

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCILCABINET2<sup>ND</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019Present:

Councillor Joe Harris	-	Chair
Councillors -		
Rachel Coxcoon		Jenny Forde
Tony Dale		Mark Harris
Andrew Doherty		Lisa Spivey
Mike Evey		Clive Webster

Observers:

Councillors

Stephen Andrews (until 7.05 p.m.)	Tony Berry (until 6.55 p.m.)
Richard Morgan (from 6.10 p.m. until 6.55 p.m.)	Gary Selwyn (until 7.10 p.m.)

CAB.12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Forde declared an interest in respect of Exempt Agenda Item (19), as she was a friend of the Agent who had sent correspondence to the Council in relation to this item.

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct for Officers.

CAB.13 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Cabinet held on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2019 be approved as a correct record.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.14 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10, questions had been submitted, and responses were provided, as follows:-

- (1) Mr. David Fowles of Poulton to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'Given the following:*

*a) that the leader of the Council was pivotal in the decision to move the times of Council and Cabinet meetings to 6.00pm (without full consultation) to enable greater engagement with the public*

*b) that when in opposition he was fiercely critical of the fact that there were only ever 4 Council meetings.*

*c) that several member and public questions, to say nothing of the rest of the Council agenda had items that demanded his input.*

*d) that it was the first Council meeting of the new administration and there was an important item on the agenda - the climate emergency to which members of the public had come to hear the debate.*

*Cllr. Harris gave his apologies and we were informed that he was away on Council business.*

*Could he explain what Council business was more important than him attending a diarised Council meeting and where he in fact was?*

*Surely there is nothing more important as leader than attending his own Council and Cabinet meetings?*

*Could he also explain why it was not possible for a member of his recently expanded Cabinet to attend in his place?*

*Would he apologise for the discourtesy his absence showed to both elected members and members of the public?*

*Would he commit to always attending in the future?'*

#### Response from Councillor Joe Harris

I was representing the interests of the Council, and indeed the District, at the Local Government Association Conference. Given the significant financial and other challenges facing local government, and the uncertain political situation nationally, I felt it important for me, as Leader, to attend, along with our Head of Paid Service. It is fair to say that we both found the conference extremely valuable.

Insofar as the Council Meeting was concerned, I am fortunate to have an excellent team of Cabinet Members and Officers who are more than capable of dealing with business even if I am not present – which proved to be the case.

Mr. Fowles thanked the Leader for his response but stated that he considered it to be slightly insufficient. Mr. Fowles explained that he recalled that, when in opposition, the Leader had always stated that he wished to see more Council meetings take place throughout the Council year and that he had since made this happen. Mr. Fowles added that the Leader had also previously criticised the previous administration in that the only way he could then, as Leader of the opposition group, challenge the administration was via public and Member questions at meetings. By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Fowles asked if the Leader agreed that he should be personally accountable and that one of the best places to justify his actions was at a Council or Cabinet meeting?

In response, Councillor Harris explained that the number of Council meetings had been increased under the new administration and that the previous administration, of which Mr. Fowles had been part of, had reduced the number of Council Meetings to four per year. The Leader added that since May 2019, when the new administration had taken power of the Council, it had increased the number to six Council meetings per year and explained that this would now result in two more

occasions when he as Leader would be present at a Council Meeting in comparison to the previous Leader and Council administration.

He added that the Council was also currently undertaking a constitutional review that would begin in the next few weeks and that this would look at times of Council meetings and give an opportunity for all Members - (Conservative, Liberal Democrat, Independent and Green) to feed into the review and to shape how and when Council meetings took place in the future. The matter of meeting locations would also be discussed as this was also considered to be a key discussion point by the administration.

The Leader concluded by explaining that, at the time of the July 2019 Council Meeting, he had been representing the Council at the LGA conference and stated that he would not apologise and enquired if Mr. Fowles would apologise for the missed opportunities that his previous administration had failed to do the same. The Leader added that talking to colleagues at the LGA, South West Councils Partnership and neighbouring leaders of authorities; it had been made clear that they had never met the previous leadership of this Council. The Leader stated that he wished to continue to represent the Council outside to ensure the Council was learning best practice from other councils and to ensure the Council could acquire enough government funding and income via other revenue streams to ensure it could carry out the administration's priorities for the residents of the Cotswolds.

