



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

3 MARCH 2020

AGENDA ITEM (12)

QUARTERLY DIGEST

INDEX

Item	Subject
(1)	Joint Scrutiny Etc. Meetings/Oral Updates as appropriate
(i)	Gloucestershire County Council Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee – Minutes of 20 November 2019 (attached).
(ii)	Gloucestershire County Council Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Minutes of Meeting held on 14 January 2020 (attached).
(iii)	Gloucestershire County Council Police and Crime Panel - Minutes of Meeting held on 3 February 2020 (attached).
(2)	Forward Plan – February 2020 Update

Notes:

- (i) The items contained within this Quarterly Digest are not for formal debate by the Committee, and do not appear as stand-alone agenda items.
- (ii) Members are invited to identify any issue(s) arising out of the information provided within this Digest for future debate and/or action by the Committee.
- (iii) If Members have any questions on the detail of any of the information provided within this Digest, they should address such questions to the accountable Member and/or Officer concerned, for a reply outside the formal Meeting.

(END)

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 20 November 2019 at the Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Brian Robinson	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Kevin Cromwell (Chairman)	Cllr Sajid Patel
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr John Murphy
Cllr Ben Evans	Cllr Gina Blomefield
Cllr Kate Haigh (Vice- Chairman)	

Substitutes: Cllr Thom Forester

Officers in attendance: Mike Dawson, Claire Edwards, Sophie Benfield, Simon Excell, Angela Presdee and Mally Findlater

Apologies: Cllr Nicky Packer, Cllr Jim Dewey, David Owen, Pete Carr and Colin Chick

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on both 4 September 2019 and 18 September 2019 were approved and signed by the Chair.

8. WORK PLAN

- 8.1 The Chair requested, inline with the Council's recent Scrutiny Review, that the work plan item to be considered first going forward.
- 8.2 Members confirmed the items as previously planned for the first two meetings in 2020.
- 8.3 On requesting any further items for considered, a member questioned whether there would be a second scrutiny item on the Local Transport Plan post its public consultation. Officers advised they were due to take an update to Cabinet on 20th December which they will share with this Committee. If there are significant questions after this, a further item can be considered.

ACTION: SIMON EXCELL

5. MOBILE CONNECTIVITY

- 5.1 The Chair requested to take item 5 first and invited Hamish Macleod, Director of Mobile UK, to present this item covering the 5G and 4G programmes and what localities can do to support the mobile network. Mobile UK is the trade association for 4 of the UK's mobile network operators - EE, O2, Three and Vodafone.

5G

- 5.2 The Committee heard that there are currently 90 million mobile connections in the UK and following the launch of 4G in 2012, 90% of the traffic on the network was now data as opposed to voice.
- 5.3 Referencing the topic of health issues relating to 5G, Members were shown a picture of an Electro Magnetic Spectrum which highlighted the difference in frequency of mobile phone signals compared to visible light.
- 5.4 It was advised that mobile frequencies were governed by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Guidelines which provided scientific advice and guidance for the design and use of mobile phone masts and Wi-Fi, for example.
- 5.5 These guidelines were currently going through a refresh process with a new version due in 2020.
- 5.6 Members were shown a screenshot images from a BBC news channel programme 'Click' which looked into the health effects of 5G. Slides 4 and 5 showed two different frequency readings at a 30cm distance to a 3m distance away from the transmitter. The probe showed a significant drop in frequency levels from 551.6% to 6.23% the further away the probe was from the transmitter. A further decrease was shown in slide 6.
- 5.7 It was informed that the 5G connection had much higher data rates and capacity on the network, which had been struggling since the significant increase in traffic from 2012. It also had Lower Latency (reaction times), which could support specialised and mission critical applications and would have a significant innovative impact.
- 5.8 Members heard that West Midlands ambulance have already installed 5G in their vehicles allowing doctors to already begin treatment on patients on their way to hospital.
- 5.9 The Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport set up a number of 'Testbeds' in 2017 in a range of geographic areas to explore the benefits and challenges of deploying 5G. Linking to Gloucestershire, it was reassured that a number of these 'Testbeds' were in rural areas.

4G

- 5.10 As previously noted, 4G was still being rolled out in some areas. The Committee heard that in October, a joint enterprise was announced with the Government called the Shared Rural Network (SRN). This made £1 billion available to address issues faced in rural areas by poor mobile phone coverage.
- 5.11 It was expected to bring a significant improvement of 4G access and take coverage of all 4 providers (o2, Three, EE and Vodafone) to 95% by 2025. This would be achieved by opening up and sharing existing masts and infrastructure between the providers.
- 5.12 It was explained that all parties reacted well to the announcement and it on track to be up and running post the 2019 general election.

Local authority support

- 5.13 Members heard that the best way for local authorities to help with the development of successful mobile networks is to show it as a significant importance in policy, assets and planning.
- 5.14 In 2015, the electronics communication code was reformed to allow mobile phone operators an equal footing with power/water companies on installing and maintaining apparatus on public and private land. Operators currently spend about £300 million per year on site rent.
- 5.15 It was therefore important that all sectors within local authorities e.g. economic growth/property services provide access to their sites at 'code value'.
- 5.16 Members were advised that planning applications were often more difficult for mobile phone infrastructure, there had been a request made to Government by the industry to relook at the planning legislation as it was currently easier to build new than enhance existing.

Member questions

- 5.17 A member questions the timescale for the 5G roll out. It was advised that the 4G and 5G roll out was happening in tandem. Where the 4G was already available, the 5G upgrade would be overlaid on the existing infrastructure. As 5G technology had yet to be certified by Ofcom, the timescale for wider roll out of investment across the UK was dependent on this and also on an area's existing connectivity.
- 5.18 It was highlighted that where it stated 95% coverage on 5G, it tended to be that the remaining 5% was concentrated in one particular area. This was something the rural areas in Gloucestershire have experienced with digital connectivity. The Committee requested that Mobile UK fed back coverage

data for Gloucestershire. This information would be provided by Mobile UK when available.

