

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING

20TH FEBRUARY 2018

Present:

Councillor Julian Beale - Chairman
Councillor David Fowles - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

SI Andrews	RC Hughes
AW Berry	RL Hughes
AR Brassington	Mrs. SL Jepson
T Cheung	RG Keeling
Sue Coakley (until 1.05 p.m.)	Juliet Layton
Alison Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
PCB Coleman	RA Morgan
Andrew Doherty	Dilys Neill
RW Dutton	NJW Parsons
Jenny Forde	SDE Parsons
JA Harris	NP Robbins
M Harris (from 10.06 a.m.)	Lynden Stowe
C Hancock	R Theodoulou (until 1.05 p.m.)
Maggie Heaven	LR Wilkins
Jenny Hincks	
SG Hirst	

Apologies:

Mark F Annett Tina Stevenson

CL.65 WELCOME

In welcoming Members to the annual budget and Council Tax setting meeting, the Chairman read out a comment submitted by Councillor M Harris which, he hoped, would apply throughout the proceedings:-

'Let our debating be reasoned and temperate, recognising that others may have a different point of view and may we always remember our deliberations and decisions are for the benefit of other people'.

CL.66 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Declarations by Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

(2) Declarations by Officers

There were no declarations of interest by Officers.

Councillor JA Harris referred to the fact that Councillor RA Morgan's Register of Interests Form was not available on the Council's website, and requested the Head of Paid Service provide an update in this regard.

In response, the Head of Paid Service confirmed that Councillor Morgan had completed and returned his Register of Interests Form within the required time period following his election, but that an administrative failure had resulted in the form not being uploaded on to the website.

CL.67 MINUTES

RESOLVED that:

(a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 20th December 2017 be approved as a correct record;

Record of Voting - for 31, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 3.

(b) the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 20th December 2017 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 30, against 0, abstentions 1, absent 3.

(c) the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 16th January 2018 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 27, against 0, abstentions 4, absent 3.

CL.68 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, LEADER OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

(i) Councillor Mark F Annett - the Chairman requested Councillor Stowe to inform Members of Councillor Annett's recent illness. Councillor Stowe informed Members that Councillor Annett had undergone an emergency operation as a result of an aneurysm, but was recovering well at the Bristol Heart Institute. Councillor Annett had praised the NHS care he had received. Councillor Stowe explained that he had visited Councillor Annett and had passed on best wishes on behalf of Members and the Council to him and his family. The Chairman informed Members that Councillor Stowe had been temporarily appointed to the Cabinet on a non-remunerated basis until Councillor Annett's return.

(ii) Honorary Alderman Hazel Jones - the Chairman informed Members of the death of Honorary Alderman Hazel Jones in January 2018. The Chairman invited the Head of Paid Service to speak in tribute to the contribution that Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones had made to the Council over many years.

The Head of Paid Service made reference to Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones' election in 1983 to the then Kempford Ward and her exceptional contribution to the Council for 22 years until her retirement from Council duties in 2005 due to ill-health. The Head of Paid Service explained that Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones' portfolio of service was one of the most detailed ever, having served on every committee, and almost 50 different sub-committees and working groups; having held 16 different Chairman and Vice-Chairman

positions; and having been the Council's representative to 20 outside bodies - as well as being a Parish Councillor, and Chairman, for many, many years.

The Head of Paid Service made reference to Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones' dislike of politics, her role as the Council's first independent, independent Councillor (when she had felt that some of the independent members were becoming a bit too political), and her passion for knitting, cricket and football, most notably Swindon Town F.C. Members were also informed that upon being bestowed the title of Honorary Alderman in 2005, Councillor Jones had accrued nearly twice the number of points required for the title. In conclusion, the Head of Paid Service expressed the view that Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones had been a truly 'unique Councillor'.

Various Members paid tribute to Honorary Alderman Mrs Jones, drawing attention to the welcome and consideration that she had always afforded to other Members and Officers throughout her service to the Council. Reference was also made to the fact that she had never thrown away any of her collection of Council papers throughout her service, 'just in case'.

Members and Officers, and other present, then stood for a period of silence in memory of, and in tribute to, Mrs Jones.

(iii) Derek Chiplin, Committee Services Manager - the Chairman explained that Derek Chiplin would be retiring at the end of March after 31 years' service to the Council and invited the Head of Paid Service to inform Members of Derek's contribution to the Council during his service.

The Head of Paid Service informed Members that Derek had started his local government career with Islwyn Borough Council in February 1975 first as a print room assistant, then as a clerical assistant, and then as a Junior Committee Clerk. Derek had joined Cotswold District Council in 1986 as an administrative assistant, before taking on the role of Committee Administrator in 1989, followed by promotion to Committee Services Manager in July 2005. The Head of Paid Service explained that Derek's career had represented 43 years' service to local government, during which time his commitment to the Council had been 'immeasurable'.

Various Members paid tribute to Derek and explained that he had always been held in high-esteem and, whilst a stickler for the rules, had an excellent sense of humour. Derek would be sorely missed by both Officers and Members of the Council.

(iv) Standing to Speak - the Chairman announced that he did not intend to pursue a Motion to remove the requirement to stand while speaking at Council Meetings, as he was aware that such a Motion lacked the full support of the Council.

(v) Motion re Police Funding - the Chairman explained that the previously-submitted Motion on this subject would be held over to a future Council Meeting as new, related information on the subject was expected to be released shortly.

(vi) Motion re 'Believe in Blue' Campaign - the Chairman informed Members that this Motion had received the support of the Cabinet, at which time the Cabinet had also placed on record the Council's gratitude to, and support for,

all of those dedicated personnel who worked across all of the 'blue light' emergency services.

(vii) Armistice Day 2018 - the Chairman informed Members that work was currently being undertaken in relation to this commemoration, and further details would be provided at the May 2018 Council Meeting.

(vi) Community Awards - the Chairman was pleased to report that the first commitment and contribution had been received and thanked various Councillors for their work and support in relation to the Awards Scheme.

(vii) Agenda Items re Budget and Council Tax - the Chairman reminded Members that the votes on these two items (and any amendments) were legally required to take the form of recorded votes.

(viii) Motion 1/2018 re: Plastics - the Chairman explained to Members that once this Motion had been Proposed and Seconded, it would stand referred to Cabinet.

(ix) Community Defibrillator Scheme - the Deputy Leader informed Members that the Leader of the Council had given his continued support to the Community Defibrillator Scheme and reminded Members of the opportunities to them regarding grants to assist the installation of such defibrillators within their Wards. The Deputy Leader explained that the Leader of the Council also wished to establish a 'concept of virement' between Wards on an informal basis, to maximise use of the available funding.

CL.69 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

- (1) From Mr M Pratley, Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing Services, and Cirencester Car Parking Project

Sir Geoffrey Clifton Brown has stated that the BDL contribution of £500,000 for car parking in the town that CDC has negotiated "will be nowhere near adequate". What does the council plan to do about this?

Response from Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington

As those who attended the Special Council Meeting on 16th January 2018 will be aware, our external legal adviser made it clear that, as a matter of law, Section 106 contributions needed to be necessary to make a development acceptable, and were to mitigate for the development and not for the wider benefit of the town.

