

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING

25<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019

Present:

Councillor Dilys Neill

- Vice-Chair (in the Chair)

Councillors -

Stephen Andrews  
Mark Annett (until 4.00 p.m.)  
Julian Beale  
Claire Bloomer  
Tony Berry  
Ray Brassington  
Patrick Coleman (until 7.30 p.m.)  
Rachel Coxcoon  
Tony Dale  
Andrew Doherty  
Mike Evemy  
Jenny Forde (until 7.55 p.m.)  
Joe Harris  
Mark Harris  
Nikki Ind  
Stephen Hirst

Roly Hughes  
Robin Hughes  
Sue Jepson  
Julia Judd  
Richard Keeling  
Juliet Layton  
Andrew Maclean  
Nick Maunder  
Richard Morgan  
Richard Norris  
Gary Selwyn  
Lisa Spivey  
Ray Theodoulou (from 6.10 p.m.)  
Steve Trotter  
Clive Webster

Apologies:

Gina Blomefield

Nigel Robbins

CL.26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Berry declared an interest in respect of Agenda Item (13A) Urgent Item - Corinium Museum Stone Age to Corinium Project, as he was a Committee Member of the Friends of the Museum. He left the room while the item was being determined.

Councillor Brassington declared an interest in respect of Motion 9 2019/20 re: A417, as he was a Member of the A419 Noise Action Group.

Councillor Spivey declared an interest in respect of Motion 9 2019/20 re: A417, as she was also a Member of the A419 Noise Action Group.

Councillor Evemy declared an interest in respect of Motion 9 of 2019/20 re: A417, as he had previously attended a meeting of the A417 Noise Action Group and was also a resident whose property was affected by the levels of noise on the road.

Councillors Bloomer and Mark Harris both declared an interest in respect of Exempt Agenda Item (18), as they were regularly in discussions with the landowner regarding parking provision within Cirencester.

Councillor Berry declared an interest in respect of Exempt Agenda Item (18), as a large part of his Ward was within the ownership of the landowner and he also communicated with the landowner on a variety of Council matters.

Councillor Judd declared an interest in respect of Exempt Agenda Item (18), as she socialised regularly with the landowner. She left the room while the item was being determined.

There were no declarations of interest by Officers.

#### CL.27 MINUTES

##### **RESOLVED that:**

**(a) subject to the following amendments, the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019 be approved as a correct record;**

- (i) deletion of the name of 'Mike Every' from the list of Members present on page 11 of the Minutes, and its inclusion within the list of 'Apologies' on page 11;**
- (ii) addition of the name of 'Mike Every' in the list of Members absent on the recorded vote on page 13 of the Minutes, and the record of voting be amended accordingly, so the total number of Members absent for the vote to be '8'.**

**Record of Voting - for 28, against 0, abstentions 3, absent 3.**

**(b) subject to the addition of the name of 'Julian Beale' in the list of Members present on page 15 of the Minutes, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019 be approved as a correct record.**

**Record of Voting - for 28, against 1, abstentions 3, absent 2.**

#### CL.28 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR, LEADER OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

##### **(i) From the Chair**

- Filming/Recording of Proceedings - the Chair referred to the standing notification previously received from a member of the public of the intention to film the Council Meeting; and stated that, accordingly, the Council would make its own audio recording of the proceedings.
- Member Behaviour at Meetings - the Chair reminded Members of the requirement to be brief and succinct when asking questions or making comments and to observe courtesy and to not interrupt other speakers. She also reminded Members of the rules of the BBC Radio 4 quiz 'Just a Minute' and in doing so asked Members to observe the

quiz's rules of 'no repetition, deviation or hesitation', which she hoped would help to assist with the large number of items required to be dealt with at the Meeting.

- Exempt Agenda Item (18) - Property Matter - the Chair informed Members that this item would require a vote by the Council to exclude any Public and Press from the Meeting prior to discussion and a decision on this item.
- Corinium Museum - "Stone Age to Corinium" - the Chair informed Members of an urgent item relating to the Corinium Museum, which had been circulated to all Members and Officers prior to the Meeting; which would be dealt with immediately following Agenda Item (13) on the Meeting's Agenda.
- Council Motions - the Chair informed Members that all Motions would be debated at the Meeting with the exception of Motion 11 of 2019/20 re: Leisure Facilities in Fairford and Tetbury which would stand referred to Cabinet owing to the expenditure requested and the requirement for more background detail.
- Acting Vice-Chair - the Chair informed Members that as she would be Chairing the Meeting in the absence of the Chair, Councillor Layton would act as Vice-Chair to the Meeting and would record any intention of Members who wished to speak at the Meeting.