ACTION MOBILE UK/ANGELA PRESDEE

- 5.19 Comparing the difference between fibre and 5G, members were advised that due to its reliance on radio frequency, 5G does have restricted capacity where as fibre doesn't. It was informed however that 5G would still have its place and was a viable alternative for areas who struggle to access a fibre connection. This was questioned by a member who explained that the 5G network uses fibre optic cables for data-transfer - and therefore, 5G could offer no improvements in terms of speed, over what was provided by direct fibre.
- 5.20 A member noted that there were still some areas that struggle to get 3G coverage or any service at all. It was advised that sometimes it was capacity issues rather than coverage but this was something the SRN would address.
- 5.21 It was advised that the Government's previous mobile network coverage scheme launched in 2011 (the Mobile Infrastructure Project) only pledged £150 million, as the SRN would have £1 billion, providers were confident there would be a significant improvement for these areas.
- 5.22 A member questioned whether the upgrade to 5G would have an effect on the energy demand on the system, and whether this was moving network providers in the right direction in terms of carbon neutrality. The Mobile UK representative agreed to provide a response to the Committee.

ACTION MOBILE UK/ANGELA PRESDEE

- 5.23 A member questioned what the envisaged timeline was for 6G becoming available. The Committee were informed that it is currently not confirmed whether 6G would be developed or whether there would just be continual evolution of 5G versions.
- 5.24 A member raised a concern about statements made regarding the health effects of 5G stating that the current ICNIRP guidelines relied on by Public Health were at present subject to scrutiny by scientists, academics and medical professionals. A member said that the safety guidelines were based primarily on research conducted in the late 1990's and were determined solely on the ability of electromagnetic radiation to directly heat flesh, whereas there was now evidence which showed biological and health impacts at non-thermal levels as well.
- 5.25 In addition, a member highlighted that where 4G used a form of electromagnetic radiation, power levels would drop off exponentially the further it travelled away from the source, 5G transmitters however, used a 'phased array' antenna allowing a far greater power-level to be transferred over a distance.

- 5.26 It was suggested that the scrutiny committee seek independent scientific and medical advice on this issue, and not rely solely on industry representations, making reference to the earlier discussions within the Joint Committee regarding a co-dependent relationship between public health and economic growth. The Chair advised that looking at the health implications of 5G would not be within this Scrutiny Committees remit.

4. GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH JOINT COMMITTEE (GEGJC) UPDATE

- 4.1 The Chair invited Cllr Patrick Molyneux as Chair of the Joint Economic Growth Committee to give members an update on the mornings meeting.

(Papers for the meeting can be viewed at the following link:

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=725&MId=9096&Ver=4>)

- 4.2 For the meetings first section, the Committee heard a summary of four presentations that were received as follows:

Fastershire Broadband Programme

- The Joint Committee had received an update on the programme delivery to date, and were advised that a revision of the current strategy to 2022 would be brought to Cabinet in December for approval. This would include a new stage 5 procurement approach.
- It highlighted the up to date statistics and percentages of coverage from fibre to premise per district area, as well as highlighting those areas that still need to be enabled with faster broadband coverage.
- For the revised 2019-2022 strategy delivery plans, it was advised that it will focus on a more flexible approach of delivering solutions for those properties in rural areas that have no enabled.

Public Health Annual Report

- Linking public health to economic growth and the future of the county.
- Highlighting the 'health and wealth cycle'; which suggested that being in good employment was good for health and what is good for health, is also good for business.
- Understanding health inequalities in the county and the need to work towards inclusive growth.

Local Nature Partnership Infrastructure Policy Pledge

- The Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership has already created a Nature Recovery Network map which is a habitat connectivity and biodiversity map

- The next stage would be to add data on ecosystem services and economic data to create a Natural Capital Baseline Map to identify the environmental constraints and opportunities in relation to growth side by side.
- This map would act as a robust, integrated evidence base for planners, enabling better, quicker decision making about proposed developments and strategic allocations.
- The Committee heard this is another example of Gloucestershire being on the forefront of environmental issues.

Cyber Central Update

- This covered aspirations for the site going forward, the project needs to create an evidence of what it will deliver for the county and its economy.
- It is a project that fits well with the aspirations of Gloucestershire as a whole and the Local Industrial Strategy being produced by the GFirst LEP.

- 4.3 Members were informed that there had been two requests for funding approved from the Business Rates Pool which were; the Rail Investment Strategy and Cyber Central Project. The Joint Committee had agreed to defer the funding decision for both the City Region Board and the Natural Capital Mapping pending further information. An additional meeting would be arranged in January 2020, to consider these requests, as well as to consider agenda item's 9 and 10 which were deferred due to time constraints.
- 4.4 Members of the Scrutiny Committee expressed their concern on issues they observed at the Joint Committee meeting that morning. Members highlighted that that there were people leaving the meeting before decisions had been made, additional items being added that weren't on the agenda, inadequate/unavailable reports and confusion over who was proposing items.
- 4.5 Members requested an update on actions taken to address this at the next meeting and that all papers are made available beforehand on both the Joint and Scrutiny Committee agendas. It was stressed that members are unable to properly scrutinise items when there were no papers available in advance.

ACTION: DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

- 4.6 In response, Cllr Molyneux fully accepted the observations and advised the Committee will be taking steps to formalise the process going forward.
- 4.7 A member sought clarity of the decision making accountability for the district representatives to their own district Councils. It was advised district councils are required to appoint a representative to the Joint Committee who has the authority to make the decisions required.

- 4.8 There was a discussion how the natural habitat mapping would be used once completed. It was advised that this project would be used to inform best decision for planning etc. going forward. Knowledge such as this would become increasingly important due to the climate emergency. It was also confirmed that the only potential to be explored in terms of monetising this project could be selling the information once the map is completed. There will be no plans to sell the natural habitats themselves.
- 4.9 Referring to the Public Health report, a member requested that the Scrutiny Committee look into a piece of work to understand why the social mobility index gap is so wide between Stroud and other parts of the County.