The contribution is considered by the Council to be adequate to meet the future parking needs arising from the Chesterton development, whilst balancing the need to promote sustainable modes of transport and the need to deliver a wide range of infrastructure including affordable housing.

At the Special Council Meeting, Members were advised about the tests in the CIL Regulations and that the proposed contribution was CIL compliant; and to ask for a larger, unsubstantiated figure would not have met the tests.

Furthermore, as the parking spaces are charged, there is also a business case for the provision of these spaces - which is part of the reason that the full cost is not achievable from the developer.

Accordingly, the contribution as set out in the Heads of Terms is considered to be appropriate, and will remain.

- (2) From Mr M Pratley of Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing Services, and Cirencester Car Parking Project

'The new primary school will not be built on the development until quite a high trigger point of 500 dwellings is reached. Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown suggested it should be set at quite a low level, maybe 200-300 houses. Are CDC going to review this?'

Response from Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington

The trigger point has been established by Gloucestershire County Council, who are the lead authority for the provision of education. The trigger point has been set to ensure that the new primary school meets the needs arising from the new development rather than becoming the first choice for children who do not live within the new development. The timing of the delivery of the school also has implications for the viability of the development and, ultimately, the level of affordable housing that can be provided.

At the Special Council Meeting on 16th January 2018, it was reported that the trigger point related to on-site provision, and that it was likely that the school would open on a host site with effect from 2021/22.

Members did not request a different trigger at the Special Council Meeting and, therefore, the trigger as set out in the Heads of Terms (as recommended by the County Council) remains.

- (3) From Save Our Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing Services, and Cirencester Car Parking Project

'In view of the experience at Victory Fields, which is an indictment of CDC's failure to exercise control over developers, are CDC going to act on Sir Geoffrey's suggestion of requiring BDL to put up a substantial insurance bond? This would be taken out at the start of development and only redeemable when parts or the whole of it is developed out satisfactorily. BDL has NO experience in building houses, and it is likely that all or parts of the development are sold on to house builders. For such a huge and complex project it would make sense to protect the town in this way. Will the council act on our MP's suggestion? If the council are not going to pursue this, what are the reasons for not doing so?'

Response from Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington

This was covered at the Special Council Meeting on 16th January 2018.

Bonds can be used to secure the delivery of a piece (or pieces) of infrastructure - for example a roundabout or a school. If construction was abandoned, the relevant authority would have to step in to secure completion, and use the monies secured through the bond as appropriate.

However, other measures are available - the Council can take legal action should the obligations within the S106 not be delivered, and the Council also has enforcement powers.

Having considered this matter, and in line with the recommendations of our officers and advisers, Members did not believe that a bond was required in this instance.

- (4) From Save Our Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing Services, and Cirencester Car Parking Project

'Will the section 106 agreements be negotiated separately? Furthermore, given the impact that this development will have on the town, will the people of Cirencester be able to have their say on them?'

Response from Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington

The requirements of the Section 106 agreements are set out within the Heads of Terms, agreed by Members at the Special Council Meeting on 16th January 2018 in line with the advice of officers and expert advisers. That decision was taken having regard to the many comments/representations that had been submitted by various consultees and third parties on the application, including in respect of the proposed Heads of Terms. The process of drafting those agreements seeks to secure these obligations within a legal framework. There is no requirement for further public engagement in this respect.

- (5) From Ms CJ Bloomer of Cirencester to Councillor Mark F Annett, the Leader of the Council

'Many people in Cirencester are concerned about on-going reductions to bus services in our area. The emerging local plan talks up the importance of public transport, particularly bus services. What therefore are Cotswold District Council doing to realise the aspirations in the local plan with respect to public transport? It is clear that it they can't be achieved under current arrangements from the County Council.'

Response from Councillor Annett

The submitted Local Plan, and in particular Policy INF3, supports development that assists the delivery of the County Council's Local Transport Plan. This Council will guide development to those locations that actively support travel choices through the enhancement and promotion of safe and recognisable connections to existing walking, cycling and public transport networks. The Council is embarking on a Town Centre Master Plan for Cirencester to help realise the ambitions of the Council's Local Plan. This will bring together work that is currently being undertaken by the Parking Board as well as wider review of redevelopment opportunities identified in the Local Plan's Cirencester Strategy, for example exploring opportunities for a purpose-built public transport hub/interchange in the Southway - Forum area. The Council will be working together with partners such as the Town Council and the County Council to help the town centre to evolve and improve, whilst respecting its rich heritage.

In thanking the Leader for his response, Ms Bloomer expressed disappointment that the response provided no details about actual bus services and made no reference to the recent reduction in services, such as the 51A service from Cirencester to Swindon which, combined with other reductions, had left some villages within the County with only one bus service per week.

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Bloomer asked what the Council's plans were for bus services within the District.

In the absence of Councillor Annett from the Meeting, Councillor NJW Parsons responded. Councillor Parsons thanked Ms Bloomer for the supplementary question and stated that the Council would continue to work with town councils, Gloucestershire County Council and all other interested bodies to explore opportunities for the provision and/or improvement of bus services. Councillor Parsons also drew attention to the fact that responsibility for the provision of bus services was vested in the County Council.

Note:

Neither Mr Pratley, nor any representative of Save Our Cirencester, was present at the Meeting.

CL.70 MEMBER QUESTIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, questions had been submitted, and responses provided, as follows:-

(1) From Councillor NP Robbins to Councillor Sue Coakley, Cabinet Member for Environment

'What plans have the administration got to better inform District residents about what can and cannot be recycled efficiently within the current recycling offer that CDC provides?'

Response from Councillor Coakley

When the current waste and recycling collection service was launched, the Council provided an information guide to all households which explained how the new service would operate and how residents could take part. All of the information contained within this guide is available on the Council's website, which is reviewed and updated to reflect any changes such as the increased focus on recycling food waste.

The Front of House team send out copies of the guide to new residents moving into the Cotswolds.

The Council, supported by the Joint Waste Team, regularly send out promotions about recycling which always signpost the Council's website for further information.

We have provided new "No Food Waste" stickers for the residual waste bins and the green Bin Licence includes information on what items can and cannot be recycled in the Green bin.

In addition, the Ubico collection teams place information stickers on any recycling containers presented with incorrect materials to advise the particular household of the items which can, and cannot, be recycled by way of the kerbside recycling service.

As part of the process of commissioning our new collection vehicles in 2019, we will undertake consultation with residents and members and revise our system in line with the feedback received and associated business cases. We will use the introduction of the new service as an opportunity to provide a new information guide to all households and to further encourage more recycling.

This work will also support the Joint Waste Partnership's aspiration of closer alignment of collection services and could lead to this Council leading the way in implementing the chosen service model for Gloucestershire.

Councillor Robbins thanked the Cabinet Member for the response and, by way of a supplementary question, asked why new advice regarding the recycling of certain products, including the various non-recyclable materials, had not been produced in an attempt to improve recycling rates across the District in the future.

In response, Councillor Coakley explained that information would be sent to every household within the District, but only after the new recycling scheme had been launched.

(2) From Councillor NP Robbins to Councillor Sue Coakley, Cabinet Member for Environment

'Could the Cabinet Member please indicate when the recycling opportunity for tetrapaks will be extended and improved?'