(ii) Leader's Announcements

- July Council Meeting - the Leader apologised to Members for his absence from the Council Meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019 and explained that he had instead been attending the Local Government Association (LGA) Conference. He wished to extend an invitation to Members of other political parties to attend the Conference next year, as he had found attendance to be very beneficial.
- Jan Britton, Managing Director Designate of Publica - the Leader welcomed Jan Britton, soon to be the new Managing Director of Publica, to the Meeting. The Leader explained that he, as Leader of the Council, had served on the appointment panel alongside the Council Leaders from the other partner Councils. The Leader explained that Mr. Britton had a long career of local government service and explained that he looked forward to working with Mr. Britton to tackle topics such as Publica accountability to the Council and to ensure smooth governance.
- Corporate Peer Challenge - the Leader reminded Members of the Corporate Peer Challenge which would take place in November 2019.
- Local Plan Review - the Leader explained that, as part of the forthcoming review of the Local Plan, the Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy wished to incorporate information regarding renewable energy, housing stock and retro-fitting in addition to other sustainability matters.

- Recent Meetings/Engagements - the Leader informed the Council that he had recently attended a South West Councils event to enable best practice to be shared amongst Councils; a Great Western Powerhouse event in the House of Commons; a meeting with Tetbury Town Council regarding leisure facilities provision within the town; and a Leadership Gloucestershire meeting.
- Working Group Business - the Leader explained that the ICT Working Group would be reconvened to review the current Member ICT allowance and its operation; and that a new cross-party working group would soon start work on a review the Council's Constitution, involving representatives from all political parties which served on the Council, would shortly commence.
- Glover Review of National Landscapes/Brexit - the Leader thanked Council Officers for their work in relation to the Glover Review of National Landscapes, including the potential for a Cotswolds National Park; and in respect of the Council's preparations for Brexit.

#### CL.29 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No Public Questions had been submitted.

#### CL.30 MEMBER QUESTIONS

- (1) Question from Councillor Nikki Ind to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'How can Cotswold District Council help Tetbury and improve their relationship with residents, who currently feel let down with the lack of infrastructure – loss of Leisure Facilities, inadequate Elderly Care and Youth Services, a dated GP Surgery and limited Public Transport – given that Tetbury is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest town in the District, which has recently seen housing stock grow by 7% (April 2019 Completions) with a further 4% (April 19 Commitments) – 11% in total since the last Census in 2011?*

#### Response from Councillor Harris

'Tetbury is a hugely important part of our district.

I know many feel let down by the District Council over the past decade or so.

A failure to implement a local plan on time and the time it took to secure a 5 year housing land supply meant that for years the town was at the mercy of predatory developers. This resulted in rapid growth in the town and often without the necessary infrastructure to support development.

I'd like to congratulate Tetbury Town Council on successfully adopting a neighbourhood development plan meaning the Town Council will receive 25% of all community infrastructure levy (CIL) receipts collected in the area for any developments permitted since the

adoption of CIL in June this year. The Town Council will be free to invest this money in the infrastructure of their choosing and I will ensure that District Council officers are there to offer support and advice.

I believe that there was a reluctance amongst the previous leadership at this council to 'grasp the nettle' and proactively plan for the future of services such as the examples that you've identified. As a result communication and trust have broken down.

A new administration here at Cotswold District Council is an opportunity for a reset so we can rebuild trust between the District Council and the community in Tetbury.

I really enjoyed meeting with you at the Tetbury Town Council offices recently in your position as Mayor and enjoyed speaking to town councillors and listening to their concerns on Monday.

Continuing this conversation is crucial and Councillor Mark Harris in his role as Cabinet Member for Town and Parish Councils will ensure that this happens. I will ask that he plans a date to come and meet with you and fellow town councillors.

The work that Cllr Jenny Forde has started on a Health and Wellbeing strategy will also be important in setting out what we as a District Council can do for Tetbury and I'll ask her to do the same.

So to summarise I see the way forward as establishing a good working relationship between the political leadership of the District Council and Tetbury Town Councillors, then identifying what resident needs, wants and aspirations for Tetbury are and finally planning how we can support Tetbury to deliver these improvements, either directly or through working with the appropriate organisations.'

Councillor Ind thanked the Leader for his response and for attending the Meeting of Tetbury Town Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2019. Councillor Ind explained that since submitting her question, she had checked resident numbers from 2001 to 2011 and this had shown that the town had doubled in residents from 5,472 to 10,150 in 2011 and that this was prior to new housing being constructed. Councillor Ind added that the Town Council were establishing working groups to deal with leisure and recreation and elderly care services, but stressed the need for support from the District and County Councils, along with partners including the NHS and the town's surgery to ensure it could meet the demand both at present and in the future. By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Ind asked if the Council would commit to assisting the town with work being undertaken by the Town Council and other groups to ensure that the town received much needed joined-up strategy attention and particularly as the Rural Services Network had recently reported that there was a higher proportion of older people in rural areas, with the fastest growth in those aged 85 and over, alongside higher living costs and poor public transport.

