

MINUTES OF COUNCIL

23 SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT:

The Mayor (Councillor Sayani), Councillors Barnett, Brown, Daly, Downes, Dumbleton, C Edwards, Freeman, Garcia, Gillias, Glowacki, Harrington, Henderson, Howling, Karadiar, Kedward, McKenzie, I Mistry, New, O'Rourke, Pimm, Poole, Pullin, Robinson, Russell, Sandison, Simpson-Vince, Stewart, Thomas, Thompson, Trimble, Timms, Ward and Willis.

31. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillors Bainbridge, Davis, S Edwards, Hassell, D Keeling, J Keeling, U Mistry and Roodhouse.

32. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2026 were approved and signed by the Mayor.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Item 8(a) of Part 1 – Notice of motion – Councillors Daly, Simpson-Vince and Stewart (other registrable interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors by virtue of being a resident of Houlton.)

Item 8(a) of Part 1 – Notice of motion – Councillors Kedward and Russell (non-registrable interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors by virtue of being Ward Councillors for Houlton.)

34. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor had been honoured to speak at Keble College, Oxford University, on 17 September.

The invitation highlighted the potential of Rugby to influence and promote exemplary leadership and governance, while driving forward values, ethics, responsibility, partnerships and social cohesion. The Mayor was particularly delighted to see Rugby recognised in this way, not just what happens in the field, but for its civil society, values and ethics, which have endured over many generations.

The Mayor had been delighted to be asked to speak on her mayoral theme: Pluralism the 4Cs - Community, compassion, cohesion and conscience. This theme has provided a strong platform for partnership work and for bringing to the fore Rugby's remarkable and distinguished civic story, its inclusive history, heritage and enduring ability to bring people and communities together, through shared values, meaningful partnerships connecting the past present and future.

The Mayor considered this recognition reinforces the belief that Rugby can provide a powerful blueprint for ethical leadership and partnership building, in these challenging times.

This story is particularly meaningful, the powerful connection between Rugby school and Oxford University, alongside the wider civic and historical links represented through HMS Keppel and our motto “Floreat Rugbeia” translated in Latin means, “May Rugby Flourish” .19th Century, Headmaster of Rugby School Dr Thomas Arnold believed that in order for a community to flourish it must nurture values and collective conscience, through leadership, civil society, these ideas went on to permeate the British Education system. These connections illustrate how leadership, teamwork, partnerships flourished, beyond the school gates. The ethos of this period was also reflected in William Butterfield’s architecture, including Rugby School, St Andrews. Later he went on to design Keble College Oxford University. These ideals, values, collective conscience, align with my theme.

The Mayor considered it was a proud moment to see the values embedded within Rugby being recognised on such a significant international platform. The sport of rugby is a natural platform for her mayoral theme, demonstrating values of teamwork, respect, solidarity and shared responsibility. The Council’s motto and the Rugby school anthem “Floreat Rugbeia” is a poignant reminder of the spirit of Rugby, may it endure and enable others to flourish.

The Mayor was proud of Rugby, a town blessed with values and good judgement. She stated that, in these challenging times and rapid advances in AI, the borough would need critical thinkers, cutting edge ideas, new ways of working together and the Council motto and history, shows the way to lasting peace and prosperity. Rugby has a unique independent identity and formula. In the spirit of our town, “Floreat Rugbeia”, may Rugby flourish and go on to share its monumental message, so other towns may follow.

35. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 10

(a) Councillor Glowacki asked the Partnerships, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder, Councillor O’Rourke, the following question:

“At the Council meeting of 22 July 2026, it was stated that footfall in Rugby town centre had increased by approximately 50,000 over the preceding two years. Could the Portfolio Holder please provide the source and methodology for this figure, including the period over which the increase was measured, the comparison period used, the locations from which the footfall data were collected, and whether the figure represents individual visitors or recorded pedestrian movements?”

Councillor O’Rourke, Partnerships, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"The data regarding footfall for the Council report on 22 July 2026 related directly to the service users of the Art Gallery and Museum in way of introducing the proposed redevelopment scheme.

I was pleased to meet Councillor Glowacki at the Art Gallery and Museum after accepting my invitation to tour the building and see first-hand what it is delivering in our town centre.