Response from Councillor Coakley

I am pleased to confirm that the service has already been enhanced by expanding the materials collected at the Tetrapak bring banks to include single use coffee cups so that they can also be recycled. They have the same issues with the use of plastic coating on paper, so the complex process required to recycle the materials is very similar.

As part of the process of commissioning our new collection vehicles in 2019, we will undertake consultation with residents and Members and revise our system in line with the feedback received and associated business cases. The service provision through all Bring Banks will be included in this review, as the Bring Banks complement the kerb-side collections.

This work will also support the Joint Waste Partnership's aspiration of closer alignment of collection services and could lead to this Council leading the way in implementing the chosen service model for Gloucestershire.

In the meantime, there are no plans to increase the provision as the focus is very much on reducing the use of plastic, encouraging consumers to choose glass or card packaging rather than plastic, and to avoid packaging such as tetrapaks which are especially difficult to recycle.

Councillor Robbins expressed his dissatisfaction that no plans had been established to improve facilities for recycling Tetrapaks and, by way of a supplementary question, asked what plans had been, or were being, put in place implemented to improve Tetrapak recycling overall?

In response, Councillor Coakley stated that a number of different Council publications had made reference to the recycling of such items, including Press Releases, Bin Stickers and Cotswold News, as part of an on-going communication programme with residents. Councillor Coakley added that the carton banks had been relocated from the Tesco car park to the Waterloo Car Park and such facility had been extended to allow the recycling of single-use coffee cups.

(3) From Councillor Jenny Hincks to Councillor Mark F Annett, Leader of the Council

'Please can the Cabinet Member give an update as to the future of Cirencester's Old Train Station building?'

Response from Councillor Annett

Periodic surveys continue to be carried out on the Old Station building to ensure that its structural and fabric integrity are maintained. Subject to survey findings, both reactive and planned works are carried out as required in line with its listed status to preserve its current condition. At present, there are no plans for refurbishment or improvement works to the building.

At the Council Meeting on 23rd February 2016, it was announced that the Council would be marketing sites for additional parking and mixed use commercial and residential development, and £75,000 was allocated for this purpose. The Old Station site was included in this work, but was not a priority site.

Officers are currently working on proposals for the Cirencester Master Plan with a view to progressing the future use of a number of Council sites, including the Old Station site. This work will build on the site allocations and policy within the emerging Local Plan, together with parking requirements.

Councillor Hincks thanked the Leader for his response and commented that the Station was an historic part of the town and expressed concern that, as part of the Cirencester Master Plan, the site was being considered for part of the parking allocation, alongside other sites including the Old Memorial Hospital.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Hincks enquired whether, as part of the Cirencester Master Plan and Local Plan, the Council could look into the feasibility of using the Old Station building for community purposes or a local charity.

In the absence of Councillor Annett from the Meeting, Councillor NJW Parsons thanked Councillor Hicks for her supplementary question and, by way of response, commented that all suggestions from members of the public regarding the use of the building would be considered. Councillor Parsons added that, as part of the Cirencester Master Plan, the Council was seeking to enable a holistic solution to the area.

(4) From Councillor Juliet Layton to Councillor SG Hirst, Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure

‘What are the figures of people denied homeless accommodation?’

Response from Councillor Hirst

In all cases where the Council has had a duty to house, and the people are of priority need, access to accommodation has been provided (in accordance with the Council’s legal duty). The figure is therefore zero.

Under Homeless Legislation, we do not have a duty to assist anyone who does not fall within any of the priority need categories. In such cases, people would be expected to resolve their own housing situation, e.g. they would need to look for privately rented accommodation. However, with non-priority need cases, we would always provide them with all the help and support that they needed and signpost them to housing options other than homelessness. This could include the Rent Deposit Scheme, Homeseeker Plus (housing allocations scheme), or other support agencies.

Councillor Layton commented that, in her view, the Council needed to do more to end the 'crisis' and, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Council held enough emergency accommodation, given the increase in spend on such accommodation. She also asked whether the Cabinet Member could supply figures of the number of priority homeless being housed by the Council and the furthest distance housing was being sourced to accommodate those registered as requiring emergency accommodation.

Councillor Hirst reported that the furthest distance that emergency accommodation had been sought was in Coventry, for a family. The Council was required to seek accommodation where it was available and he confirmed that the arrangement in this instance was acceptable to the persons involved. The Cabinet Member also undertook to provide details regarding the number of priority homeless after the Meeting.

- (5) From Councillor Juliet Layton to Councillor SG Hirst, Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure

'How much is the discretionary housing fund? Is it increasing or having larger demands on it?'

Response from Councillor Hirst

For 2017/18, the sum of £115,595 was available for discretionary housing payments. For 2018/19, we will have £110,281. Although there has been a high demand for this money, we are managing to help most customers who approach us for assistance. It is envisaged that there will be an increase in applications during the further roll-out of universal credit.

Councillor Layton referred to the fact that whilst the Council was expected to receive an increase in the number of calls in relation to Universal Credit for the coming year, the budget was less than in 2017/18. By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Layton asked how the Council was intending to mitigate the situation of eviction procedures.

In response, Councillor Hirst explained that the Discretionary Housing Payment from Government had been reduced by £5,000 and as a result, the Council was forced to use its initiative to continue to deliver an effective service. Councillor Hirst added that an evaluation had been undertaken to assess whether further officer resource was required to meet the likely increase in demand, but stated that, at present, this had not been considered necessary - existing Officers were well-trained and prepared.

- (6) From Councillor Jenny Forde to Councillor SG Hirst, Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure

'How much has been spent each year on emergency accommodation by Cotswold District Council since 2010?'

Response from Councillor Hirst

Data is only available from 2012/13, and those figures are as follows:-

2012/13	-	£23,767.66
2013/14	-	£21,317.01
2014/15	-	£18,778.29
2015/16	-	£18,236.02
2016/17	-	£62,850.40

As a generality, the costs incurred in providing emergency accommodation are recovered by the Council through housing benefit subsidy.

Councillor Forde thanked the Cabinet Member for providing the figures and commented upon what, in her opinion, was a huge increase in spending which, whilst troubling, was not unexpected. By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Forde enquired as to the reason for the 345% increase in 2016/17, and what the data for 2017/18 was looking like in comparison.

By way of response, Councillor Hirst stated that spend on emergency accommodation was dependent upon the number of cases that had to be resolved and explained the Council had a duty to resolve all demand for accommodation. Councillor Hirst confirmed he would provide figures relating to 2017/18 following the Meeting.

(7) From Councillor Jenny Forde to Councillor SG Hirst, Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure

'On average how long are people staying in emergency accommodation that Cotswold District Council are funding?'

Response from Councillor Hirst

Over the last six years, the average stay has been 40 nights.

However, for 2017/18, it is 24 nights; and we have placed 15 families.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Forde asked the Cabinet Member to provide an explanation as to why the average stay over the last six years had reduced from an average of 40 to 24 nights.

Councillor Hirst responded that the Council had a first class Revenue and Benefits service which worked hard to resolve homeless situations. The Council had been able to reduce the average stay to 24 nights largely due to the hard work of Officers, and he commended Officer for this.