(2) Mr. David Fowles of Poulton to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'Following the approval of the CDC local plan last November, the intention was that in Cirencester the Town Council would be starting on its neighbourhood development plan ( which I understand has just commenced) and that CDC would start work on the Cirencester Master Plan. As I understand it nothing has happened for 10 months on the Cirencester master plan. Why not?'*

Response from Councillor Joe Harris

Your understanding is not correct. A lot of work has been taking place, including the following technical work which has been undertaken and/or completed in recent months:

- Cirencester Health Check (including interviews);
- Conservation Area Appraisal;
- Individual site appraisal packs;
- Transport and Movement Evidence Review;
- Memorandum of Understanding with Cirencester Town Council
- Submitted bid to access
- Urban Design criteria;
- Historic environment evidence review;
- Options assessment methodology; and
- Held the Cirencester Futures conference and processing of outputs from.

The Council is working actively with partners such as Gloucestershire County Council and Historic England and is also a member of Cirencester Town Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group offering technical support and advice.

The new Liberal Democrat Administration at Cotswold District Council have decided to undertake a partial review of the local plan to ensure that it is 'green to its core'.

A key tenet of this review will be the Cirencester Master Plan and indeed the Neighbourhood Development Plan that Cirencester Town Council are beginning work on.

Whilst the Cirencester Futures event back in January was a worthwhile and useful exercise it is clear that not enough residents, councillors and other stakeholders were involved which was regrettable. Also, it wasn't clear to those outside of the event what was happening next and how they could engage with the project.

We look to relaunch Cirencester Futures and ensure as many people as possible understand the process and can engage in it.

(3) Mr. Dom Morris of Quenington to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'Cllr Harris,*

*We farm outside an isolated village in the Cotswolds.*

*Late one evening I caught four men stealing our farm truck. It was not a pleasant altercation. Fortunately, my military training took over, I was unhurt, and we got our truck back. That was not the case when Coln Stores was burgled last month, and a member of our community was hurt.*

*When our community and its representative raised the issue of escalating rural crime in the Standard (25<sup>th</sup> July) you called us "Whingers".*

*Needless to say, calling constituents who have been victims of crime 'whingers' came as a bit of a surprise.*

*But to see you taking the credit on Twitter for the Police Commissioner's U Turn on rural crime a few weeks later after you have been on holiday and cancelled Council meetings for August was a shock.*

*Please could you substantiate your claim that you are responsible for the Police Commissioners newfound focus on rural crime and what made you realise that rural crime was actually an issue. Our community would also be grateful for an explanation of what substantive changes to rural policing we will see and the effect this will have upon rural crime statistics in the Cotswolds which are some of the worst in the UK (The Independent, 17 Aug, 2019).*

*Please could you also apologise for calling constituents that are victims of crime whingers?'*

Response from Councillor Joe Harris

'I am sorry to learn about the attempted theft(s) at your family's farm and am pleased that you were able to intervene to recover your property. I also hope that the police response was satisfactory and encourage you to contact them directly if you have any outstanding concerns.

As someone who has been the victim of a violent crime I know how unsettling it can be.

My administration wants to help support the Police and Crime Commissioner in his work to help improve policing in the Cotswolds.

The government have decimated police budgets over the last decade and his work to try and do more with limited resources is to be commended. Since I've become the Leader of this Council I've met with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Inspector Simon Ellson to discuss a number of policing issues including rural crime. It was really interesting to hear about the proactive work that PC Ashley Weller, whom I'm sure you've met, is doing to help tackle rural crime. I shared my concern with them about a number of high profile crimes in the Cotswolds including theft of farm machinery, burglaries and the ram raid thefts of ATMs. I offered District Council resources to help support them in crime prevention.

