings on the inclusion of the Bullinghope site no further work is being carried out on the current application submitted by Bloor Homes on this site.

The letter from Boyer is entirely typical of letters sent to the Council during the UDP process. Its purpose was to promote the site for inclusion in the Plan and to suggest the basis on which that could be achieved. In the event that a site was allocated in the UDP for residential purposes the basis on which that was eventually achieved in the Plan would be the result of a detailed series of negotiations/discussions with the developer and, in some cases, following the guidance of the inquiry Inspector.

In response to a further question on why a site, which was perceived as being unsuitable, was chosen Councillor Jarvis was unable to comment, as he was not in office at the time of the decision.

Questions from Councillor M Lloyd-Hayes

Did the change of political leadership in May 2003 lead to any changes of policy in

relation to housing at Bullinghope or the funding of the Rotherwas Access Road?

On the morning of 28th July 2006, what meetings did the Leader have prior to Full Council 2006 and who attended this or these meetings?

Is it true that the Government could have funded the Rotherwas Access route recommended by the council's own consultants?

Why did the council ignore the Planning Inspectors advice as well as that of the professional planning officers who rejected development at Bullinghope from the beginning?

Answers from Councillor RJ Phillips, Leader of the Council

It is impossible to say whether the change in political leadership would have affected policy decisions made, but it is unlikely.

I attended part of the Independent Group meeting and the Conservative Group meeting on the morning of 28 July 2006.

Yes, it is true that the Government could have funded this and any other route for the Rotherwas Access Road. Unfortunately they chose not to. Ever since the purchase of the Rotherwas estate in the 1960s, successive Councils have strived to improve the access to the estate. Since the formation of Herefordshire Council in 1998, there had been several cross-political attempts to lobby Government Ministers on the issue of a Rotherwas access road with very little success.

The Council included the Bullinghope site in the UDP in order to meet future housing needs in the city and as a way of potentially securing funding for the Rotherwas Access Road.

In response to further questions, Councillor Phillips advised that he was never aware of any alternative routes for the relief road. He also made it clear that the sole reason the land at Bullinghope was added to the UDP because the Government had failed to supply the money for the construction of the relief road even through a great number of similar schemes in the West Midlands had been approved and funded.

Questions from Councillor H Davies

The Council's own costs in defending the action in the High Court by the Dinedor Hill Association. Please include external payments, staff, time, travelling and accommodation costs and all other expenditure that was incurred in relation to this Court case.

The costs of the Dinedor Hill Action Association awarded against the Council by Mr Justice Callings

The cost of officer, time travel, accommodation and any other costs involved in the meetings with JS Bloor to discuss and evaluate their various proposals in relation to housing at Bullinghope and road funding.

The costs so far of receiving the JS Bloor planning application for housing at Bullinghope and conducting a public Consultation including all time expended so far in preliminary discussions and evaluations.

Answers from Councillor JP French, Cabinet Member Corporate and Customer Services and Human Resources

The Council's schedule of costs submitted to the court sets out the matter. The total costs at the time were £14,793.75 which includes Counsel's fees including staff time, disbursements, travel and accommodation.

There is an order limiting the recovery costs to £15,000. These are still in the process of being agreed, however it is unlikely to be less than £15,000.

A number of informal meetings have taken place with officers in attendance. It is estimated that these meetings have cost approximately £1,250 the majority of which is in officer time.

Given the current legal proceedings on the inclusion of the Bullinghope site no further work is being carried out on the current application submitted by Bloor Homes on this site.

In response to a further question, Councillor French stated that all accommodation costs were included in the totals given.

Question from Councillor ACR Chappell

Did the Leader of the Council inform the Chief Executive of the Council and its Legal Officers that he intended to move a motion at Full Council on July 28 2006 with the purpose of rejecting the Planning Inspectors recommendations about Bullinghope and the Cabinet decision to accept it? If so, when did he inform them and what was the response?