(8) From Councillor Dilys Neill to Councillor Mark F Annett, Leader of the Council

'The people of Stow are not happy about an apparent lack of support which they have received over the areas that CDC can influence in Stow. Having spoken to members and officers alike there appears to be a consensus that some of this is down to the fact that CDC are so late in implementing a local plan.

Why has it taken the Conservative administration so long to produce the emerging local plan?'

Response from Councillor Annett

The Council's approach has been to front-load the plan-making process with the objective being on earliest date for adoption of the Local Plan rather than early submission of what is then judged to be unsound. The plan-making process has been a focussed exercise that has been based on proportionate and robust evidence and public scrutiny.

The public examination of the Local Plan was a critical stage in the plan-making process, where the measure of effectiveness of Local Plan preparation was whether or not it is found sound and legally compliant at examination. The Council has been mindful of neighbouring authorities that have encountered delays at examination and it is clear that soundness and legal compliance issues can lead to a timely and costly delays.

The Cotswold District Local Plan was submitted in July 2017 and is expected to conclude within 12 months of it being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Should the timetable continue to be followed this would see the examination concluding approximately 12 months earlier than the local average, which includes authorities that have continued with a Core Strategy style plan (and therefore still have the task of preparing their local borough/district plans) and authorities that have yet to progress their Community Infrastructure Levy.

Councillor Neill thanked the Leader of the Council for the response and commented that a proliferation of elderly care development in Stow-on-the-Wold had resulted in a lack of provision for young people within the town. Councillor Neill explained that the town had also lost the only site for light industrial development and stated that Sir Geoffrey Clifton Brown, MP for the Cotswolds, had criticised the Council's Local Plan. Councillor Neill questioned if there was a need for a report to be generated and questioned if the Local Plan could have been implemented in a shorter period of time.

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Neill asked if there was any intention to review the time taken to implement the Council's Local Plan and the possible effects the time period had had on planning in the District.

In the absence of Councillor Annett from the Meeting, Councillor NJW Parsons responded. Councillor Parsons explained that the reasons for the time taken in relation to the Council's Local Plan had been identified and well-

rehearsed in previous Council Meetings. Councillor Parsons stated he was pleased that the Inspector had not found any fundamental issues with the Plan as submitted and that, consequently, as Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning, he was able to work in conjunction with the Council's Forward Planning Team to deal with any minor changes. Councillor Parsons added that the Council was embarking on a consultation with Members, stakeholders and residents regarding the Plan as there was a need to balance aspirations of local people, landowners and developers.

(9) From Councillor Dilys Neill to Councillor Mark F Annett, Leader of the Council

'Who decides on the content of the section 106 agreements and why are Town and Parish Councils often not consulted? What review is undertaken of the section 106 after the development has taken place and why is no provision made to obtain further contributions from developers who make much larger profits than was originally anticipated?'

Response from Councillor Annett

The consideration of Section 106 (S106) contributions (otherwise known as planning obligations) is dictated by national planning policy guidance. Para 204 of the relevant guidance states that:-

"Planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. These tests are set out as statutory tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 [the CIL Regulations] and as policy tests in the National Planning Policy Framework."

In the context of the above, the content of S106 agreements is determined by firstly applying Local Plan policy requirements, for example in respect of affordable housing provision or other specific policies where there is a requirement for contributions. The need for policy-related contributions results from consultations with technical bodies, such as the County Council (e.g. in respect education). The latter contributions are usually calculated on the basis of well-established formulae. In addition to technical consultations, the Council will also have regard to responses from the local community, primarily through the town and parish councils, in terms of the impacts of a proposed development, and will therefore consider opportunities for contributions to local projects to mitigate those impacts provided that seeking those contributions would meet the test set out in the CIL Regulations. To ensure that contributions to local projects stand up to potential challenge, the projects need to be appropriately costed and defined. Any S106 provisions that are not robust run the risk of being overturned on appeal or legal challenge. It is also important to note

that contributions are subject to demonstration of impact on the viability of the development.

The obligations set out within a S106 agreement are subject to triggers, e.g. the occupation of a certain number of dwellings. This is monitored by the Council or, in the case of education, library and highways obligations, by the County Council.

S106 agreements can include a “review mechanism” which enables the viability of a development to be reviewed at certain stages.

However, the inclusion of a review mechanism within a S106 agreement can actually have a negative impact upon the viability of a development because they cause uncertainty for prospective developers purchasing development sites, resulting in lower land values. This, in turn, can have implications for the amount of affordable housing that can be secured or other obligations. Review mechanisms can also result in delays to the delivery of housing.

Councillor Neill expressed the view that consultation with town and parish councils did not often happen and, by way of supplementary question, asked, if no review process was being implemented, how the Council was aware that the Section 106 agreements contained the correct content.

In the absence of Councillor Annett from the Meeting, Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington responded. Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington stated that, throughout the Local Plan, there had been extensive consultation, including all town and parish councils, to ensure each had an opportunity to input into the Local Plan.

(10) From Councillor JA Harris to Councillor Mark F Annett, Leader of the Council

‘Please can the Leader supply me with figures for each year since 2010 detailing how much money the government have cut from the revenue support grant to this Council?’

Response from Councillor Annett

The attached table compares the value of Revenue Support Grant funding from 2010/10 to 2018/19. The Local Government funding model changed significantly in 2013/14 with the introduction of 50% Business Rate Retention and the move from Council Tax Benefit to Local Council Tax Support. In order to make a like for like comparison of core central government funding, the table includes the value of cash grants paid to the Council which were subsequently rolled into Revenue Support Grant and Retained Business Rates. The cash grants are shown for the years when a cash payment was made. In the following years the funding is included in either Revenue Support Grant or Retained Business rates. This provides a clearer picture of cuts to core government funding.*

The impact of New Homes Bonus, Rural Services Delivery Grant and the 100% Business Rates Pilot for 2018/19 is not included.

* Note: A copy of the table is attached to the signed copy of the Minutes.

By way of supplementary question, Councillor Harris asked if the Leader still considered that the Cotswold District Council had been one of the most unfairly treated Councils in the County and if he considered the Council's 'luck was about to run out'?

In the absence of Councillor Annett, Councillor Stowe responded. Councillor Stowe acknowledged that, in recent years, the Council had received a generous Rural Services Delivery Grant from government, and had benefitted from New Homes Bonus. However, prudent and pro-active budget management, coupled with initiatives such as joint working, had enabled the Council to respond positively to reductions in central government funding.

(11) From Councillor JA Harris to Councillor Mark F Annett, Leader of the Council

'How much have CDC made from Parking Charges in Cirencester since May 2015?'

Response from Councillor Annett

Car park income and expenditure figures are published on our website.

However, the figures for the whole years 2015/16 and 2016/17, apportioned to relate to Cirencester car parks only, are set out below:-

<i>Financial year</i>	<i>Income</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Net</i>
<i>2015/16</i>	<i>£2,123,938</i>	<i>£888,740</i>	<i>£1,235,198</i>
<i>2016/17</i>	<i>£1,960,763</i>	<i>£889,317</i>	<i>£1,071,446</i>

Figures are therefore from April 2015.

The full-year figures for 2017/18 are not yet complete/available.