I'm pleased to say that the Commissioner has indicated he'd be willing to attend a public meeting in the South Cotswolds in the next few months to listen and hear residents' concerns about crime and also outline the challenges facing the police force.

To suggest that I have at any time ever referred to the residents of Coln St Aldwyns, or indeed any other town or village in derogatory terms is strongly refuted.

I understand that you are a member of the Conservative Party. In contrast to the apparent strategy of some within your political party to undermine the rural crime initiatives that the PCC had agreed with the NFU, police and others, my group took a contrary position which was to challenge, support and influence.

I have never implied that I, or my group, are solely responsible for the operational activity of the Gloucestershire Police. That is a matter for the Chief Constable. To that end, I have worked over several years with the police and the Police and Crime Commissioner to achieve the best possible outcome for the residents I represent.

I do not see any evidence of a 'U' turn by the police with regards to rural policing but a progression of activity based upon what I assume is an intelligence picture, resources and local concerns.

The Commissioner has just published his mid-term refresh of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Plan and I for one am delighted to note the additional focus on burglary and acquisitive rural crime. It's not for me to say how much the representations of myself and group influenced that plan but I can assure our residents that we will fully support it.

The Cotswolds remains a wonderful place to live and work. I hope we are in agreement that low crime levels are important to everyone. The attack on Coln St Aldwyns' village store was a dreadful crime but thankfully, overall our district remains one of the safest places in the country to live.'

(4) Mr. Dom Morris of Quenington to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'The internet at our 4<sup>th</sup> generation family farming business is so bad that we are unable to do online banking, invoicing or sometimes even just check our email. It also prohibits any form of diversification/expansion*

*since no-one else would be able to conduct business with such limited connectivity.*

*I understand that CDC was given £500k to support the rolling out of fast broadband services in the Cotswolds by the County Council. Furthermore, that this money was supposed to be spent on hard to reach places.*

*Could Cllr Harris explain when he is intending to spend this money and does he agree that CDC should explore with the County Council and Gigaclear how best to spend the funds in rural communities?*

*Has he considered using the £500k to initiate a grant scheme for hard to reach communities and businesses like ours? Does he agree that initiatives like this would help stimulate economic development in the Cotswolds?'*

#### Response from Councillor Joe Harris

'Thank you for your question and I am sorry to hear that limited internet connectivity is impacting upon your business and diversification opportunities.

As part of our emerging Council Plan, which was set out in our manifesto, we are making it clear that we are a business focused Council that wants to ensure all businesses are given the opportunity to thrive. As part of this we recognise that broadband connectivity presents one of the challenges and limiting factors for rural business growth.

Specifically to your questions, Cotswold District Council was not, in fact, given £500k to support rural broadband by the County Council although the County Council does, itself, lead the rural broadband roll out in Gloucestershire through its partnership with Herefordshire Council (the Fastershire partnership). In fact, it is Cotswold District Council that has committed £500k of its own resources to support the County Council and Fastershire to deliver to the most rural settlements, as part of its strategy to ensure that as much of the Cotswolds as possible gets high speed broadband, at the earliest opportunity.

Indeed on Tuesday of this week, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the Council, received an update report from Fastershire on progress. The Committee discussed how the Councils funds could be best used to ensure as many of the current unserved premises could receive a service in a way that worked with the Fastershire project, whether delivered through BT , Gigaclear or another of the potential providers, within the partnership.

Therefore I absolutely agree that the Council should work in tandem with the County Council (Fastershire) and, indeed, that is exactly what we are doing.

Furthermore, the discussion with Fastershire around future strategy and how our allocation could be best spent, was very much focused around a grant scheme for businesses and those harder to reach communities, that lay outside the current Fastershire delivery plans. In this way, we believe that the Cotswolds, which already has the best broadband service in Gloucestershire, can reach still further into our rural settlements so that all residents and businesses get the services they deserve.

Over the coming months, we will be working with Fastershire, to bring forward a package of measures which should enable the allocated resources to become available in a way that delivers for residents and businesses and reaches as far as possible into our rural communities. In the meantime, I will look at the Fastershire plans, to see if you are covered by any existing planned rollout.'