ACTION: DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

6. GFIRST LEP - INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO

- 6.1 The Chair invited Mally Findlater, Programme Manager at the GFirst LEP, to present the report on the Investment Portfolio.
- 6.2 The report was taken as read and the Committee were informed that it represented an early part of the process in anticipation for further clarity from government on the criteria and funding opportunities. It was a fairly uncertain picture from central government at the moment.
- 6.3 A member questioned the phrase 'investment portfolio' and whether it should be a 'funding portfolio' instead. In response it was advised that the LEP would only agree 3rd party funding if the project on offer would have an investment back into the county and therefore they saw 'investment portfolio' as better suited.
- 6.4 There was a discussion on timing for the Scrutiny Committee to be involved in the next funding allocation process. It was reiterated at this time, the picture is unclear, the criteria for projects has not been confirmed from Government and it is not known when this will happen. It was advised that it is not the Committee's role to take part in the selection of projects but they request an opportunity to scrutinise what projects are eventually selected and the merits of that selection.
- 6.5 The Chair informed the Committee that following the previous meeting's action, they are working with the LEP offline to understand how the Committee can improved its scrutiny.
- 6.6 A member questioned where the funding for the LEP is drawn from within Government. Reiterating that the LEP are still unclear on the criteria for the next funding round, it was advised that it is usually drawn from Capital. It is envisaged that funds may be drawn from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund to replace the EU funding received currently.

- 6.7 It was noted by a member that a lot of power lies in the first stage of project selection, effectively being the 'gatekeepers' of the project pipeline and relies on the discretion of a very small group of people. It was questioned whether this is a satisfactory way to being the selection process.
- 6.8 It was advised that the main decision made at this stage is removing projects that are not within the LEPs remit. In this circumstance, the LEP will send project proposals to the most appropriate area e.g. local district councils.
- 6.9 In addition, this is the stage where the LEP may ask advice where there may be a wider strategy that needs looking into instead of them funding one individual project. The example given is if they had five separate cycling scheme projects, it would seek a view from Gloucestershire County Council on its cycling strategy and what would help the most.

7. GLOUCESTERSHIRE VISION 2050 UPDATE

- 7.1 The Chair invited Mike Dawson, Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to present the item on Gloucestershire Vision 2050.
- 7.2 Members were reminded that they had requested an update in May of this year which is shown at Appendix 1.
- 7.3 It was advised that Leadership Gloucestershire have approved the Terms of Reference for the three boards established under the concordat (as shown in Appendix 2). Two boards have had their initial meetings but the Rural Ambitions Board is yet to meet.
- 7.4 The City Region Board submitted a request for funding to the Joint Committee that morning which was deferred pending further information.
- 7.5 A member questioned Publica's role in this piece of work. It was advised that as a provider of resources jointly owned by the local authorities, it would be a decision for the individual authorities to decide their membership on the boards.
- 7.6 There was a question on the financial support for the boards. The Committee heard that the source for supporting the boards is yet to be determined. Given the size and importance of these projects, each will need to be properly supported and not just rely on the existing resource to expand its workload.
- 7.7 As previously mentioned, one of the boards had submitted a funding request to the Economic Growth Joint Committee which is currently viewed as the most appropriate source at the moment.
- 7.8 There was a discussion about how the Committee will properly scrutinise the work of the boards, especially in relation to their environmental

impacts/policies. It was reiterated that it is still early days for the boards at the moment and the detail is still being developed.

- 7.9 It was noted that none of the boards are decision making bodies, their visions will steer and drive work within the county but decisions will remain with the appropriate bodies as they currently stand.
- 7.10 Members were reassured that Economic Growth would be the Committee best placed to scrutinise the vision, work and finances of the boards once they were up and running. Members were especially keen to understand the funding process for work of the boards in advance to allow effective scrutiny. It was stressed that the democratic accountability of Vision 2050 is left behind.
- 7.11 The Chair requested that going forward, officers keep the Committee up to date with regular briefings on the Vision 2050 work. It was noted that Mike Dawson was only one of the lead officers involved with the boards and going forward, all lead officers should be involved with scrutiny updates.

ACTION: MIKE DAWSON/DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

CHAIR

Meeting concluded at 15:55

HEALTH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 14 January 2020 at the Council Chamber - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Dilys Neill
Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE
Cllr Paul Hodgkinson (Vice-Chairman)	Cllr Jill Smith
Cllr Carole Allaway Martin (Chairman)	Cllr Robert Vines

Substitutes: Cllr Iain Dobie (In place of Cllr Martin Horwood)
Cllr Graham Morgan (In place of Cllr Brian Oosthuysen)
Cllr Steve Robinson (In place of Cllr Steve Lydon)

Officers in attendance: Stephen Bace, Ingrid Barker, Mary Hutton, Peter Lachecki, Deborah Lee, Becky Parish, Angela Potter, Dr Andy Seymour and Caroline Smith

Apologies: Cllr Collette Finnegan, Cllr Helen Molyneux, Cllr Pam Tracey MBE and Cllr Suzanne Williams

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

See above.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations made

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 The minutes of the meeting on 19 November 2019 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment.

Nick Relph listed as an attendee.

3.2 In relation to actions arising, one member queried whether the detailed answer in relation to a public question at the last meeting had been circulated. This would be followed up.

ACTION Becky Parish

3.3 Members were informed that a visit had been arranged to the Aspen Centre and a brief report would be circulated. The Chair thanked the Centre for the openness with which they answered questions and the your of the building. It had been a positive visit and the Chair noted the input of the CCG and Patient Participation Group in driving significant change in the practice.

3.4 In relation to a question on 62 day cancer targets, Deborah Lee explained she would welcome an opportunity to bring members up to speed on the progress against Cancer Strategy at a future meeting of the committee. The Chair suggested that members may wish a set up a short task group looking into cancer care for the County but this would need to be properly scoped. Further consideration would be given at the next work planning meeting.