To confirm, the services front of house team use physical clickers for recording visitors, enabling accurate collection of data. The data also captures wider engagement such as school assemblies, care home visits and other community-based programmes.

Reported key performance indicators for previous financial years is provided below for all Councillors to have sight of the performance of the council's service."

Year	Service users
2021/22	28,736
2022/23	58,736
2023/24	74,319
2024/25	81,727
2025/26	88,394

Councillor Glowacki then asked the Portfolio Holder, with regard to the increase in footfall over the last two years, what is the source of the data, how was it obtained, during which period, how was it obtained, which streets it relates to and how is it transferable to the overall year and is it reviewed.

The Portfolio Holder responded that the figures cited at the last Full Council meeting were figures that are used from Rugby Art Gallery and Museum. Councillor Glowacki had been provided with a full and detailed response on how the data is collected. The Portfolio Holder stated that if Councillor Glowacki required further information on the wider town centre, this was not within her portfolio.

(b) Councillor Kedward asked the Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, Councillor McKenzie, the following question:

"What was the total cost to the public purse of commissioning TTC and CBRE to produce the 2025 Car Parking Strategy?"

Councillor McKenzie, Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"The Rugby Regeneration Strategy, adopted in December 2022 under the Conservative administration, recommended the commissioning of a Car Parking Study to enable further development of sites for regeneration within the town centre.

Following consideration by the cross-party Town Centre Regeneration Working Group a Car Parking Strategy was commissioned in August 2024 as there was no internal resource with the expertise to carry out the work. The purpose of the study was to provide further background evidence regarding existing and future demand in the town centre for car parking. This strategy was also used as background evidence in the production of the Local Plan which proposes additional residential units in the town centre although not on the scale promoted in the Rugby Regeneration Strategy.

Town Centre Regeneration Working Group was consulted on a number of occasions regarding the production of the strategy including the original brief for the commission.

The costs of producing the evidence based document have previously been reported to Council on the 23rd April 2025 and as part of the bi-annual reporting and also more recently to Cabinet on the 8th September 2026, it also appears elsewhere on this agenda. The total cost was £65,280."

(c) Councillor Ward asked the Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, Councillor McKenzie:

"The 2025 Rugby Town Centre Car Parking Strategy is referenced within the Town Centre Masterplan. Can the Portfolio Holder explain why this strategy has not been brought before Cabinet or Scrutiny for consideration?"

Councillor McKenzie, Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"As a member of the Town Centre Working Group Cllr Ward will know that the Car Parking Strategy is an evidence base document produced to inform the Submission Local Plan and Rugby Town Centre Delivery Plan.

The Car Parking Strategy was commissioned to understand the current car park capacity within Rugby town centre including Rugby Borough Council's car parks, private car parks such as Asda and Rugby Central and Warwickshire County Council on street parking. The study also looked at what future capacity requirements were with the projected Local Plan growth.

There is no constitutional or legal requirement for evidence based documents to be brought to Cabinet or Council as they are not decision making documentation."

(d) Councillor Poole asked the Communities, Housing and Safety Portfolio Holder, Councillor C Edwards, the following question:

At Cabinet on the 3rd August 2026 the Portfolio Holder stated," We're still working on a new car parking strategy.

When does the Council expect this strategy to be published?

What has been the cost producing to date?

Why was it considered necessary to develop a further strategy alongside the current 2025 Car Parking Strategy?"

Councillor C Edwards, Communities, Housing and Safety Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"At Cabinet on the 3rd August, Cllr McKenzie the Portfolio Holder for Growth and Investment talked about ongoing work in the town centre relating to parking.

When Cllr McKenzie referred to working on a car parking strategy she was referring to the current review of car parking in relation to the Notice of Motion by Council in June.

*The Notice of Motion agreed by Council "notes that this work is currently underway and will report within approximately six months to Cabinet to inform the Council's budget-setting process for 2027/28, considering the available evidence, financial implications, operational requirements and best value options for supporting Rugby town centre, including the consideration of an appropriate element of parking without fees, alongside any other measures identified through the review;
It also requested that Cabinet considers the outcome of the review and any recommendations arising and that any resulting matters requiring approval of Full Council, in particular changes to the budget or policy framework be brought to Full Council for decision".*

This is the car parking review that is underway and the work is being undertaken by officers."