CAB.15 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No Member questions had been received.

CAB.16 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader wished to extend his thanks on behalf of the Cabinet to the Executive Director - Commissioning for preparing the Council's response to Brexit. The Leader referred to the letter which he had been sent to Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP and circulated to all Members requesting information in regard to the current political situation. The Leader added that he had asked the Executive Director to prepare a risk register relating to how Council services could be affected by a 'no deal' outcome and explained that he hoped the Council could communicate with the District's residents about how they may be affected. The Leader also stated that the LGA Peer Review would be taking place in November 2019 and that he would use the outcome of the Peer Review to support his review of the Council's retained Council staff and the Council's relationship with Publica.

The Leader informed the Cabinet that Highways England were currently consulting on landscaping matters associated with the A417 'Missing Link' (Option 30) and he stated that he wished for the Council to be well-prepared to respond to the consultation and to ensure residents were also kept informed.

CAB.17 DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT POLICY

The Cabinet was requested to approve the implementation of the Disabled Facilities Grant Policy, for which the updated Policy had been included within the circulated report.

The Cabinet Member for Health, Well-being and Public Safety introduced the report and explained that the Policy was trying to ensure greater flexibility around the grants and she highlighted the fact dementia had been included as a new specific. She added that the Council would look to review the environmental impacts of the Policy in regard to making homes more accessible and to ensure energy consumption was also taken into account, but reported that insulation within homes would have a positive impact on climate change. The Cabinet Member concluded that the Policy was ongoing and that the documents presented would continue as working documents.

The Cabinet expressed its thanks to the Cabinet Member for her work in relation to the Policy and its support for approval of the updated Policy as recommended.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) Cabinet adopt the updated Policy; including the provision of discretionary grants (subject to the availability of funding and under the Regulatory Reform Order 2002) in relation to:-**

- (i) Top-up to Mandatory Scheme;**
- (ii) Dual Residency of a Disabled Child;**

- (iii) Relocation Grant;
- (iv) Excessive Contribution;
- (v) Safe, Warm and Well;
- (vi) Making Homes Dementia Friendly;

**(b) the Group Manager for Resident services be given delegated authority to approve such discretionary grants.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.18 TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION PLACEMENT POLICY

The Cabinet was requested to approve the introduction and implementation of a Temporary Accommodation Policy, for which the Policy had been included within the circulated report.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness introduced the report and explained that the Council had been recommended to put in place such a policy following a judgement by the Supreme Court. The Cabinet Member added that she considered it important to ensure the Council had a robust policy in place which allowed the Council to defend itself against any appeals it may have to make and also thanked Housing Officers for their work in relation to the Policy.

The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy enquired as to the provision of emergency accommodation in the north of the District, given the availability of properties within the south of the District. In response, it was confirmed that work was currently being undertaken to provide similar facilities within the north of the District.

**RESOLVED that the introduction of the Temporary Accommodation Placement Policy be approved.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.19 FLEXIBLE HOMELESSNESS SUPPORT GRANT

The Cabinet was requested to consider the planned expenditure of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness introduced the report and informed the Cabinet that the funding in relation to the Grant was ring-fenced for the prevention of homelessness across the District. She added that the Council was working with its Council partners to enable part of the funding to be pooled and that a shared Officer would be appointed to assist with preventing homelessness, who would also look to work with landlords across the District.

The Leader explained that he wished to praise Officers for maintaining a successful relationship with those the Council wished to help and also to those who worked in the voluntary sector to assist the Council with ensuring it could help those in need within the District.

The Chief Finance Officer informed the Cabinet that with regard to the Officer recommendation as published within the circulated report, the Grant did not require further approval from Council as the decision could be implemented following a Cabinet decision only.



**RESOLVED that the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant be adopted as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.20 2019/20 BUSINESS RATES REVALUATION DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF SCHEME

The Cabinet was requested to approve an updated discretionary relief scheme for 2019/20 under Section 47 of the Local Government Act 1988.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the item and explained that the spend recommended by Officers would help to defray the increase in business rates and would benefit businesses across the District. He added that the recommendation by Officers would also encourage the minimising of bureaucracy in relation to the Scheme.