ACTION – Work Planning

4. PUBLIC REPRESENTATION

No representations were made.

The Chair outlined that she had received positive feedback on the opportunity for public representations being made available. One member asked whether there had been any publicising of the facility and suggested a greater use of social media. This would be reviewed as part of the reflection following on from the previous year's scrutiny review process.

ACTION **Stephen Bace**

5. FIT FOR THE FUTURE

5.1 Mary Hutton introduced the output of the Fit for the Future engagement. This engagement sought views on the future provision of urgent and specialist hospital care in Gloucestershire. The comprehensive report could be found at www.onegloucestershire.net. Members were informed that the Citizen's Jury process would begin week commencing 20 January 2020 and was the final element of the engagement.

5.2 Becky Parish outlined that the engagement was an opportunity to talk about the way in which services could be organised to get the best urgent advice, support and care across Gloucestershire as well as the benefit of having two thriving specialist hospitals in future in Cheltenham and Gloucester. It was important to find out what mattered to people. The CCG had outlined that they felt that it was important to make it easier, faster and more convenient to get advice and services 7 days a week, ensuring care was coordinated, with most care provided in or near home with services of high quality in the right place with the right staff, skills and equipment.

- 5.3 The engagement process asked the public and staff to help develop ideas and outline what was important to them. In particular it was about feedback on ideas for 'centres of excellence' approach and to develop potential solutions for specialist services. In addition the public was asked to consider the new hospital for the Forest of Dean.
- 5.4 Members were informed of the number of people that had been involved, over 3300 (number rounded down) local people had participated in planned activities, but the focus of engagement was not about numbers, it was about receiving qualitative feedback from a broad range of people. Members noted the views on the website and the number of surveys completed (1230). A number of surveys were responded to with the same response. 153 Forest of Dean Hospital surveys had been completed.
- 5.5 The team had worked with Inclusion Gloucestershire to ensure the voices of people with protected characteristics were heard. A range of demographic data had been collected and this broadly represented the local population profile. The exception was a high response rate from people with a Cheltenham postcode and people identifying as an unpaid carer. No weighting had been applied to feedback and was reported to the appendices of the output report.
- 5.6 Members were informed of the main feedback themes noting that Cheltenham was a focus of a number of the responses, including Cheltenham A & E. Feedback on 111 had been more positive than it had been previously but there still needed to be improved confidence in the service. Quality and Equity of services were featured in a number of responses.
- 5.7 It was explained that there was some reservations within the feedback as to whether acute medicine was a specialism and a number of conversations were held explaining the expertise and specialist skills required. Mental health in emergency and urgent services was a theme, with respondents keen that provision for this be built into services. Communication and more simplified pathways were raised as an issue as well as discussions around workforce and technology.
- 5.8 General (including Emergency) Surgery and Image Guided Interventional Surgery received less feedback but good quality feedback. This included comments regarding retaining General Surgery at Cheltenham General and Gloucestershire Royal and others on centralising General Surgery at Gloucestershire Royal. In relation to Image Guided Interventional Surgery, there had been surprise over patients potentially having to go out of county for some treatments currently.
- 5.9 One member noted that workforce planning had been the topic of a joint meeting and suggested that there be another meeting to have an update on this. This would be discussed at a future work planning meeting.

ACTION

Work Plan

- 5.10 A number of workshops had been held at the University of Gloucestershire where some of the staff of the future were being trained. It was suggested that the committee might wish to visit these facilities.
- 5.11 Caroline Smith provided an update on the new hospital in the Forest of Dean. The focus on the engagement was to test and develop ideas, find out what was important to local people and gather feedback on the outpatient and diagnostic services that should be provided. The example of 300 people being spoken to at a supermarket in Lydney was given to demonstrate how the engagement exercise had been approached. The announcement around the site in Cinderford had been made.
- 5.12 Specific information had been given out on the thinking behind the numbers of beds, the way in which urgent care would be provided, and outpatient and diagnostic services. Feedback on these areas were outlined for members including significant concerns about any reduction in beds and the importance of bed planning, as well as transport and accessibility difficulties, end of life care, and access to GP appointments. Some responses outlined the importance of the new hospital providing the same range of services provided at the two current hospitals.
- 5.13 Members noted the three stages as part of the next steps including the Citizen's Jury (20 January 2020), solutions appraisal development of business cases and consultation process. The Citizens Jury would consider General Surgery, Acute Medicine and Image Guided Intervention. Members would find more detail on the One Gloucestershire website. The solutions appraisal criteria had been changed in relation to the feedback in order to appraise some of the potential solutions.
- 5.14 A link would be circulated to committee members providing details of the Citizen's Jury and allowing members to book a place if they wanted to. The venue was the Chase Hotel in Brockworth which had good public transport access.
- ACTION Becky Parish/Stephen Bace**
- 5.15 One member commented that Cheltenham A & E had been a major feature of the feedback received and that prior to the General Election the Secretary of State had stated that he had been given assurances that there would be no change of service at Cheltenham A & E. He asked what had been said to the Secretary of State to provide that assurance. In response Deborah Lee outlined that she had stated that there would continue to be a consultant led Emergency Department at Cheltenham General Hospital.
- 5.16 The member asked for greater clarity to ensure openness and transparency and asked whether this meant that there would be no change to Cheltenham A & E. In response it was explained that there would be a long list of options following the engagement exercise that would need to be considered and

one of these options would include the restoration of Cheltenham General at night. This was due to the commitment made to engage, listen and reflect the views of the people during the engagement and so there would be an exploration as to whether the constraints that had led to the service changes at Cheltenham General had now been removed. Deborah Lee expressed her concern that her personal integrity was being questioned in this regard.