Answer from Councillor RJ Phillips, Leader of the Council

I refer to the routine meeting between the Cabinet and Corporate management board on 20 July 2006, when following the government's refusal of funding for the Rotherwas access road under the Regional Funding Arrangements, the issue of the land at Bullinghope was discussed and I quote from the minutes:

"The Chief Executive advised that it would be unwise to react to any positive noises from Advantage West Midlands until a firm commitment had been received – the approach should be to 'plan for the worst but hope for the best'. However Cabinet Members would need to take view on the position of Bullinghope within the UDP before Council on 28 July. If action were not taken at Council it would be difficult to bring back in the future. The advantages of reinstating Bullinghope as a housing development area included:

- Supporting the case for growth points
- If it was considered that the development would take place there once the road was achieved it would be preferable to secure the development control advantages obtained by inclusion within the UDP

These advantages needed to be weighed against the potential for a challenge to the UDP process, although the current review of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the likelihood of additional housing requirement in the region may negate that concern.

Question from Councillor WU Attfield

What is the current status of the JS Bloor planning application for 300 houses at Bullinghope?

Answer from Councillor JG Jarvis, Cabinet Member Environment and Strategic

Housing

Given the current legal proceedings on the inclusion of the Bullinghope site no further work is being carried out on the current application submitted by Bloor Homes on this site.

In response to an additional question, Councillor Jarvis said that it was not within the Council's power to "draw a line under the incident" and the Council must go through the process once the judgement has been made.

Questions from Councillor GF Dawe

Did any members of the Cabinet receive any information prior to July 28 2006 about future housing requirements in Herefordshire that would have provided grounds to reject the Planning Inspectors recommendation on housing numbers to 2011?

What communications have Legal and Democratic Services (Herefordshire Council) had with JS Bloor or their legal advisers post-the High Court judgement? Please supply copies of letters, emails and telephone conversation notes.

What communications have the Planning Department (Herefordshire Council) had with JS Bloor or their legal advisers post-the High Court judgement? Please supply copies of letters, emails and telephone conversation notes.

Answers from Councillor RJ Phillips, Leader of the Council

Cabinet Members were not aware of any individual pieces of information regarding housing figures apart from the general ongoing discussions around the West Midlands government office's proposed allocations for the Regional Spatial Strategy where three levels of housing numbers were used the maximum being 500 000.

The Leader also stated that a change in attitude between the meetings of Cabinet and Council was because no money was made available for the relief road. The position would undoubtedly have changed if the money had been secured.

Members of the public and Members are aware that JS Bloor is seeking leave to appeal against the High Court judgement. The Council is classed as an interested party in the case. The litigation is therefore still ongoing, and such papers cannot be disclosed.

4. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER STANDING ORDERS (Pages 1 - 4)

Councillors ACR Chappell and GW Dawe submitted the following Notice of Motion:

"NOTES the Judgement by Mr. Justice Collins in the case of the Dinedor Hill Action Association v Herefordshire County Council.

NOTES that the Rotherwas Access Road has been completed without any financial contribution from JS Bloor Ltd.

NOTES that JS Bloor Ltd have submitted a Planning Application to build 300 houses at Bullinghope without any socially affordable element.

RESOLVES that the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Political Group Leaders, should appoint suitable persons independent of the Council to conduct a full and public enquiry and to publish the outcome.

INSTRUCTS the Chief Executive to include in the Terms of Reference for this Enquiry:

The circumstances that on 28 July 2006 led the Leader of the Council to move the rejection of a decision by his own Cabinet, despite assurances given to the contrary less than 24 hours previously.

Whether Councillor Phillips and others were warned by Legal Officers as to the conduct now found unlawful by Mr Justice Collins.

A full and detailed chronology of discussions, proposals and responses between Council Members, Council Officers and representatives of JS Bloor Ltd, concerning the Rotherwas Access Road and housing allocations at Bullinghope.