Councillor Poole then asked the Portfolio Holder if she had been involved in the last two years in producing the 2025 or 2026 car parking strategy. Councillor C Edwards responded that car parking had been part of her portfolio since taking on the role. She stated that work was continuing on car parking to improve it within the town. Councillor Edwards added that it was the administration's intention to work with members of the Town Centre Regeneration Working Group to look at improvements to car parking in the town centre in detail. Whilst there are papers informing that, there is no agreed strategy currently that she is aware of. Councillor Edwards stated that Councillor Poole would see all papers relating to this as a member of that Working Group. A commitment was made at a previous Council meeting to bring the proposals back to Members within six months.

Councillor Poole then asked if an urgent meeting could be held between himself, the Chief Executive, the Monitoring Officer, the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder on this matter. The Mayor confirmed that this request had been duly noted.

(e) Councillor Timms asked the Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, Councillor McKenzie, the following question:

"Have the neighbouring landowners around North Street Car Park been consulted on the proposals to remove parking spaces to create the new walkway and does the Council have an estimate of how many spaces will be lost as a result, along with a total budgeted cost (including internal staffing costs) implementing the proposal?"

Councillor McKenzie, Growth and Investment Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"It is understood that Councillor Timms is referring to the Town Centre Regeneration Delivery Plan that was approved by Cabinet on the 3rd August, referred to Scrutiny on the 17th September and the subject of an All Member briefing on the 21st September.

As set out in the Cabinet Report at paragraph 1.2

"The Delivery Plan sets out a 10-year programme to revitalise Rugby town centre and support delivery of the Rugby Town Centre Vision 2035. It identifies the spatial priorities, sequencing, delivery requirements and partnership approach needed to bring forward a coordinated programme of regeneration activity."

Further explanation of the purpose of the document is found at paragraphs 1.8 and 1.9.

The Delivery Plan is not, in itself, a commitment to spend. It provides a framework to guide future feasibility work, business case development, funding bids, land assembly, procurement and delivery decisions. Individual projects will be subject to further approvals through the Council's normal governance and budget processes."

Councillor Timms then asked the Portfolio Holder if any consultation had taken place with landowners, as this has not been addressed in the response she had received to her question. Councillor McKenzie stated that no consultation was needed at this stage as the delivery plan was a conceptual idea. All consultation processes would come forward as part of each phase of the delivery plan.

(f) Councillor Garcia asked the Environment and Climate Portfolio Holder, Councillor S Edwards, the following question:

"What is the Council's current level of resourcing for fly-tipping removal in rural areas, and what action is being taken to address any backlog?"

Councillor S Edwards, Environment and Climate Portfolio Holder, provided the following response:

"There are currently two full-time operatives dedicated to fly-tip removal across the whole of the borough. These resources deal with reports from all areas, including both rural locations and the town centre, and there has been no transfer of resources from rural areas to prioritise the town centre. The same teams respond to fly-tipping across the borough as a whole, prioritising jobs according to a range of factors, including the nature of the waste and any risks associated with it.

It is also important to note that the Council does not collect fly-tipped waste from private land; responsibility for this generally rests with the landowner, unless specific circumstances require Council or other statutory intervention.

In addition, not all fly-tips can be treated as routine waste. Where a fly-tip contains hazardous material such as asbestos, our standard operatives cannot safely remove it, and an appropriately qualified external specialist must be commissioned instead. This can extend the time taken to resolve an incident.

On the regulatory side, officers investigate fly-tipping incidents with a view to identifying and taking action against those responsible, rather than treating each incident purely as a clean-up cost. Where waste is dumped in a way that allows the source to be traced, for example correspondence, invoices or other identifying material found within the waste itself, or where a vehicle is seen or recorded depositing waste, officers pursue that evidence to identify the person or business responsible. The law also assists here: under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the owner or registered keeper of a vehicle used to deposit waste can be treated as having caused the deposit unless they can show otherwise, so investigations do not always depend on identifying who was driving at the time.