Councillor Harris expressed the view that, from studying the figures, he considered that Cirencester was being used as a 'cash-cow' for the Council and, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Cabinet Member could provide commitment that any profit from car parking charges in Cirencester would be reinvested into car parking in Cirencester?

In the absence of Councillor Annett, Councillor Hancock responded. Councillor Hancock explained that car parking charges were spent for the benefit of the District, across a wide range of services, which included public toilets, community safety, abandoned vehicle collection, litter collection and cleaning, street naming and environment protection.

CL.71 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

CL.72 DRAFT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2018/19 TO 2021/22 AND BUDGET 2018/19, CAPITAL AND REVENUE BUDGETS 2018/19

In the absence of Councillor Annett, Councillor Stowe presented this item. In so doing, he thanked the Chief Finance Officer and her team for their work on the budget. Councillor Stowe also referred to the responses to the public consultation on the proposed budget which, he considered, indicated that the respondents had broadly supported the proposals. Councillor Stowe also drew attention to the updated report which had been circulated, reflecting the recommendations of the Cabinet and the final Local Government Finance Settlement figures.

Councillor Stowe amplified aspects of the circulated report, drawing specific attention to the key budget elements recommended by the Cabinet, as follows:-

- the District Council element of Council Tax for 2018/19 be frozen at its 2017/18 level;
- a one-off sum of £60,000 be provided for work on the Cirencester Town Centre Master Plan;
- a one-off sum of £75,000 be provided for implementing the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- a one-off sum of £60,000 be provided for additional resources within Development Control to assist with the management of workloads;
- a one-off sum of £34,000 be provided to enable a grants scheme for youth projects to be established (with each member to be allocated a sum of £1,000);
- a sum of £260,000 be set aside from the revenue budget surplus to contribute towards the funding of the decked car park at The Waterloo, Cirencester.

In addition, the recommended budget proposals provided for (i) a continuation of the freeze on parking charges at all CDC-owned car parks; (ii) a continuation of the freeze on the cost of garden waste licences; (iii) an extension of the 'free after 3 pm' parking scheme until the end of March 2019 at selected car parks across the District, including in Bourton-on-the-Water, Cirencester, Moreton-in-Marsh, Stow-on-the-Wold, and Tetbury; and (iv) further investment into Council vehicles, waste collection and replacement bins. Councillor Stowe was delighted to report that all proposals could be achieved without any reduction in front-line services.

Councillor Stowe reported that the planned freeze on the authority's share of local residents' council tax payments for 2018/19, followed a freeze for 2017/18 and 2016/17, a 5% cut in 2015/16, a 3% cut in 2014/15 and a 5% reduction in 2013/14. This meant that the actual amount being charged for a Band D council tax payer - without cutting front-line services - had been reduced by £17.98 per year (12%) over a period stretching back to 2010/11. Even more significantly, the £126.40 charge was on a par with what residents were paying back in 2005 and, taking the average annual inflation rate into

account, represented a real terms reduction of about 45%, saving tax payers about £50 per year.

Councillor Stowe then referred to the investment in the Waterloo decked car park and informed the Council that this represented the largest capital investment the Council had made to date. He explained that the proposal was for the £15m investment in the car parking to be funded by £7.5m through borrowing, £2.5m through the use of the New Homes Bonus and £5m through the use of Capital Receipts. Councillor Stowe then apprised the Council of the Capital and Treasury Management Strategies, and explained that the Capital Strategy was a new requirement for the Council from 2018/19 and, as such, the document as presented was a working draft and would be subject to further work during 2018/19.

With particular reference to the advance budget proposals put forward by the Liberal Democrat Group, as contained within the circulated report, Councillor Stowe commented that, whilst he had a lot of sympathy for the Changing Places initiative, the requirements promoted by the initiative were already contained within existing Council policy and that, accordingly, enhanced facilities would be most likely incorporated into future public convenience provision, including within the Waterloo decked car park. Councillor Stowe added that more information would also be required if existing facilities were required to be altered. Councillor Stowe stated that he was unable to support the second proposal - a £100,000 one-off funding sum in order to undertake a scoping exercise to research the increased provision of social housing within the District - as work had already been undertaken by the Council and he considered there to be no reason to duplicate such work.

In conclusion, Councillor Stowe expressed the view that the recommended budget represented great news for the people of the Cotswolds, and formally Proposed the Budget and Capital and Revenue Budgets.

Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington Seconded the Proposition.

Councillor JA Harris, the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group was invited to respond to the Proposed Budget and explained his Group wished to Propose five amendments, including the two that had been notified in advance. Details of all amendments were circulated. Councillor Harris requested that the Council adjourn for a period of time to allow Members to consider and discuss the amendments. The Chairman agreed to such request and adjourned the Meeting.

When the Meeting reconvened, Councillor JA Harris commented that he considered the presented Budget provided a sense of déjà vu. He believed that the Budget was 'reactionary', lacked ambition and contained no clear plan; and, as a result, the Council simply 'bounced' from crisis to crisis. Councillor Harris drew attention to Council's poor rating in the Social Mobility Commission report of November 2017, due to the lack of approach to tackling crime in the District and poor approach to youth mobility in England. With reference to the investment in the Waterloo decked car park, Councillor Harris praised those Members from the Liberal Democrat Group who had contributed as part of the Council's Parking Board, but expressed concern that the Council was putting parking before people. Councillor Harris added that the package of amendments presented had made a disappointing Budget slightly better, but stated that he disagreed with Councillor Stowe about

Revenue Support Grant and believed that any amount received from the New Homes Bonus should be reinvested where the amount has been raised.

The Council was then invited to consider the five amendments to the Proposed Budget, one-by-one, as follows:-

- That the Council agrees to provide up to £50,000 in support of the national Changing Places Initiative, to install two bespoke changing facility units for the disabled (ideally one in the north and one in the south of the District);
- That the Council makes available a one-off sum of £100,000 to undertake a scoping exercise to look at how social housing provision in the Cotswolds could be increased;
- That the Council makes a £20,000 one-off contribution to set up a two-year trial from September 2018 to July 2020 to provide free sanitary provision to all schools and colleges in the District in order to alleviate period poverty; the trial would inform whether the scheme should remain a Council priority and be funded on a long-term basis;
- That the proposed Youth Activities Funding be increased from the figure of £1,000 per Member to £1,500 per Member - the total budget effect being £51,000;
- That the Council Tax Support Grant to town and parish councils be reinstated for 2018/19, at a cost of £31,143, in view of the substantial sums available to the District Council through the Rural Services Delivery Grant, New Homes Bonus and retained Business Rates income.

Councillor Harris Proposed the first Amendment, relating to the Changing Places initiative. In so doing, he expressed the view that a situation currently existed where disabled people were being changed on toilet floors, owing to the lack of bespoke disabled facilities currently in existence. He therefore proposed that two facilities, situated in the north and south of the District, be installed so that, in future, no one had to be subjected to a loss of dignity. Councillor Harris was pleased that this had now been written in to Council policy, and would assist in the future, but stated that there was a real need for the service now and that a pro-active approach was required of the Council to demonstrate support for those who needed the facilities.