- 5.17 In response to a further question, Deborah Lee confirmed that there would be no reduction of service at Cheltenham A & E. She clarified that proposals for the development of services for the small number of patients who required onward care after their A & E attendance were a component of the Fit for the Future Engagement and forthcoming Citizen's Jury and would be publically consulted upon if changes were proposed.
- 5.18 In response to questions, it was explained that the engagement process had not been about saving money but about sustainability of services into the future. In relation to enacting historic changes at Cheltenham General overnight, the original decision had been driven by workforce availability. If following on from this process a work-force had to be identified to re-establish any services at Cheltenham General, that would require investment from resources that were currently directed elsewhere. It was stressed that the original workforce drivers were even more acute than previously. The evaluation criteria for the long list of options under consideration included financial parameters.
- 5.19 One member asked whether there would be a proposal to concentrate the Emergency Department at Gloucester Royal only. In response Mary Hutton stated that this option had 'never been on the table'.
- 5.20 One member provided his endorsement for the new hospital in the Forest of Dean citing the current disparity between facilities in the Forest compared to other areas. He particularly highlighted the good services available at the Vale in Dursley.
- 5.21 A criteria would be used as part of the Solutions Appraisal which would include finance, quality of service, technology and sustainability amongst other things. The Chair requested that the criteria be shared with the Committee. Once it had been developed for the appraisal process on 27 January 2020 it would then be shared with members.
- ACTION Becky Parish**
- 5.22 It was clarified that there were 18 members of the Citizen's Jury. Any consultation following the solutions appraisal would come later in 2020. The Chair noted that the engagement had been diligent and thorough.

6. GLOUCESTERSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP PERFORMANCE REPORT

- 6.1 Mary Hutton presented the performance report explaining that there continued to be system pressure within urgent care. In relation to delayed transfers of care, work continued in this area within an improvement on the previous two months. The issue around non-obstetric ultrasound had been resolved. In relation to the Cancer two week wait, performance was good.
- 6.2 One member commented that he understood that the CCG and Virgin Health were working with south west ambulance to treat falls at the individual's home and that action had greatly reduced hospital admissions. He asked whether this was a service that was available or being considered in Gloucestershire. In response it was explained that this type of approach was carried out in Gloucestershire and that details could be provided.
- ACTION** **Mary Hutton**
- 6.3 One member commended the service on the improved performance for timeliness in Children mental health. He noted that the information outlined that this was predicted to continue assuming that demand in the service was stable and that all planned staff recruitment and retention strategies were successful. It was explained that best estimates were considered, but there was a plan which was being followed and additional resources had been put in place
- 6.4 The Chair commented that she had received good feedback from the communities about GPs being able to contact consultants in order to get expert advice. It was explained that this was one of a number of tools available to GPs for advice and guidance. Cinapsis provided a direct link to an acute consultant on call.

7. ONE GLOUCESTERSHIRE ICS LEAD REPORT

- 7.1 Mary Hutton introduced the report explaining that the focus of the report was on 'enabling activate communities.' She emphasised the engagement from the voluntary sector, district councils and County Council.
- 7.2 The Committee was informed that there were currently 155 schools taking part in the Daily Mile. One member praised the initiative and asked whether it could be rolled out further than schools such as within the work place. In response it was explained that there was a Workplace Wellbeing Charter and a number of initiatives in place such as Park Run.

8. GCCG CLINICAL CHAIR/ ACCOUNTABLE OFFICER REPORT

- 8.1 Mary Hutton introduced the report outlining the updates on Adverse Childhood Experiences and the Integrated Care System (ICS) Workforce and Organisational Development update.
- 8.2 Members noted the update on the Dermatology Training Day that had been held on 10 October 2019. Dr Andy Seymour explained that there were a number of routes available for all GPs to seek advice and help support the patient. He would discuss details with one member who outlined concerns he had from a personal experience.
- 8.3 One member asked for assurances regarding the Phlebotomy service explaining that he had heard risks that the service at Cheltenham could be closed down and individual GP services expected to pick up the workload. It was explained that those blood tests requested within hospital were carried out at hospital. There would be no change to any of those services. In terms of primary care, for historical reasons, it was currently a mixed picture within some practices referring those requiring a blood test to hospital which put pressure on services. Many GP surgeries carried out their own blood tests and the aim was to standardise the approach. Some surgeries would need to employ additional staff to carry out blood tests and would receive funding along with that. Members were informed that some confusion had been caused by an old notice with incorrect information that might have given the impression that services were closing, this was not the case. One member complimented the Phlebotomy service from personal experience.
- 8.4 One member praised the 'Stop! Think...' campaign and asked the high impact video content could be made more widely available. In response it was agreed that a link would be provided.
- ACTION** **Becky Parish**
- 8.5 Deborah Lee reminded the committee of the Trust's decision in 2019 to set aside the General Surgery pilot, and explained that the Trust had continued to closely monitor the impact of this decision on the service and its patients. Health partners were now commencing a dialogue on further proposals for General Surgery, in light of the increasingly unsustainable nature of the controls and mitigations in place and the expectation was that something would be brought to a meeting in the near future.

9. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Members noted the agreed Memorandum of Understanding, which would be reviewed annually or sooner as necessary.

Deborah Lee thanked the Chair for her work over the past two and a half years, noting that this was her last meeting, and stated that while there had been some

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

challenges over that time she had chaired the committee superbly and that health partners had felt listened to. The Committee member echoed the thanks.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 11.25 am



GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Minutes of the meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel held on Monday, 3 February 2020 at 10am.

Present:

William Alexander	Cllr Karen McKeown
Cllr Ray Brassington	Cllr David Norman MBE
Cllr Jonny Brownstein	Cllr Loraine Patrick
Cllr Philip Burford	Cllr Steve Robinson (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Collette Finnegan	Cllr Mattie Ross
Cllr David Gray	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Colin Hay (Chair)	

Apologies: Martin Smith

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2019 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

3. PROPOSED GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE PRECEPT 2020/21

3.1 The Chair welcomed students from the University of Gloucestershire studying professional policing.

3.2 Before introducing his budget, PCC Martin Surl paid tribute to the officers of the Metropolitan Police for how they had responded to terrorist attack that had taken place the previous day in London.