The Chief Finance Officer advised the Cabinet that the 2019/20 funding from central government represented the third year of relief and that this funding had, and was expected to, continue to decrease over time.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Skills and Young People explained that he wished to commend Officers for the efficient way in which the Scheme had been implemented and that he considered the funding would be vital to smaller businesses within the District.

In response to a specific question, the Deputy Leader responded that the relief would automatically be reimbursed to the businesses' accounts as the Council would be aware of the increases. He added that it was also the business owner's requirement to inform the Council if they no longer qualified for any relief.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) the updated discretionary rate relief scheme for the 2019/20 financial year be approved, with relief being awarded at 7.5% of the increase over £1,800 since 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017;**

**(b) the Group Manager for Resident Services be given delegated authority to award discretionary rate relief under the updated scheme.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.21 FUNDING FOR CLIMATE CHANGE MANAGER

The Leader informed the Cabinet that this item was now withdrawn from the Cabinet's discussion and debate at the Meeting and that this decision had been made following the despatch of the Agenda and papers for the Meeting. He added that it was hoped that a full report would be presented at the September 2019 Council Meeting and that the role would be for a full-time Officer.

The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy added that the role would be an important one within the Council moving forward and that it was considered that discussion was required by the Council and not just by the Cabinet, given the investment the Council would be making in relation to the role.

CAB.22 SUMMARY FINANCE / SERVICE PERFORMANCE REPORT 2019/20  
(QUARTER 1)

The Cabinet received a report summarising overall performance for the Council, with particular focus on progress towards achieving the Council's top tasks, and efficiency measures and an update in regard to the Council's financial position including revenue outturn and budget variances; capital expenditure, capital receipts and use of reserves.

The Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the item and explained that the Council had slightly underspent on its Budget and reported upon various aspects of the circulated report.

Various Cabinet Members highlighted that with regard to customer service call answering they hoped to see an improvement by the time the Quarter 2 report was published and it was confirmed that the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Skills and Young People would be meeting with Publica's Head of Transformation in the coming weeks to discuss this matter further.

The Cabinet Member for Development Management, Landscape and Heritage explained that targets in relation to the planning service had been set at pre-Local Plan introduction levels at a time when a high number of applications had been received and that he hoped to shortly brief the Chief Finance Officer on various proposals to help reduce the shortfall that had been suggested by the department's senior Officers.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness wished it be recorded that, with regard to the central government grant received of £34,000 there were many concerns held by the Council regarding the current national political situation regarding Brexit in both the country leaving with or without a deal, through no fault of the Council's own.

**RESOLVED that service and financial performance for Quarter One of 2018/19 be noted.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.23 REVIEW OF COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL'S HACKNEY CARRIAGE TABLE  
OF FARES

The Cabinet was recommended to agree the proposal by Cotswold District Taxi Trade Association (CDTTA) to review the Hackney Carriage (taxi) table of fares and increase the fares accordingly.

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health explained that the current fees had been set 11 years ago and that, should the proposals for increasing the fares be approved, would result in the Council rating in the middle of the national table for fares. The Cabinet Member added that the fares were regulated, but that it was a competitive market for taxi drivers, of which a current shortage was being faced within the District.

The Leader commended the proposals and explained that the risk of a shortage of taxis within the District could have the potential to cause issues to vulnerable people and increasing the fares would hopefully lead to a greater service provision across the District.

In response to a specific Member's question, the Service Leader - Licensing explained that previously the trade within the District had not been supportive of a review and that there was always the option to charge less than the recommended fare cost. She added that a yearly review could be undertaken providing this was requested by at least 10% of the trade.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (a) Cotswold District taxi fares be increased;**
- (b) delegated authority be given to the Licensing Service Leader to carry out necessary advertising requirements to comply with section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976; and**
- (c) subject to there being no substantive amendments being made following formal advertising, delegated authority be given to the Licensing Service Leader (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee) to adopt the proposed fares.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**CAB.24 LAUNCH DATE FOR WASTE SERVICE**

The Cabinet was requested to consider the risks and benefits associated with delaying the planned launch date for the waste service from 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 until March 2020.