Where a person or business is identified as responsible, the Council has a range of enforcement options available, from a Fixed Penalty Notice through to prosecution in the more serious cases, and the power, on conviction, to seize and forfeit vehicles used to commit the offence. Officers also enforce the separate duty of care that applies to anyone who produces, carries or disposes of waste, including checking that businesses and waste carriers are properly licensed and issuing the required documentation when waste changes hands. In practice, a significant proportion of fly-tipping originates from unlicensed operators who have been paid to remove waste but have no lawful means of disposing of it, so enforcement action against that end of the chain, not just against the site where waste is found, is an important part of addressing the problem at its source.

To help minimise recurrence, officers are also working on preventative measures that do not rely on enforcement alone. This includes proactive engagement with residents and waste carriers, reminding people of their duty to check a carrier's licence and obtain a waste transfer note before paying for waste removal, and a programme of commercial waste checks to confirm that local businesses have adequate and lawful waste arrangements in place. A borough-wide notice under section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, specifying how household waste should be presented for collection, has now been developed and is being published, which will support consistent collection and enforcement standards across the borough.

We fully recognise the impact that persistent fly-tipping has on communities and the importance of removing it, and addressing its source, as effectively as possible. The Council is developing a Fly-Tipping Strategy and Action Plan and a dedicated Fly-Tipping Enforcement Policy, both due to come before Cabinet shortly, which will bring forward a fuller, borough-wide approach informed by the operational and enforcement experience set out above. In the meantime, we will continue to make the best use of available resources, and to ensure that incidents requiring specialist intervention are dealt with through the appropriate channels."

Councillor Garcia asked for reassurance that resources were not being moved from the rural area to support the town centre. The Leader of the Council, in the absence of the Portfolio Holder, stated that a written response would be provided once the Portfolio Holder was available.

36. REPORT OF CABINET – 8 SEPTEMBER 2026

Council considered the report of Cabinet of 8 September 2026 which contained two reports.

During debate on item 1 (Wayfinding project), following comments made by councillors towards each other, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for a short period.

Following the reconvening of the meeting, the Mayor informed the meeting that it was unacceptable for Members to imply that other members are being untruthful. Members were reminded that it is incumbent on them to behave to the highest of standards in meetings which are webstreamed. The Mayor trusted that she would not have to repeat this message.

Further to debate on both agenda items from Cabinet, Members requested that separate votes be taken on each item. A councillor also requested that the number of votes made on each item be recorded in the minutes.

(a) Town Centre Wayfinding Project:

Recommendation:

(1) A supplementary General Fund budget of £0.120m (revenue) be approved to fund a new wayfinding system, to be financed from the Town Centre Strategy Reserve; and

(2) a supplementary General Fund budget of £0.275m (capital) be approved and added to the capital programme for 2026/27 to fund a new wayfinding system, to be financed from the Town Centre Strategy Reserve.

Votes cast:

For the recommendation – 19 votes
Against the recommendation - 15 votes
Abstentions from voting – 0 votes

The Mayor declared the motion carried.

(b) Town Centre Regeneration update

Recommendation:

The Town Centre Regeneration update report be noted.

Votes cast:

For the recommendation – 31 votes
Against the recommendation - 0 votes
Abstentions from voting – 3 votes

The Mayor declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED THAT –

- (1) a supplementary General Fund budget of £0.120m (revenue) be approved to fund a new wayfinding system, to be financed from the Town Centre Strategy Reserve;
- (2) a supplementary General Fund budget of £0.275m (capital) be approved and added to the capital programme for 2026/27 to fund a new wayfinding system, to be financed from the Town Centre Strategy Reserve; and
- (3) the Town Centre Regeneration update report be noted.

37. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

(a) Constitutional Amendments – Governance, Procedure and Senior Officer Structure

Council considered the report of the Monitoring Officer (Part 1 - agenda item 7(a)) concerning a tranche of constitutional amendments concerning governance, meeting procedure, delegations and the audit function; and to note the amendments made, or to be made, by the Monitoring Officer under his own delegated authority under Article 15.2(a), including those reflecting the senior officer structure adopted by the Council on 1 March 2026.