The Leader thanked Councillor Ind for her supplementary question and explained that the Council was ready to provide help to ensure that taxpayers' money was spent responsibly. He added that the Council's Forward Planning Team were looking at the issues raised in the question, but stated that there was also a requirement for Members of the Town Council to approach the Council and Cabinet Members to ensure the support could be given to the appropriate areas.

(2) Question from Councillor Tony Berry to Councillor Rachel Coxcoo, Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy

*'At the Council Meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July, we agreed that my motion to assess the viability of placing PV Solar panels on our Trinity Road building be deferred into an overall 'Climate Change Plan' which would shortly be forthcoming. Nearly 3 months on the approval to recruit a 'Climate Change Manager' has only just been agreed by Cabinet and since it can take up to 6 months to get someone on board should we not take action now given that this is a Council 'emergency'? Moving to solar power is something of a 'no-brainer' as far as climate change is concerned; does Cllr. Coxcoo not think that we should bring this motion forward now?'*

Response from Councillor Coxcoo

'Funding for appointment of a Strategic Climate Change Manager is the subject of a report on this agenda together with funding for consultants to carry out the necessary review to identify projects and changes required to support carbon reduction of the Council's own operations, services and estate.

A high level action plan is being worked up, by officers with experience from across the Council's services, in parallel to this additional request for resources.

The funding requested for consultant support, together with the action plan means that this work will begin immediately and does not have to wait until the new officer is in post.

However, it is essential that a full review of all the Council's properties is carried out, and this work will include a review of the Trinity Road property. The review will enable an energy action plan for the building to be created as a whole, rather than a review of solar PV considered entirely in isolation. It is important for the Council to ensure that we fully understand the balance of on-site consumption vs generation and energy storage, which will of course alter if the buildings become more energy efficient.

In recognition of the desire from members to see progress on our own buildings, we have already sought and received an outline specification showing the maximum generation potential of the Trinity Road buildings (144 kWp) and are meeting with a sustainability consultant to discuss this on the 30th of September. In addition, we have already taken advice from the planning team and conservation team on a proposed layout, to guide us on how the design may have

to be altered to be acceptable in planning terms. This will allow us to progress quickly through planning considerations once the full building review is complete.

Finally, we are also awaiting further advice on potential community financing structures, such as a community share offer, to pay for any PV systems on the roof. This would allow the Council to secure extra finance and create opportunities for genuine community involvement in such a project. For illustrative purposes, the likely cost of a PV system on the Trinity Road buildings is £150-£160k, and this is within the scale of similar projects financed, either wholly or partly, by community share offers in other parts of England.'

Councillor Berry thanked the Cabinet Member for her response and explained that he was delighted action had been taken following the previous Council Meeting and that a meeting was planned for 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019. By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Berry asked if he could attend the meeting as an interested Member of the Council.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that she would be very pleased to invite Councillor Berry to the meeting and also explained that she would like to extend an invitation to Councillor Berry to also join the soon-to-be established working group regarding the Council's heritage buildings.

(3) Question from Councillor Stephen Andrews to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance

*'The government's transparency programme aims to hold public bodies to account in order to deliver better value for money in public spending. As part of the programme, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government instructed all local Councils to publish details of all their supplier spending over £500 on a monthly basis, no later than 30 days after the month end.*

*In the interests of transparency and since August 2012 the previous Conservative administration had published details of **all** payments, not only those of £500 or more.*

*As at the date of submission of this question (13th September, 2019) the Liberal Democrat administration at CDC has failed to publish any details of expenditure whatsoever, as required, since they came to power in May.*

*Nothing has been published for May, June, July or August, 2019.*

*What are the Cotswolds Liberal Democrats trying to hide from us and the taxpayers of the Cotswolds?'*

Response from Councillor Evemy

'Thank you for bringing this to my attention. I apologise to members of the Council and any members of the public that this information was not published within 30 days of each month end as required. The information had been prepared for publication, but was awaiting a check to ensure no personal data was published. On receipt of your

question, officers were made aware of this omission and the information was published within two hours.

The Chief Finance Officer and I have met to discuss this and have agreed a new process to ensure that this information is published on time in future.

Our Liberal Democrat administration is committed to transparency with members and the public, working with officers to rebuild the Council's reputation as a listening and responsive organisation.'