- 3.3 Consideration was given to the report providing details of the Police and Crime Commissioner's precept proposals for 2020-21. PCC Surl explained that £32 million in savings had been made since 2010 to allow a balanced budget to be achieved. He was pleased that since 2018-19 there had been more flexibility to increase the precept and that in 2020-21 there had been a significant uplift in funding.
- 3.4 He regretted that neighbourhood policing had diminished dramatically across the country due to reductions in funding. He believed that neighbourhood policing was the golden thread for all policing and was the foundation for all policing objectives in Gloucestershire. There was a long held belief that resources in Gloucestershire were not enough to do what the public realistically expected of the police. This was a serious cause of stress and anxiety amongst officers because they could not deliver the service that they would like to.
- 3.5 It was an improving picture with new funding and he hoped that this would continue. Since 2018-19, the organisation had grown by 74 police officers and 37 associated staff. This had not just been desirable but was essential to provide an adequate police service in Gloucestershire.
- 3.6 There was an increasing burden on local taxpayers with a reduction in Government funding and local taxation increasing from 36% to 49% of overall funding during the last 10 years. This was likely to be the pattern moving forward and it was more important than ever that local people had a voice in determining police priorities. As a result of the General Election the financial settlement had only just been released so there had been no time to undertake consultation on the budget in the conventional way. However, during the year he along with his Deputy PCC, Chris Brierley, had attended events across the county and had gained a good understanding of what local people wanted.
- 3.7 New areas of focus had been introduced based on what local people said was important to them. The six priorities in the Police and Crime Plan remained in place but there would be more focus on responding to burglary and adopting an overriding principle that every crime matters. There would also be a focus on serious acquisitive crime and rural crime and the Constabulary would embrace the child friendly approach being adopted by the public sector in Gloucestershire. None of these areas could be addressed properly without improving the way that the public communicated with the Police.
- 3.8 PCC Surl paid credit to Chief Finance Officer Peter Skelton and successive Chief Constables on the strong financial position of the Constabulary. This was in stark contrast to a number of other forces who faced serious financial deficits. For

Gloucestershire, this meant that the new funding could be used in its entirety to address local priorities. The force would grow by 46 officers next year and this could rise to 152 officers over three years. He recognised that it was not easy to achieve that level of growth, particularly with vetting of new recruits taking up to six months and training increasing from 18 months to three years. A new training facility, called the Sabrina Centre, was being developed at Berkeley to provide the capacity for training new officers.

- 3.9 PCC Surl advised that a national spending review was due to take place during 2020 and there was a possibility that the national police funding formula would be reviewed in 2021. He had recently met with the six county MPs and they were all anxious that Gloucestershire did not lose out as a result of changes to the funding formula.
- 3.10 Crime was rising across the country and was becoming increasingly complex. It was proposed that £1 million would be provided in one-off funding in 2020-21 to improve public contact and embrace the principle that every crime matters. If this was successful then the funds could be converted to ongoing revenue funding.
- 3.11 PCC Surl stated that he had taken careful consideration of the ability of households to pay, and he recognised that local people were facing increasing levels of taxation elsewhere. He believed that his proposal for a 2.7% in the police precept represented a good balance between affordability for local people and providing sufficient funds to deliver improvements to local policing. In terms of monetary value, 2.7% represented an increase of £6.76 at band D council tax.
- 3.12 Some members expressed concern that if the police precept was not increased by 4%, the maximum permitted, Gloucestershire would lose out in the future as the Government might think that funding could be reduced in future years. PCC Surl stated that 3% would not make a huge difference and Peter Skelton advised that there was no evidence to suggest that any police forces had lost out in future years if their precept had not been raised to the maximum level.
- 3.13 Some concern was expressed by members that the balance of funding was putting a greater burden on local taxpayers with the proportion of Government funding reducing. It was apparent that there were major disparities between forces across the country with the proportion of funding raised through local taxation much lower than Gloucestershire. The amount of core grant funding per head of population also varied significantly across the country with Gloucestershire receiving £92 and some forces in urban areas getting more than £160. Comparative information was requested comparing the balance of funding and the funding per head of population for forces across England.

Action – Peter Skelton

- 3.14 PCC Surl noted that, according to crime statistics, Gloucestershire was the second safest area to live in England. There was real pressure from forces covering large urban areas, such as the West Midlands, for more funding as they were experiencing particular problems with serious organised crime. He was anxious, however, that funding was maintained in Gloucestershire to allow a balanced approach to policing that included adequate support for new officers, ICT infrastructure, training facilities, Police Community Support Officers and firearms' units.
- 3.15 In terms of the recruitment of new officers, PCC Surl explained that both he and the Chief Constable were anxious to make Gloucestershire Constabulary a good organisation to work for. That meant providing first class buildings, good welfare to support the mental and physical health of all employees and promoting diversity. He said that, as the Vice-chair of the National Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, he had a close involvement in a national campaign to recruit police officers. He offered to put Cllr Collette Finnegan in touch with the appropriate officer at the Constabulary who was leading the local recruitment campaign.
Action – *Richard Bradley*
- 3.16 A member expressed concern that huge amounts of public money were being spent on national infrastructure projects like HS2 but, at the same time, critical services affecting people's daily lives such as the police were not getting the money they needed. He noted pressures around cyber-crime and questioned how much the Commissioner expected to increase the police precept in future years.
- 3.17 PCC Surl said that he expected the precept to go up by the rate of inflation each year and believed that this was reasonable for local people. He stated that as part of his national role he would be working hard with fellow Police and Crime Commissioners across the country to ensure that policing received its fair share of the public purse. A great deal of research and analysis was being undertaken to prepare for the national spending review. He explained that one of his most important roles locally was to hold the Chief Constable to account. A Finance Panel met every month and challenged the Chief Constable and senior officers. This process had resulted in significant savings being achieved on a variety of projects.
- 3.18 Answering questions regarding the £1 million improvement fund for 2020-21, PCC Surl advised that the focus would be on improving public contact including 101 and 999 and also wider police engagement with the public. None of the funding had been committed so far and he recognised that there might be opportunities to spend in particular areas with the intention of freeing up resources for elsewhere. This was likely to include mental health although this work would be depend on

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

partnership working with other agencies. Spend against the £1 million fund would be monitored separately and could be reported to the Police and Crime Panel.