RESOLVED THAT -

Full Council:

- (1) approves the transfer of the function of granting Members' dispensations under section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 from the Dispensation Sub-Committee to the Monitoring Officer, with the Sub-Committee retained as the route where the Monitoring Officer has a conflict of interest, together with the consequential amendment to the Members' Code of Conduct, paragraph 5.3 (item A1);
- (2) approves a new Standing Order 3(e) limiting the business of an extraordinary meeting to the matter(s) specified in the summons (item A2);
- (3) approves a new proviso to Standing Order 6 permitting the proper officer to convene a meeting on shorter notice where business is of special urgency, consistent with Schedule 12 to the Local Government Act 1972 and, for executive business, the Access to Information Rules (item A3);
- (4) approves replacement of the Standing Order 4.4 mechanism for permanent, within-group, balance-neutral committee-membership substitutions with a group-leader notification to the proper officer, reported to Council for information, any change engaging political balance under sections 15–16 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 remaining a decision of Full Council (item A4);

- (5) approves a new Standing Order authorising the cancellation or rescheduling of a meeting before the agenda is published, and postponement (with business held over to a properly-noticed reconvened meeting) after the agenda is published, in exceptional circumstances (item A5); and
- (6) notes the amendments made, or to be made, by the Monitoring Officer under his own delegated authority under Article 15.2(a) of the Constitution, as set out in Section C, comprising:
 - (a) Legislative Changes under Article 15.2(a)(i): the correction of Standing Order 20.1 and the Standing Order 23 application table to apply the disclosable-pecuniary-interest withdrawal duty universally (section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011); the correction of Rule 15(e) from three to five clear days and consequential review of Rule 13(b) (the 2012 Regulations); and the amendment of the Audit and Ethics Committee's functions in Part 2A to meet the functions required by section 94 of the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026; and
 - (b) Minor Changes under Article 15.2(a)(ii): the routing of public questions to Democratic Services / the proper officer; and the amendments giving effect to the senior officer structure adopted on 1 March 2026 (deputisation; the Leadership Team and appointments; operational delegations; the Chief Officer definition; the Part 6A management structure; and consequential terminology and cross-references), the draft wording for which is set out at Appendix 2.

(b) Amendments to the Constitution to Give Effect to the National Scheme of Delegation for Planning

Council considered the report of the Monitoring Officer (Part 1 - agenda item 7(b)) concerning two matters which the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 (SI 2026/854) reserve to the Council (the size of the Planning Committee and the categories of application considered for referral against the Gateway Test) and the noting of the consequential amendments to Parts 2A, 2B and 4B of the Constitution made by the Monitoring Officer under his own authority under Article 15.2(a) to give effect to the national scheme of delegation for planning from 31 October 2026.

RESOLVED THAT - Full Council:

- (1) approves the retention of the Planning Committee at 12 members, within the statutory maximum of 13 set by the Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026 (Council may instead resolve a different number, up to that maximum);
- (2) approves the scheme for referral set out in Appendix B, namely that Schedule 2 applications, where applicable as set out in Part 2B Section 5.2.4, are considered by the nominated officer and nominated member against the Gateway Test for possible referral to the Planning

Committee, all other applications being determined by officers, and that a record of the cases considered, the outcome and the reasons is kept and reported to the Planning Committee;

- (3) notes that the amendments to Parts 2A, 2B and 4B required to give effect to the national scheme of delegation (Appendices A to C) are made by the Monitoring Officer under his own authority under Article 15.2(a)(i) of the Constitution (Legislative Changes); that the Monitoring Officer will incorporate the Council's decisions at recommendations 1 and 2 under Article 15.2(a)(ii) (Minor Changes); and that both take effect from 31 October 2026 and will be reported to the next meeting of Full Council;
- (4) notes the change to the role of ward members described in this report, and the arrangements made for the All-Member Briefing on 21 September 2026 to explain it to all Members; and
- (5) delegates to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the appropriate Strategic Director or Chief Planning Officer, authority to make any further consequential amendments to the Constitution required to keep it aligned with the national scheme of delegation and any successor regulations or guidance.

(c) Officer Briefings for Non-Cabinet Members of a Coalition Partner Group: Amendment to Part 4D (Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations)

Council considered the report of the Monitoring Officer (Part 1 - agenda item 7(c)) concerning a proposal for a non-Cabinet Member of a coalition partner group to receive officer briefings on a portfolio matter comparable to that given to a Cabinet Member, following a request from the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council, by approving a new paragraph 4.3 of Part 4D of the Constitution operating as an express exception to the individual equal-treatment principle in paragraph 2.4.