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health explained that the launch date of November 2019 had been decided upon by the previous Council however due to delays in anticipated vehicle delivery and implementation of in-cab technology, it was felt a delay in the new service launch would reduce the risk of any service disruption for customers. He added that pushing the launch date back to March 2020 would avoid the worst of any possible winter weather and would also link in with the renewal of the Council's optional garden waste service. Whilst the new launch date would mean the Council would need to store new containers, which have already been ordered, it would give sufficient time to ensure that the communications to residents could be successfully managed in the lead up to the launch.

The Cabinet expressed its support for delaying the service, highlighting that waste was the single biggest service the Council provided and the delay would also result in no required additional spending.

In response to a specific Member's question, the Leader responded that the decision to move to a fortnightly garden waste collection service had been passed at the Council Meeting in February 2019, providing the decision be reviewed and consultation be undertaken with residents prior to March 2020. However, it was clarified that this consultation had been planned after a fortnightly service had been in place for a number of months, so that residents could feedback on their experience. As the launch was being delayed until March a consultation on the impacts of the new service would also need to be delayed.

**RESOLVED that, having considered the risks and benefits associated with delaying the planned launch date for the waste service from 4<sup>th</sup> November until March 2020; Cabinet agree to this delay.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.****CAB.25 FUTURE JOINT WASTE PARTNERSHIP AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROVISION**

The Cabinet was requested to agree to end the current formal Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee and form a Waste Partnership to facilitate continued joint working and, in addition, to agree to withdraw from the Joint Waste Team and request that Publica provide future management of waste functions through a shared contract management service.

The Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health informed the Cabinet that there were difficulties in continuing the current Joint Waste Committee given the decisions made by other councils who also served on the Committee and that there was a desire to ensure the continuity of staffing in the hope of the Council working more closely with Ubico in the future.

**RESOLVED that, Council be recommended to:-**

- (a) allow the Joint Waste Committee to end on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2019;**
- (b) support the formation of a structured but less formal Joint Waste Partnership;**
- (c) withdraw from the Joint Waste Team on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2019 and request Publica provide the waste management function from 14<sup>th</sup> December 2019;**
- (d) put in place a contract variation between the Council and Publica to obligate Publica to provide services and to increase the Publica contract sum by £53,240 to fund the Officer posts which will transfer to Publica from the Joint Waste Team through the TUPE process to facilitate recommendation (c) above.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.****CAB.26 ISSUE(S) ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND/ OR AUDIT (IF ANY)**

The Leader and Cabinet noted that, with regard to the Audit Committee Meeting Minutes of 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019, concern had been raised by the Committee in regard to Section 106 monitoring. The Leader confirmed that he wished to ensure that progress in regard to this matter was regularly reported and published on the Council's website and confirmed that, in addition to work planned to be undertaken by various Cabinet Members, this matter would also be discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019. He also thanked the Audit Committee for bringing this matter to the attention of the Cabinet.

**CAB.27 OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business that was urgent.

**CAB.28 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**

**RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public and Press be excluded from the Meeting for the following item of**

**business on the grounds that it involves likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part I of Schedule 12A to the said Act and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information concerned.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.29 CIRENCESTER PROPERTY

The Cabinet was requested to agree terms for a lease of site in Cirencester for the provision of temporary parking to support the town centre car park developments with decant parking space.

**RESOLVED that the Council be recommended to:-**

- (a) enter into negotiations for a new lease parking at the proposed site;**
- (b) allocate £180,000 from the Council Priorities Fund for the costs over a three year period;**
- (c) delegate authority to the Head of Paid Service, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, the Monitoring Officer and the Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Car Parks and Town and Parish Councils, to (i) agree the final terms for the lease and other legal transactions associated with this lease and (ii) complete these transactions.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and closed at 7.33 p.m.

Chair

(END