An investigation of whether or not inappropriate pressure was placed on Planning Officers during this process, and if so by whom.

What professional advice was given to Councillor Phillips concerning the Planning Inspector's view on future housing numbers.

How have the Government's targets for housing in Herefordshire been determined and whether that process has been influenced directly or indirectly by JS Bloor Ltd.

What evaluation was made of proposals for alternative methods of funding the Rotherwas Access Road.

What understandings have been reached with JS Bloor Ltd about issues additional to the application for 300 houses at Bullinghope.

What pre-application discussions were held with JS Bloor Ltd in relation to Flood Risk, water supply, sewerage and traffic.

Why the Council submitted its evidence to the High Court late and withheld crucial evidence.

Why the Council's Scrutiny procedures failed to challenge the conduct that has led to the current circumstances.

Whether any Members failed to Register or declare Interests that should have been registered or declared in relation to JS Bloor Ltd.

Any other matters that they believe to be relevant to the matter and that the public would expect to know."

The Chairman ruled urgency.

Councillor ACR Chappell spoke on the Notice of Motion and stated:

- He believed there was a need for a public enquiry into the allocation of the land as Members might have been "whipped" into making their decision at Council in July 2006.
- A meeting took place between Council officers and Bloor Homes representatives in Leominster in September 1998 where it was suggested that a bypass for Hereford could be built in exchange for permission to build

five thousand homes. Planning officers expressed concern at the proposed routing and plans were never made public for discussion.

- He judged it was inappropriate for developers to dictate the conditions of any proposed development and that supporters of a relief road should not have been manipulated by Bloor Homes.
- He agreed the importance of the Rotherwas Access Road and had been part of the delegation to Government Office.
- It was asked of the Leader why he had changed the housing development from Holmer to Bullinghope without consulting Cabinet.
- He accepted the details that had been given so far, but did not believe them and therefore feels an enquiry is needed.
- Some of the queries go back as far as the first administration of Herefordshire Council under the Liberal Democrats.
- Why was nothing done to pursue the funding of the Rotherwas Access Road under the regeneration of the Rotherwas Industrial Estate.
- An investigation is needed as to whether inappropriate pressure was put on planning officers.
- Members were reminded of the requirement for good governance.

Councillor Chappell requested a named vote on the issue and formally moved the Notice of Motion. It was seconded by Councillor GW Dawe who reserved his right to reply until the end of the debate.

Councillor MAF Hubbard spoke on the Notice of Motion and asked whether the public was consulted at the start of the process. He expressed his concern over the funding arrangements and felt it was wrong for the funding over the new road to be agreed solely based on any monies raised from a potential housing development. He was particularly concerned that the Council appeared to have approved the road's construction on that basis. He questioned the openness and transparency of the lead up to the Council's decision in July 2006 and felt there were a number of unanswered questions.

Councillor Hubbard went on to point out that there were a number of alternative routes considered for the road by the Government Office for the West Midlands and questioned why there was no record of this. He said that overall, the whole issue had undermined the public's perception of Herefordshire Council and that an enquiry would go some way towards restoring public confidence in the Council.

Councillor AM Toon proposed a slight amendment to the Motion before Council and requested the words "financial options appraisal" be inserted into paragraph 12 of the original motion so that it would read:

"What evaluation and financial option appraisal was made of proposals for alternative methods of funding for the Rotherwas Access Road."

Councillor Toon, in speaking on the proposed amendment, asked why the houses were not allocated to Roman Road as originally intended and why a vote at a previous Council meeting on whether to split houses between Rotherwas and

Holmer, did not take place.

Councillor ACR Chappell accepted the proposed amendment to the motion. Councillor PA Andrews formally seconded the amendment and a vote was taken.

For – 17

Against – 32

Abstentions – 2

The amendment to the motion was lost.