Action – *Richard Bradley*

- 3.19 The Chair hoped that the members of the Police and Crime Panel would seek the views of their councils on how they could support Gloucestershire Constabulary and influence the Government on funding. It was evident that crime was taking different forms and cooperation was required across the public sector. He noted that the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels could provide an avenue to influence the Government.
- 3.20 The Chair thanked PCC Surl for providing such a detailed explanation of his budget proposals.
- 3.21 On being put to the vote, the following resolution received unanimous support.

RESOLVED to support the Police and Crime Commissioner's precept proposals and related budget for 2020-21.

4. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE, FIRE AND CRIME PANELS

- 4.1 Consideration was given to a report relating to membership of the National Association of Police, Fire and Crime Panels.
- 4.2 There was general support for joining the National Association as it provided a voice for police and crime panels and allowed information to be shared on the different ways that panels hold commissioners to account. It was noted that there was no longer a fee for joining.

Action – *Andrea Clarke*

RESOLVED to join the National Association for Police, Fire and Crime Panels.

5. OFFICE OF THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER - CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT

- 5.1 Consideration was given to the OPCC Chief Executive's report.
- 5.2 PCC Surl made a Powerpoint presentation providing information on the facilities available at the Sabrina Centre at Berkeley. The centre had good access to the M5 and was located next to the University of Gloucestershire and close to the Bloodhound Land Speed Record facility and Stroud School. Generous car parking

was available with 250 spaces on site. Users of the centre would have access to the restaurant and catering facilities at the University of Gloucestershire restaurant.

- 5.3 He stated that it had been purchased at a good price, £600,000, and he believed that overall development costs of £6.7 million were reasonable for a modern facility. The building would be eco-friendly with solar panels. It provided more capacity than currently needed and would include commercial facilities that could be used by other organisations. There might be an opportunity for other police organisations to use the centre including the South West Regional Organised Crime Unit, the College of Policing and other forces.
- 5.4 PCC Surl offered to host a future meeting of the panel at the Sabrina Centre.
Action – *Andrea Clarke*
- 5.5 The Vice-chair noted that the highest number of complaints received by the OPCC related to road safety which was in line with the concerns raised with local councillors. Richard Bradley advised that funds raised through speed enforcement cameras on the M5 had been used to install speed activation signs in villages. Speed enforcement activity had increased with areas of 'community concern' identified for action when local communities had particular problems.
- 5.6 Answering a question relating to press reports, Deputy PCC Chris Brierley explained that inaccurate reports were challenged but often the damage was already done and it was difficult put the situation right.
- 5.7 Answering a further question, Richard Bradley advised that the inspection report on the Youth Offending Service would be covered in his highlight report for the next meeting.
Action – *Richard Bradley*
- 5.8 The Chair noted that the report was intended for information and he encouraged members to send in questions by email to Richard Bradley ahead of the meeting. He believed that there might be some value in holding a workshop to provide an opportunity to discuss how the Police and Crime Panel could be more effective, particularly in terms of encouraging public engagement with the police.
Action – *Andrea Clarke*

The meeting ended at 11.55am

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

CHAIR

Dated



**COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN
INCORPORATING NOTICE OF DECISIONS PROPOSED TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE
SESSION AND NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A KEY DECISION**

The Forward Plan

By virtue of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, local authorities are required to publish a notice setting out the key executive decisions that will be taken at least 28 clear days before such decisions are to be taken. The Regulations also require notice to be given of any matter where it is proposed that the public will be excluded during consideration of the matter.

This Forward Plan incorporates both of these requirements. In the interests of transparency, it also aims to include details of those items to be debated by the Cabinet that relate to either policy/budget formulation, matters which will be subject to a recommendation to the Council, and other matters due to be considered by the Cabinet. This programme covers a period of four months, and will be updated on a monthly basis. The timings of items may be subject to change.

It should be noted that although a date not less than 28 clear days after the date of the notice is given in each case, it is possible that matters may be rescheduled to a date which is different from that given provided, in the cases of key decisions and matters to be considered in private, that the 28 day notice has been given. In this regard, please note that agendas and reports for Meetings of the Cabinet are made available on the Council's Web Site - www.cotswold.gov.uk - five working days in advance of the Meeting in question. Please also note that the agendas for Meetings of the Cabinet will also incorporate a necessary further notice which is required to be given in relation to matters likely to be considered with the public excluded.

There are circumstances where a key decision can be taken, or a matter may be considered in private, even though the 28 clear days' notice has not been given. If that happens, notice of the matter and the reasons will be published on the Council's Web Site, and available from the Council Offices, Trinity Road, Cirencester, Glos. GL7 1PX.

Key Decisions

The Regulations define a key decision as an executive decision which is likely -

(a) to result in the relevant local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the relevant local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or

(b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the authority.

In financial terms, the Council has decided that a key decision is any executive decision which requires a budget expenditure of £100,000 or more, or one which generates savings of £100,000 or more.

A key decision may only be made in accordance with the Cabinet Procedure Rules contained within the Council's Constitution.

Matters To Be Considered in Private

The great majority of matters considered by the Council's Cabinet are considered in "open session" when the public have the right to attend.

However, some matters are considered with the public excluded. The public may only be excluded if a resolution is passed to exclude them. The grounds for exclusion are limited to situations where confidential or exempt information may be disclosed to the public if present and, in most cases involving exempt information, where in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. The definitions of these are set out in the Council's Constitution.