RESOLVED THAT - Full Council:

- (1) approves Option A: a new Part 4D, paragraph 4.3, permitting the Leader of the Council and the Leader of a formally recognised coalition partner group jointly to nominate, in writing to the Monitoring Officer, a named non-Cabinet Member of that group to receive a briefing on a specified portfolio matter which may, unlike a paragraph 4.1 briefing, include the officer's professional recommendation, subject to the safeguards at Appendix A; the new paragraph 4.3 to operate as an express exception to the individual equal-treatment principle in the first sentence of paragraph 2.4, to which it cross-refers;
- (2) confirms the authorisation route at paragraph 4.3(a) (joint written nomination by the Leader of the Council and the coalition partner's Leader); and
- (3) confirms the definition of "coalition partner group" at paragraph 4.3(a) (a written coalition agreement lodged with the Monitoring Officer).

(d) Decision taken in exceptional circumstances

Council considered the report of the Monitoring Officer (Part 1 - agenda item 7(d)) concerning an urgent executive decision taken by Cabinet on 3 August 2026 concerning the response to MHCLG on warding arrangements, the nomination of the Council's two representatives to the North Warwickshire Joint Committee, and the Section 31 grant recipient, certified urgent and exempt from call-in under Standing Order 14.9.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

38. NOTICES OF MOTION PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 11

A notice of motion, proposed by Councillor Kedward and seconded by Councillor Daly, had been submitted pursuant to Standing Order 11 as detailed below:

“This Council notes that:

- Houlton is one of the largest and fastest-growing residential developments in the Borough, with thousands of residents already living in the community and further homes continuing to be occupied.
- Access to primary healthcare infrastructure has not kept pace with population growth, resulting in many Houlton residents travelling considerable distances to access GP services.
- A community petition has demonstrated significant public support for the earlier delivery of a permanent GP surgery within Houlton. The petition, together with supporting analysis, shows that 293 residents have signed in support and that residents travel an average of 5 miles to reach their registered GP practice.
- Land has been identified within Houlton for the future provision of a GP surgery. However, delivery of the land for the proposed GP surgery is currently linked to trigger points contained within the Section 106 Agreement.
- Residents deserve clarity regarding when this essential healthcare infrastructure will be delivered and what actions are being taken by all relevant organisations to meet the healthcare needs of the growing community.

This Council believes that:

- Essential community infrastructure, including primary healthcare, should be delivered alongside housing growth wherever possible.
- The evidence gathered through the community petition demonstrates a clear and growing demand for local GP provision within Houlton.
- Rugby Borough Council has an important role in representing residents' interests by bringing together partners, advocating for earlier delivery where appropriate, and seeking greater transparency regarding future healthcare provision.

Accordingly, this Council resolves to:

- (1) formally receive the Houlton GP Surgery Petition and accompanying evidence as a representation of significant community concern regarding access to primary healthcare;
- (2) write, in the name of the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition, to Urban&Civic requesting that Urban&Civic works with Rugby Borough Council and the Coventry and Warwickshire Integrated Care Board to explore whether the land identified for the Houlton GP surgery can be released earlier than currently provided for within the Section 106 Agreement, should all parties consider this feasible;
- (3) write, in the name of the Leader of the Council, and the Leader of the Opposition to the Coventry and Warwickshire Integrated Care Board requesting:
 - a. an update on the current status of proposals for the Houlton GP surgery;
 - b. confirmation of the anticipated timetable for commissioning, construction and opening of the facility;
 - c. details of any funding, workforce, contractual or other barriers preventing earlier delivery; and
 - d. consideration of whether the timetable for delivery can be accelerated in light of the evidence presented through the community petition and the continued growth of Houlton;
- (4) request that Cabinet, through the appropriate Portfolio Holder, instructs relevant officers to facilitate discussions between Rugby Borough Council, Urban&Civic, the Coventry and Warwickshire Integrated Care Board and other appropriate NHS partners to explore all practical opportunities to accelerate the delivery of a permanent GP surgery for Houlton residents; and
- (5) request that the Leader of the Council arranges for a written progress update to be provided to all Members within six months of this motion being approved."