Councillor Juliet Layton Seconded the Amendment. Councillor Layton commented that she considered herself very fortunate that she had never had to experience changing an adult in the current facilities and that she considered it 'a crying shame' that provision was not being looked at immediately. Councillor Layton informed the Council that those who required these facilities were currently forced to research the location of suitable facilities prior to leaving their homes, and added that the required facilities consisted of a 3 by 4 metre room with a lift, bench and other standard disabled facilities; and that these facilities could be accommodated in sports and leisure places alongside schools and colleges. In conclusion, Councillor Layton expressed the view that approving the Amendment would put the

Cotswolds 'on the map' whilst voting against the Amendment would be seen as discriminatory against disabled people and their carers.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure explained that when the Initiative had been discussed by the Cabinet, it had expressed its support for the initiative, but advised that information received from the Changing Places Initiative had highlighted the view that it was more suitable to provide new facilities to a new specification rather than seek to adapt and refurbish existing facilities. The Cabinet Member concluded that he would be undertaking an inspection of all public conveniences in the week commencing 19th March 2018 and confirmed that any future toilet facilities created would incorporate all necessary disabled facilities.

A Member commented that, given the policy and recent investment in the Corinium Museum, the venue could prove a suitable location for the installation of the new facilities. The Cabinet Member responded that he had considered the venue as one of the key opportunities for such facilities in the District and informed the Council that he would be compiling a comprehensive list of all suitable locations, and would welcome suggestions for sites from other Members.

Another Member expressed the view that the Council held sufficient funds to refurbish existing toilet facilities and reiterated the risk of 'social exclusion' that the lack of facilities currently presented.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Partnerships explained that many of the buildings considered by the Liberal Democrat Group for the installation of the new facilities were not under the Council's control, largely being community buildings. The Cabinet Member therefore suggested that those in control of such buildings could submit applications for the installation of enhanced toilet facilities within them.

In conclusion, Councillor JA Harris stated that he could not understand why the Council always sought to take the 'long way round' to matters and expressed the view that the Council could fund a programme of improvements to its existing facilities, if it so wished.

On being put to the vote, the First Amendment was LOST.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the First Amendment. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, M Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 12;

Against: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Sue Coakley, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, SDE Parsons, Lynden Stowe, R Theodoulou and LR Wilkins - Total: 20;

Abstentions: Total: 0;

Absent: Councillors Mark F Annett and Tina Stevenson - Total: 2.

Councillor Harris then Proposed the Second Amendment, in relation to the proposed scoping exercise to look at how social housing provision in the Cotswolds could be increased. In so doing, he drew attention to the severe difficulties faced by young people in getting on the housing ladder or even being able to rent a property within the District. Councillor Harris shared the view that the Council should start building social housing again and expressed extreme disappointment that the recently-approved Chesterton application would provide only 70 social rented properties. Councillor Harris explained that he did not believe that a home within the District with a value of £300,000 could ever be considered affordable and urged the Council to deliver affordable homes via the only option of social rented properties. In conclusion, Councillor Harris made reference to work being undertaken by Cheltenham Borough Council, Forest of Dean District Council, West Oxfordshire District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council in response to this 'issue' and reminded Members that the Amendment presented sought to ensure money was spent on the delivery of, not research into, affordable homes.

Councillor Neill Seconded the Amendment. She stated that the recent Gloucestershire 2050 event had highlighted the issue that 400 people under the age of 25 were leaving the County every year; and raised the issue of the future care of elderly residents within the District. In conclusion, Councillor Neill explained the issue would 'only get worse with time'.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, Health and Leisure responded by questioning what was meant by a 'scoping' exercise and commented that, in his view, this meant research. The Cabinet Member explained that, of the recently-completed 300 affordable homes, two-thirds had been for rent and the remainder shared-ownership. The Council was working towards increasing social rented housing in the District.

A Member expressed his view that, as the Cotswolds was the second most unaffordable area in the Country, it was vital that this issue was addressed to help mitigate the continuous impact of rising property prices within the District.

Another Member expressed the view that housing was built based on need and that the Council had had success in achieving figures of 'affordable housing'. In this connection, he commented that the Local Plan Inspector's target of 157 affordable homes per year was substantial, but achievable; although he did have doubts as to whether such provision could be achieved from properties provided by developers alone. In any event, there was a need for urgent action.

The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that the Council had received an allocation of £800,000 to assist with investigations into the provision of social housing. The Cabinet Member also explained that different situations pertained across Districts, for example Forest of Dean District Council had a situation where there was unwanted land, whereas land was at a premium in Cotswold District.

A Member agreed with the view that 'affordable' housing within the District was expensive, though stated that the market responded to need and the

high level of need had resulted in the 'unaffordable' prices. Various Members also commented that parishes and towns had conducted housing need surveys, which could be achieved at low cost and did not require high levels of research. These Members questioned why this had not been undertaken in Cirencester.

In conclusion, Councillor JA Harris commented that some families within the District had faced Christmas homeless, which represented an unacceptable situation; reiterated that he did not consider the proposed exercise to be a waste of money; and expressed the view that the Council faced a huge problem regarding the very poorest people in society and that the Council was not being proactive enough in tackling the issue.

On being put to the vote, the Second Amendment was LOST.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the Amendment. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, M Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 12;

Against: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Sue Coakley, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, SDE Parsons, Lynden Stowe, R Theodoulou and LR Wilkins - Total: 20;

Abstentions: Total: 0;

Absent: Councillors Mark F Annett and Tina Stevenson - Total: 2.

Councillor Jenny Forde then Proposed the Third Amendment. In so doing, she explained that 1 in 10 girls could not afford hygiene products and that whilst the issue had previously been a hidden scandal, the fact was now in the open and there was therefore no excuse to ignore the matter. Councillor Forde explained that rural isolation and poverty had resulted in some girls being faced with the choice between eating and keeping clean, and expressed her view that period poverty should outrage everyone. Councillor Forde was asking the Council to end the silence of period poverty and take another step towards the Cotswolds becoming a fairer society.

Councillor Doherty Seconded the Amendment; and added that some girls at primary school age from poorer backgrounds were already facing difficulties in affording everyday sanitary items.

Councillor Stowe stated that he had great sympathy for anyone in this situation and explained that a similar Motion regarding the possibility of 'free for all' sanitary provision had been presented to Gloucestershire County Council at its Meeting in February 2018. Councillor Stowe explained that, given the 3,500 schools and colleges within the County, the figure proposed in the Motion would do little to solve the situation. He added that the County

Council had decided to target support to the Support Groups which existed within the County to determine if there was a further need for investment.

The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that she considered 'period poverty' was not right, but also stated that adult women, in addition to young girls in schools and colleges, also faced difficulties in this regard and expressed the view that all deserved the Council's support. The Cabinet Member added she was pleased Gloucestershire County Council had agreed to provide £50,000 by way of targeted support and explained that, if this figure was found to be insufficient, organisations should be encouraged to approach Cotswold District Council to support the scheme further in the District.

A Member expressed his disappointment at the responses, stating that 'period poverty' was causing crippling mental effects on those affected, and urging Members to provide a universal service instead of targeting support.

Various Members expressed their concern at the risk of 'period poverty' and supported assistance being provided to those in need. However, there were other issues poverty generally, and the proposed delivery mechanism disregarded the decision already taken by Gloucestershire County Council.