The Leader of the Council proposed an amendment to the notice of motion before Council asking that only the first two paragraphs be included. Councillor Phillips then spoke on the proposed amendment and emphasised the following points:

- The construction of a Rotherwas access road had long been a priority for the Council and in 2003 planning permission for the road was agreed.
- There were no records of meetings between Cabinet Members and Bloor homes around the time in question as diary dates had not been kept. Electronic diaries are to be used in the future.
- No undue pressure was placed on Planning Officers and professional advice was noted. The decision to act against the advice was not taken lightly.
- In January 2006, Cabinet was surprised when the funding bid was declined for the third time by government.
- Land at Bullinghope was not included in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) at this stage.
- Businesses in Rotherwas are grateful for the relief road and its construction was a positive step for Herefordshire
- The decision to proceed with the road's construction was endorsed by Cabinet and all group leaders
- If the funding to secure the road was received as expected then the motion would not have been needed – the policy was sincere and based on information held at the time
- The UDP's existence will cease in 2010 unless the Council extends it.
- There was no debate at Council in July 2006 on the Cabinet report that said land for 16000 homes needed to be found in Herefordshire.
- Central Government expects section 106 agreements to be used for improvements to infrastructure, education provision and other related themes.
- The percentage of affordable homes in the UDP has been increased from 25 to 35%.
- A successful business park is central to the success of Herefordshire. It will attract well paid jobs, bring the younger generation back to live in Herefordshire and might go some way towards the creation of a university for Herefordshire.
- All information that the proposed enquiry aims to uncover is already available under freedom of information.

In response to a question from Councillor MAF Hubbard, the Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic advised Council that Councillor Phillips' amendment did not, under Standing Order 4.26.5.1, "negate" the meaning of the original motion as it was deleting words from the original motion.

Councillor PJ Edwards seconded the amendment to the motion and made the following points:

- The public were consulted over plans for a Rotherwas relief road but the consultation events were very poorly attended.
- Development companies meeting with local authorities to discuss proposals are common place – this has long been established practise and is in no way unethical.
- Councillors must always be seen to lead through the democratic process and this has been done in this instance.
- Believe valuable public money and officer time would be wasted if a full enquiry were to take place.
- The construction of the relief road has improved air quality for residents of Holme Lacy Road

Councillor WU Attfield spoke against the amendment to the motion and made the following points:

- The importance of holding an enquiry was not widely recognised.
- On arrival at the meeting of Council in July 2006, Members believed that land at Bullinghope would not be included in the UDP and Members were “bounced” into a debate which they were not prepared for.
- The trust in the senior hierarchy of the Council had been compromised and public faith in the Council would be difficult to restore. An enquiry would reassure the public that their grievances were being investigated

Councillor MD Lloyd-Hayes stated that at Council in July 2006, the Leader had proposed an amendment. Had it been a notice of motion the public would have been aware and been able to present their questions.

Councillor Toon concurred with Councillor Hubbard and stated the fundamental element of the motion was regarding the process.

Councillor Oliver spoke against the amendment proposed by Councillor Phillips and raised the following points:

- It was long established that the land at Bullinghope was unsuitable for housing and the UDP working group at its meeting in March 2003 endorsed this view
- When land at Holmer was deleted from the UDP, only limited housing should have been proposed to be built on the land at Bullinghope in exchange for funding for an access road to Rotherwas
- The planning enquiry saw the inspector delete the allocation of land at Bullinghope, as it would have been harmful to the area.

Councillor JG Jarvis spoke to formally second the amendment put forward by Councillor Phillips and made the following points:

- The decision making process of Cabinet has always been transparent – this is especially true now that full minutes are taken at its meetings
- The Local Development Framework (LDF) has just finished consulting the people of Hereford which has looked at the best way to allocate land in Herefordshire for housing and will shortly report to Members
- Time spent conducting an enquiry would be wasted and better spent focusing on ensuring success for the future of Herefordshire

Councillor GF Dawe spoke against the proposed amendment and highlighted that the recent High Court Case was lost, in part, by this Council and that crucial

evidence was not provided to the court in a timely manner.