The Mayor informed the meeting that an amendment, proposed by Councillor O'Rourke and seconded by Councillor McKenzie, had been submitted as detailed below:

"This Council notes that:

- Houlton is one of the largest and fastest-growing residential developments in the Borough, with thousands of residents already living in the community and further homes continuing to be occupied.
- Access to primary healthcare infrastructure has not kept pace with population growth, resulting in many Houlton residents travelling considerable distances to access GP services.
- A community petition has demonstrated significant public support for the earlier delivery of a permanent GP surgery within Houlton. The petition, together with supporting analysis, shows that 293 residents have signed in support and that residents travel an average of 5 miles to reach their registered GP practice.
- Land has been identified within Houlton for the future provision of a GP surgery. However, delivery of the land for the proposed GP surgery is currently linked to trigger points contained within the Section 106 Agreement.

- Residents deserve clarity regarding when this essential healthcare infrastructure will be delivered and what actions are being taken by all relevant organisations to meet the healthcare needs of the growing community.

This Council believes that:

- Essential community infrastructure, including primary healthcare, should be delivered alongside housing growth wherever possible.
- The evidence gathered through the community petition demonstrates a clear and growing demand for local GP provision within Houlton

Rugby Borough Council has an important role in representing residents' interests by bringing together partners, advocating for earlier delivery where appropriate, and seeking greater transparency regarding future healthcare provision.

This Council recognises that there have already been substantial discussions between this Council and Urban&Civic regarding the land for the Houlton GP surgery. The Council also recognises the significant discussions which have occurred between officers, Rugby Place and the Coventry & Warwickshire Integrated Care Board regarding GP facilities across the Borough, not just at Houlton.

Accordingly, this Council resolves to:

- (1) formally receive the Houlton GP Surgery Petition and accompanying evidence, and submit it to the Coventry & Warwickshire Integrated Care Board, as a representation of significant community concern regarding access to primary healthcare;
- (2) write, in the name of the Leaders of all Parties to the Coventry and Warwickshire Integrated Care Board requesting:
 - a. an update on the current status of proposals for the Houlton GP surgery;
 - b. confirmation of the anticipated timetable for commissioning, construction and opening of the facility;
 - c. details of any barriers preventing earlier delivery; and
 - d. consideration of whether the timetable for delivery can be accelerated in light of the evidence presented through the community petition and the continued growth of Houlton;
- (3) request that the Leader of the Council in conjunction with the relevant portfolio Holders arranges for a written progress update to be provided to all Members within six months of this motion being approved; and
- (4) that the Chief Executive arranges for all Members to receive a briefing from the Integrated Care Board on primary and urgent care provision across the Borough."

Councillor Kedward, as proposer of the original motion, confirmed she was happy to accept the friendly amendment. The amendment then became the substantive motion which was proposed by Councillor Kedward and seconded by Councillor Daly.

Further to debate, the Mayor put the substantive motion to the vote and declared it carried.

RESOLVED THAT – Council:

(1) formally receives the Houlton GP Surgery Petition and accompanying evidence, and submit it to the Coventry & Warwickshire Integrated Care Board, as a representation of significant community concern regarding access to primary healthcare;

(2) writes, in the name of the Leaders of all Parties to the Coventry and Warwickshire Integrated Care Board requesting:

- a. an update on the current status of proposals for the Houlton GP surgery;
- b. confirmation of the anticipated timetable for commissioning, construction and opening of the facility;
- c. details of any barriers preventing earlier delivery; and
- d. consideration of whether the timetable for delivery can be accelerated in light of the evidence presented through the community petition and the continued growth of Houlton;

(3) requests that the Leader of the Council in conjunction with the relevant portfolio Holders arranges for a written progress update to be provided to all Members within six months of this motion being approved; and

(4) requests that the Chief Executive arranges for all Members to receive a briefing from the Integrated Care Board on primary and urgent care provision across the Borough.

39. MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC UNDER SECTION 100(A)(4) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

RESOLVED THAT - under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of information defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act and in all the circumstances of the item, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

40. PRIVATE REPORT OF OFFICERS

(a) Decision taken in exceptional circumstances

Council considered the report of the Monitoring Officer (Part 2 - agenda item 1(a)) concerning decisions taken in exceptional circumstances.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

MAYOR