Other Members supported the Amendment, stating that the NHS already provided incontinence pads for the elderly and that menstruation was not a choice for those affected.

In conclusion, Councillor Forde stated that the provision of sanitary equipment in schools and colleges would address inequality and would help eradicate barriers to learning, including social and mental health and social mobility.

On being put to the vote, the Third Amendment was LOST.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the Amendment. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, M Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 12;

Against: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Sue Coakley, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, SDE Parsons, Lynden Stowe, R Theodoulou and LR Wilkins - Total: 20;

Abstentions: - Total: 0;

Absent: Councillors Mark F Annett and Tina Stevenson - Total: 2.

Councillor Robbins then Proposed the Fourth Amendment, relating to increased Youth Activities Funding. In so doing, he explained that an increase in funding from £1,000 to £1,500 per Ward Member would enable Members to spend amounts, and support projects, similar to when the £50,000 fund had been provided by Gloucestershire County Council; and

would also enable more meaningful virement between Ward Members to fund significant or strategic projects.

Councillor JA Harris Seconded the Amendment, adding that the fund had previously enabled successful projects and that the Amendment would result in the total funds allocated to Ward Members being higher than previously provided by Gloucestershire County Council. Councillor Harris provided information relating to a number of explained to projects that had been supported in his own Ward, and expressed the view that the Amendment was a clear way of addressing social mobility on a small scale.

Councillor Stowe explained that funding for the year 2018/19 would represent a higher amount than 2017/18 and explained that a figure of £1,000 per Ward Member had been arrived at having regard to the fact that there had not been universal use of the Fund by Ward Members.

A Member expressed disappointment at the loss of the National and Youth Facilities Fund previously provided by Gloucestershire County Council, but acknowledged that, in times of funding pressures, non-statutory services were inevitably at risk.

The Cabinet Member for Forward Planning reminded the Council of the various funding initiatives available through the Council, and asked all Members to encourage applications on behalf of residents and communities.

In conclusion, Councillor Robbins stated that he was pleased that an option of virement would exist between Ward Members, and still believed that a need clearly existed for an increase to the funding.

On being put to the vote, the Fourth Amendment was LOST.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the Amendment. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, M Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 12;

Against: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, SDE Parsons, Lynden Stowe and LR Wilkins - Total: 18;

Abstentions: Total: 0;

Absent: - Councillors Mark F Annett, Sue Coakley, Tina Stevenson and Ray Theodoulou - Total: 4.

Councillor Coleman then Proposed the Fifth Amendment. In so doing, he explained that the reinstatement of the Council Tax Support Grant in 2018//19, at a relatively small cost of £31,143, would enable the phased return of funding to town and parish councils to assist residents in the District.

Councillor M Harris Seconded the Amendment, and informed the Council that he fully supported the Amendment and echoed the comments made by Councillor Coleman.

Councillor Stowe reminded Members that town and parish councils within the District had been given three years' notice of the planned withdrawal of funding support, but recognised that some of the larger town councils had faced a bigger impact as a result. Councillor Stowe explained that funds were finite, and drew attention to other community funds provided by the Council that could help with local initiatives.

A Member expressed his support for the Amendment, explaining that local councils in the large market towns within the District had been most affected and would benefit greatly from the small amounts proposed in the Amendment.

In conclusion, Councillor Coleman explained the Amendment sought to ensure that town and parish councils were not disadvantaged further, and he believed that local councils had a 'wealth of knowledge' so as to enable the funding to be distributed effectively.

On being put to the vote, the Fifth Amendment was LOST.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the Amendment. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, M Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 12;

Against: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, Lynden Stowe and LR Wilkins - Total: 17;

Abstentions: Councillor SDE Parsons, Total: 1;

Absent: Councillors Mark F Annett, Sue Coakley, Tina Stevenson and Ray Theodoulou - Total: 4.

Councillor JA Harris expressed his disappointment that the Amendments suggested by the Liberal Democrat Group had not been accepted. Councillor Harris considered such Amendments to have been of value and believed that they would have helped tackle social exclusion and isolation within the District. Nevertheless, Councillor Harris thanked Officers for their work in relation to the Budget and stated that he still believed the Cotswolds to be the best place to live in the Country. Councillor Harris expressed the view that the Council was 'playing fast' with the finances and the continuous freeze in Council Tax was purely an attempt to get the lowest tax possible, notwithstanding other needs. In conclusion, Councillor Harris stated that the freeze helped only the privileged few within the District and that there was now consequently a need for a pro-active Council to ensure all residents received the services they desired and needed, with people put before politics.

Councillor Stowe stated that he took issue with comments made by Councillor JA Harris and explained the Council had been the most prudent authority since 2003. Councillor Stowe highlighted the New Homes Bonus monies, which had enabled £4 million to be put in reserves, which had consequently put the Council in an extraordinarily beneficial position. In concluding his response to Councillor Harris, Councillor Stowe explained that the Council was now in the top 25 Councils with the lowest council tax level and that this achievement reflected the hard work of the Conservative Group who served the Council.

A Member expressed the view that, if Council Tax was raised, the Council could transform services, with particular emphasis on social housing within the District.

Another Member felt that the surplus in New Homes Bonus monies represented a planning failure, and reported that he had received various comments from residents in relation to restrictions of the planning department owing to the department's workload. The Member also stated that the Council appeared to be transferring many services across to already stretched town councils.

In formally proposing the Substantive Budget Motion, Councillor Stowe expressed his confidence that residents of the District would support the Budget and highlighted the fact that less than one-third of the respondents to the budget consultation had supported an increase in Council Tax. In conclusion, he believed that residents would benefit from the budget proposals over the next 12 months.

RESOLVED that, subject to the amendments recommended by the Cabinet, as outlined at the Meeting:

- (i) the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2018/19 to 2021/22, attached at Appendix 'A' to the updated circulated report, be approved;**
- (ii) the Capital Programme for 2018/19 to 2020/21, as detailed in section 11 of the updated circulated report, and attached at Appendix 'B' thereto, be approved;**
- (iii) the Net Budget Requirement for 2018/19, as detailed at paragraph 9.1 of the updated circulated report, and the Detailed Budget attached at Appendix 'B' thereto, be approved;**
- (iv) the Pay Policy Statement for 2018/19, attached at Appendix 'D' to the updated circulated report, be approved;**
- (v) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2018/19, attached at Appendix 'E' to the updated circulated report, be approved;**
- (vi) the Capital Strategy 2018/19, attached at Appendix 'F' to the updated circulated report, be approved.**

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of the Substantive Motion. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, SDE Parsons, NJW Parsons, Lynden Stowe and LR Wilkins - Total: 18;

Against: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 11;

Abstentions: Councillor M Harris, Total: 1;

Absent: Councillors Mark F Annett, Sue Coakley, Tina Stevenson and Ray Theodoulou - Total: 4.

CL.73 COUNCIL TAX 2018/19

In the absence of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stowe introduced this item, drawing attention to the updated report which had been circulated, reflecting the revised recommendations of the Cabinet and incorporating a freeze in the District Council element of Council Tax, and the Budget for 2018/19 approved by the Council under the previous item of business.