Councillor KG Grumbley supported Councillor Phillips' amendment and said that an enquiry would not achieve anything. He pointed out that since 2003 things had been achieved and that the eventual access road was built without money from Bloor homes.

Councillor SJ Robertson said that she recognised Rotherwas was an important place for employment for 18-25 year olds living in Herefordshire but expressed disappointment that the land for 300 homes at Holmer was included in the UDP.

Councillor DB Wilcox spoke in favour of the amendment and said that people in Herefordshire were pleased with their new road as it was important for the rural economy. He added that only a small number of Councillors voted against the issue in 2006 and that the planning process introduced the concept of developers paying for infrastructure. He pointed out that the High Court judgment of Justice Collins conceded that the planning inspector did accept that a contribution from developers towards a road was justifiable. The decision to include land at Bullinghope in the UDP was endorsed by the Government Office for the West Midlands and this accordingly updated the Regional Spatial Strategy. He added that the Rotherwas improvement scheme was now fully on track and a public enquiry would not be beneficial.

Councillor A Seldon said that the fact the Council is assembled at an extraordinary meeting goes to prove that something went wrong and an enquiry is needed to establish what went wrong.

Councillor PM Morgan said that the cost of an enquiry would impede on any future work of the Council and have no benefits

Councillor JP French said that enquires could be time consuming and expensive. Decision making processes are more transparent than ever as minutes are now routinely taken at Cabinet meetings and available electronically.

Councillor French highlighted the fact that the Rotherwas road was the first piece of major infrastructure for Hereford since the 1960s. She added that we must learn the lessons the judge has stated, that we must put the case clearly.

Councillor Chappell spoke against the proposed amendment. He contended that Councillor Phillips' proposed amendment would stifle any debate and not lead to the truth being found out. He urged Members to vote against the proposed amendment.

A vote on the proposed amendment was then taken.

In accordance with Standing Order 4.15.4 a named vote was held and is attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes. The voting for the amendment was as follows:

For 35
Against 14
Abstentions 2

The amendment to the motion therefore became the substantive motion.

Councillor MAF Hubbard then proposed an amendment to the substantive motion:

Council instructs that the Group Leaders should arrange a special Scrutiny Committee chaired by the chair of the Standards Committee, Mr Robert

Rogers, to take evidence; call witnesses co-opt appropriate advisors and publish a report. This committee would make recommendations to ensure that any future infrastructure projects and housing proposals did not meet the same difficulties as Bullinghope and the Rotherwas Access Road.

Councillor Hubbard then spoke on the amendment to the substantive motion:

- The proposed scrutiny review would be more cost effective than a public enquiry.
- The Council should be concerned that the road was not being used to its full potential

Councillor MD Lloyd Hayes formally seconded the amendment to the substantive motion and a number of Members spoke in support of the amendment.

In accordance with Standing Order 4.15.4 a named vote was held and is attached at Appendix 2 to the minutes. The voting in support of the amendment to the substantive motion was as follows:

For 16

Against 32

Abstentions 3

The amendment to the substantive motion was lost.

5. HEREFORDSHIRE UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN: OUTCOME OF LEGAL CHALLENGE

The Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Democratic Services presented the report updating Council with the current legal position in respect of the recent High Court challenge to the Council resolution of 28 July 2006.

He said there remained an outstanding leave to appeal and that the Court of Appeal may overturn the ruling of Lord Justice Collins. He reiterated that the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted in 2006 and replaced the Local Development Framework (LDF). These changes were adopted by Council in July 2006. The UDP was judicially reviewed and heard in the High Court on 27 and 28 June 2008. Lord Justice Collins, in his judgement, said that land at Bullinghope should be deleted from the UDP. JS Bloor is appealing against the High Court ruling and Herefordshire Council has been served as an interested party in the case.