Documents and Queries

Formal reports presented relating to any executive decision will be available on the Council's Web Site at least five working days in advance of the Meeting at which the decision is to be made (except insofar as they contain confidential and/or exempt information).

The Decision Notice for each key decision will be published as soon as reasonably practicable after it has been made. We will seek to do this within five working days of the date of the decision. The Decision Notice will be available for public inspection on the Council's Web Site, and at the Council Offices, Trinity Road, Cirencester, Glos. GL7 1PX.

If you have any questions about the Forward Plan, or if you wish to make representations about any of the matters contained within it, please contact the Council's Democratic Services Team. The Democratic Services Team can also, on request, provide copies of, or extracts from, documents listed in the Plan and any which subsequently become available (subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure).

Contact Details:

Democratic Services,
Cotswold District Council,
Trinity Road,

Cirencester,
Glos.
GL7 1PX.

E-mail: democratic@cotswold.gov.uk

Telephone: 01285 623000

Fax: 01285 623907

Website: www.cotswold.gov.uk

The Council's Executive Arrangements

The Council currently operates the Strong Leader and Cabinet form of governance.

By law, the Cabinet can comprise a Leader of the Council, together with up to nine other Members to be appointed by the Leader (one of whom has to be appointed as Deputy Leader). The Leader will be elected by the Council, for a four-year term; and the Deputy Leader appointment is also for a four-year term.

The Cabinet at Cotswold District Council currently comprises a Leader, a Deputy Leader, and seven other Cabinet Members. The structure is as set out in the table below.

Executive decisions are taken either collectively by the Cabinet or individually by Cabinet Members.

The Cabinet generally meets monthly; whereas decision-making by individual Cabinet Members occurs on an 'as and when needed' basis.

Decisions of the Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members are subject to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor	Portfolio Area	Areas of Responsibility
Joe Harris	Leader	Policy Framework including the Corporate Plan; Co-ordination of executive functions; Democratic Services/Legal Services; Press and communication; Publica.
Mike Evey (Deputy Leader)	Finance	Financial Strategy and management; Revenues and benefits; property asset and management; grants; Cotswold Water Park.
Rachel Coxcoon	Planning Policy, Climate Change, and Energy	Climate Change and Energy Planning; Strategic Forward Planning; Local Plan; Neighbourhood Plans; Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 Agreements.
Tony Dale	Economic Development, Skills and Young People	Local enterprise and partnership and county-wide partnerships; promoting enterprise sustainable tourism, visitor information centres; economic development; youth development services.
Andrew Doherty	Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health	Waste and recycling; drainage and flood resilience; public protection; food safety; building control.
Jenny Forde	Health, Well-being and Public Safety	Improving social mobility; tackling social isolation; public health, well-being and mental health; crime disorder and community safety; supporting and safeguarding people.
Mark Harris	Car Parks and Town & Parish Councils	Delivery of Cirencester car park; car parking and enforcement; parish and town council support; support for community events; community building/liaison.
Lisa Spivey	Housing and Homelessness	Tackling homelessness and improving housing security; support for community land trusts; promotion of self-build and system build housing, strategic oversight of tenure and housing needs assessment; delivery of council and social rented housing.
Clive Webster	Development Management, Landscape and Heritage	Development management, heritage and design management, landscape conservation; AONB liaison.

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020/21 to 2029/30 and Budget 2020/21	Yes	No	Council (Recommendation from the Cabinet)	February 2020	Leader of the Council	Jenny Poole	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers Treasury Management Advisers Local Businesses Residents Town/Parish Councils	Likely Local Government Finance Settlement Council Aims and Priorities Medium Term Financial Strategy Update Consultation Process
Building Control Update	No	No	Cabinet	February 2020	Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health	Matt Kirby	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Response to the Government's consultation on the Future Homes Standard: changes to Part L and Part F of the Building Regulations for new dwellings	No	No	Cabinet	February 2020	Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy	James Brain	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Investment in Roller Brake testing to reduce costs and Carbon	No	No	Cabinet	February 2020	Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
Approval to award contract in respect of a Revenues and Benefits management system	Yes	No	Cabinet	March 2020	Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance	Mandy Fathers	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None.
Performance Report (Quarter 3)	No	No	Cabinet	March 2020	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data
Local Plan Review	No	No	Recommendation to Council Cabinet	March 2020	Planning, Policy Climate Change and Energy	James Brain	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Approval of the Private Rental Scheme policy	No	No	Cabinet	March 2020	Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness	Mandy Fathers	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
<p>Land at Station Road, Kemble Housing Options Report</p> <p>Likely disclosure of exempt information - paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person</p>	Yes	Yes	Recommendation to Council Cabinet	April 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Ward Member Senior Officers March 2020	<p>Acquisitions and Disposal Policy</p> <p>Cabinet Report dated 14th February 2019 - Agenda Item 9</p> <p>Cabinet report dated 14th September 2017- Exempt Agenda Item 16</p> <p>Cabinet report dated 19th January 2017 - Agenda Item 10 - Community Led</p>

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
								Housing Fund
The Cotswold Club Likely disclosure of exempt information - paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 - Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person	No	Yes	Cabinet	April 2020	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Ward Members Senior Officers Internal consultation	Scheme of Delegation for Land and Property and the Acquisitions and Disposals Policy
Electric Vehicle Charging Point Report	No	No	Cabinet	April 2020	Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health	Claire Locke	Cabinet Members Senior Officers	None
No items yet identified				May 2020				

Item for Decision and (if applicable) Reason(s) the Matter is Likely to be Considered in Private	Key Decision (Yes/No)	Likely to be Considered in Private (Yes/No)	Decision-Maker	Date of Decision	Cabinet Member	Lead Officer	Consultation	Background Documents
Performance Report (Quarter 4)	No	No	Cabinet	June 2020	All	Andy Barge	Cabinet Members Overview and Scrutiny Committee Senior Officers	Service and Financial Performance Data

(END)