The Head of Paid Service advised that an appropriate reference should be included within recommendation (8) to reflect the fact that such officers could be retained Officers of the Council, employed by Publica or employed on a joint contract.

It was duly Proposed, Seconded and

RESOLVED that:

- (1) for the purposes of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 Section 35(2), there are no special expenses for the District Council in 2018/19;**
- (2) it be noted that, using her delegated authority, the Chief Finance Officer calculated the Council Tax Base for 2018/19:**
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 40,297.79 (item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and**
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish Precept relates as in the attached Schedule 1.**
- (3) the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2018/19 (excluding Parish Precepts) is £126.40;**
- (4) the following amounts be calculated for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-**

- (a) £44,330,460 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (2) of the Act, taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils and any additional special expenses.
- (b) £36,307,692 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act.
- (c) £8,022,768 being the amount by which the aggregate at 4(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 4(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement of the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
- (d) £199.09 being the amount at 4(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts and Special Expenses);
- (e) £2,929,126 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish Precepts and Special Expenses) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as per the attached Schedule 2;
- (f) £126.40 being the amount at 4(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 4(e) above by Item T(1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish Precept or special item relates;
- (g) the amounts shown in Schedule 2 being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 4(f) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area shown in Schedule 2 divided in each case by the amount at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one of more special items relate;
- (h) the amounts shown in Schedule 3 being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 4(f) and 4(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;
- (5) it be noted that for the year 2018/19 the Gloucestershire County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire have issued precepts to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of

the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated below:-

Valuation Band	Gloucestershire County Council	Police and Crime Commissioner
	£	£
A	821.47	150.99
B	958.39	176.16
C	1,095.30	201.32
D	1,232.21	226.49
E	1,506.03	276.82
F	1,779.86	327.15
G	2,053.68	377.48
H	2,464.42	452.98

(6) the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in Schedule 4 as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2018/19 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

(7) the Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2018/19 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

(8) the Chief Finance Officer, Principal Solicitor, Legal Executive, Group Manager Revenues and Welfare Support, Joint Operations Manager, Joint Support Lead Officer, Overpayments Officer, Senior Recovery Revenues Officer, Senior Revenues Officer, Revenues Officer and Recovery Officer (whether retained Officers of the Council, employed by Publica, or employed by virtue of a joint contract) be authorised to:-

- (a) collect and recover any National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax, and**
- (b) prosecute or defend on the Council's behalf or to appear on its behalf in proceedings before a magistrate's court in respect of unpaid National Non-Domestic Rates and Council Tax.**

Record of Voting - for 19, against 10, abstentions 1, absent 4.

Note:

In accordance with legislative requirements, a Recorded Vote was taken in respect of this item. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: - Councillors SI Andrews, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, M Harris, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, NJW Parsons, SDE Parsons, Lynden Stowe and LR Wilkins - Total: 19;

Against: - Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Andrew Doherty, Jenny Forde, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and NP Robbins - Total: 11;

Abstentions: - JA Harris, Total: 1;

Absent: - Councillors Mark F Annett, Sue Coakley, Tina Stevenson and Ray Theodoulou - Total: 4.

CL. 74 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS - CIRENCESTER TOWN COUNCIL AND UPPER RISSINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Council was requested to consider undertaking further Community Governance Reviews in relation to potential increases in the number of councillors to be elected to the Cirencester Town Council and Upper Rissington Parish Council; and the potential introduction of warding arrangements in Upper Rissington. The changes to governance arrangements had been requested by the relevant local councils.

The circulated report of the Head of Democratic Services set out the background to the review requests, and how these linked in with previous reviews undertaken at parish/town level; the detailed proposals; review considerations; and the review process, including timelines.

RESOLVED that the Council agrees to undertake Community Governance Reviews in relation to:-

- (i) a potential increase in the overall number of councillors on Cirencester Town Council to 16 (from 15) by way of an increase, from one to two, in the number of councillors to represent the New Mills Ward;**
- (ii) a potential an increase in the overall number of councillors on Upper Rissington Parish Council from seven to either nine or eleven; and the potential division of the parish into wards for the election of those councillors;**

as set out in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.13 of the circulated report.

Record of Voting - for 30, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 4.

CL.75 ISSUES/ REPORTS ARISING FROM CABINET

There were no further issues/reports arising from the Cabinet.

CL.76 ISSUES/REPORTS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND/OR AUDIT

There were no issues/reports arising from Overview and Scrutiny and/or Audit.

CL.77 NOTICE OF MOTIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, the following Motion (Motion 12/2018) regarding the use of plastics had been Proposed by Councillor AR Brassington and Seconded by Councillor NP Robbins:-

‘This Council notes with concern:-

- That 300 million tons of new plastic is made each year, half of which is for single use plastic such as packaging and convenience foods. In many cases, such as plastic straws, takeaway food containers and coffee cups, there are practical alternatives available that are either reusable or sustainable.
- That in 2016, the Ellen MacArthur Foundation estimated that by weight, there could be more plastic in our oceans than fish, as soon as 2050. As plastics are durable and strong they will stay in our environment for up to an estimated 600 years. (Columbia University)
- That marine plastic leads to coastal / offshore dead zones, entanglement, death through ingestion, toxic transfer and, once degraded into micro plastics, contamination of the food chain - including our own. We are quite literally eating the plastic that has ended up in our seas.

The Council welcomes:-

- The significant increase in recycling achieved in the District in the last decade, through improvements to doorstep recycling.
- The success of the ‘Plastic Bag Levy’, put forward by the Liberal Democrats during the Coalition Government, which has led to an 85% reduction in disposable plastic bag usage.

This Council therefore commits that Cotswold District Council will play its full role in helping to reduce plastic waste, specifically:

- That the Council will undertake an audit, within existing resources, of single use plastics used by the Authority seek to replace with sustainable or reusable alternatives where practicable.
- That the Council will play its role in helping to educate members of the public about plastic waste, specifically by including information for members on the public of reducing plastic waste in both online and written materials.
- That the Council will use its membership of the Gloucestershire Waste Authority to work towards increasing the amount of plastic product that can be recycled through doorstep and other recycling.

- To write our Member of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament, and to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, urging them to consider legislation and regulations which will reduce the amount of single use plastic used by society.
- To use the links we have with businesses in the Cotswolds to encourage them to reduce the amount of plastic waste produced and specifically to write to each of our major supermarkets asking them to consider introducing a 'plastic free aisle' in their Cotswold store(s) on a trial basis.'

The Chairman referred to his comments made earlier in the Meeting that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, once Proposed and Seconded, the formal Motion would stand referred to the Cabinet.

According, following a brief introduction to the Motion by way of formal proposal and seconding, the Motion stood referred to the Cabinet; it being noted that, in accordance with the Council's procedures and custom and practice, Councillors Brassington and Robbins would be invited to attend the Cabinet Meeting to present and speak to their Motion.

CL.78 SEALING OF DOCUMENTS

RESOLVED that the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to all contracts, conveyances and any other documents necessary for carrying into effect all resolutions passed by the Council.

Record of Voting - for 30, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 4.

The Meeting commenced at 10.03 a.m., adjourned between 11.30 a.m. and 11.50 a.m., and closed at 2.00 p.m.

Chairman

(END)