He pointed out that if the appeal is unsuccessful, the UDP would need to be modified to remove the Bullinghope land.

Councillor Phillips moved the recommendations of the report with Councillor Jarvis seconding the recommendations.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) Council note the outcome of the High Court decision which is the subject of appeal;**
- (ii) Council receive a further report from the Assistant Chief Executive – Legal and Democratic following the completion of legal proceedings; and**

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2008

- (iii) Council notes the proposed amendments to the Unitary Development Plan at this stage.**

The meeting ended at 1.30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

THE HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

MINUTE ITEM 4

NAMED VOTE LIST

Appendix 1

4 September 2008

Amended Motion from the Conservative Group, which became the Substantive Motion

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain	Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
PA Andrews				JA Hyde	x		
WU Attfield		x		TM James			
LO Barnett	x			JG Jarvis	x		
CM Bartrum				P Jones CBE	x		
DJ Benjamin		x		MD Lloyd-Hayes		x	
AJM Blackshaw	x			G Lucas	x		
WLS Bowen				RI Matthews	x		
H Bramer	x			R Mills	x		
ACR Chappell				PM Morgan	x		
ME Cooper	x			AT Oliver		x	
PGH Cutter	x			JE Pemberton	x		
SPA Daniels		x		RJ Phillips	x		
H Davies		x		GA Powell	x		
GFM Dawe		x		PD Price	x		
BA Durkin	x			SJ Robertson		x	
PJ Edwards	x			A Seldon		x	
MJ Fishley	x			RH Smith	x		
JP French	x			RV Stockton	x		
JHR Goodwin	x			J Stone	x		
AE Gray		x		JK Swinburne	x		
DW Greenow			x	AP Taylor			
KG Grumbley	x			DC Taylor	x		
KS Guthrie	x			AM Toon		x	
JW Hope MBE	x			NL Vaughan			x
MAF Hubbard		x		WJ Walling		x	
B Hunt	x			PJ Watts	x		
RC Hunt	x			DB Wilcox	x		
TW Hunt				JB Williams	x		
				JD Woodward		x	

TOTALS	FOR	35	AGAINST	14	ABSTAIN	2
---------------	------------	-----------	----------------	-----------	----------------	----------

THE HEREFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

NAMED VOTE LIST

Appendix 2

4 September 2008

Amendment to the Substantive Motion by Councillor Hubbard

Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	Councillor	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
PA Andrews				JA Hyde		x	
WU Attfield	x			TM James			
LO Barnett		x		JG Jarvis		x	
CM Bartrum				P Jones CBE		x	
DJ Benjamin	x			MD Lloyd-Hayes	x		
AJM Blackshaw		x		G Lucas		x	
WLS Bowen				RI Matthews	x		
H Bramer		x		R Mills		x	
ACR Chappell				PM Morgan		x	
ME Cooper		x		AT Oliver	x		
PGH Cutter		x		JE Pemberton		x	
SPA Daniels	x			RJ Phillips		x	
H Davies	x			GA Powell		x	
GFM Dawe	x			PD Price		x	
BA Durkin		x		SJ Robertson	x		
PJ Edwards			x	A Seldon	x		
MJ Fishley		x		RH Smith		x	
JP French		x		RV Stockton		x	
JHR Goodwin		x		J Stone		x	
AE Gray	x			JK Swinburne		x	
DW Greenow			x	AP Taylor			
KG Grumbley		x		DC Taylor		x	
KS Guthrie		x		AM Toon	x		
JW Hope MBE		x		NL Vaughan			x
MAF Hubbard	x			WJ Walling	x		
B Hunt	x			PJ Watts		x	
RC Hunt		x		DB Wilcox		x	
TW Hunt		x		JB Williams		x	
				JD Woodward	x		

TOTALS	FOR	16	AGAINST	32	ABSTAIN	3
---------------	------------	-----------	----------------	-----------	----------------	----------