Councillor Andrews thanked the Deputy Leader for his response and explained that the answer had demonstrated a need for attention to detail. He added that he recognised the challenges faced by the Council's Finance Officers this year and, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Deputy Leader could confirm that all financial reports published on the Council's website were up-to-date.

In response, the Deputy Leader explained that all financial information relating to August 2019 was published on the Council's website and he drew attention to the fact that some delays would be inevitable over August, given that this was a popular time for both Officer and Member holidays. He added that whilst he was responsible for ensuring the publishing of this information, the actual task was undertaken by Officers on his behalf. The Deputy Leader added that he wished to apologise to the Council that this had been an oversight, and one that he was aware his predecessor had also made.

(4) Question from Councillor Richard Morgan to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council

*'At the last full council meeting on 3 July 2019, Cotswold District Council (unanimously) passed a motion regarding the Valley Trading planning application in my ward (Grumbolds Ash with Avening). The motion resolved Cotswold District Council would:*

*1. Seek clarification as to whether the Valley Trading application is in direct conflict with the Tetbury and Tetbury & Upton Neighbourhood plans, and if it is, write to GCC questioning why the application has not been rejected on these grounds.*

*2. Write to GCC seeking confirmation that, should the applicant be approved, the Valley Trading plant would be defined as a "major development" and of "strategic scale" by their own Waste Core Strategy and should therefore be located in Zone C (and it is not appropriate for its current location).*

*3. Write to GCC and confirm Policy GWCS14 states that major development in AONB must be in the "proven public interest" and planning permission only granted in exceptional circumstances following the "most rigorous" examination. Furthermore the letter should state that CDC does not feel this application is currently being subjected to the "most rigorous" examination.*

*4. Write to GCC and ask for a fully independent survey to be conducted over multiple random days to ascertain the exact level of HGV movements along the A4135 and how many of these movements are Valley Trading vehicles. Once the survey has taken place, these results should be made public".*

*As I have not heard anything about this motion since 3 July 2019, could the Leader of the Council confirm these points have been actioned. In addition, would he be willing to give me a copy of the outgoing letters, and any replies CDC have received?*

Response from Councillor Joe Harris

'Further to your request for additional information regarding the resolution made by Council regarding the Valley Trading planning application submitted to GCC I understand that Nigel Adams has provided you with the detailed information required to answer the points raised.

However for clarity and in answer to your specific points:

**1. Seek clarification as to whether the Valley Trading application is in direct conflict with the Tetbury and Tetbury & Upton Neighbourhood plans, and if it is, write to GCC questioning why the application has not been rejected on these grounds.**

Officers did write to GCC as per the motion. The application will have to be determined on the basis of the policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, but this is a matter for GCC as decision maker.

**2. Write to GCC seeking confirmation that, should the applicant be approved, the Valley Trading plant would be defined as a "major development" and of "strategic scale" by their own Waste Core Strategy and should therefore be located in Zone C (and it is not appropriate for its current location).**

The application is considered to be a "major" proposal.

**3. Write to GCC and confirm Policy GWCS14 states that major development in AONB must be in the "proven public interest" and planning permission only granted in exceptional circumstances following the "most rigorous" examination. Furthermore the letter should state that CDC does not feel this application is currently being subjected to the "most rigorous" examination.**

As advised above the decision making context is set out in law and must be followed if any subsequent decision is not to be liable to potential challenge.

**4. Write to GCC and ask for a fully independent survey to be conducted over multiple random days to ascertain the exact level of HGV movements along the A4135 and how many of these movements are Valley Trading vehicles. Once the survey has taken place, these results should be made public".**

The concerns regarding traffic impact appear to be shared by Gloucestershire County Council in that it is understood that they have requested (but not yet received) the submission of a Transport Assessment by the applicant. Following submission, they anticipate a further period of consultation on the submitted document. The application has therefore not moved on in any sense whilst awaiting that essential document. The deadline for reports is 6 weeks prior to their Committee Date. I am therefore informed that it is unlikely that the proposal will make even the November Committee.'

Councillor Morgan thanked the Leader for his response and confirmation that letters had been sent. He explained that the application was for a huge site within his Ward and was attracting a significant level of scrutiny. By way of a supplementary question, he asked if the Leader could please send copies of the letters and replies received.

The Leader confirmed that he would send copies of the letters and replies to Councillor Morgan as soon as possible and would also be happy to meet with him at the site to discuss the application further.

(5) Question from Councillor Richard Morgan to Councillor Mike Every, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance

*Could Cllr Every please confirm the exact level of financial reserves, and the approximate level of investments available to CDC at the end of the 2018-19 fiscal year, and if there was a financial overspend or underspend for this financial year.*

*Furthermore, could he clarify if the council has overspent or underspent against budget forecasts at the end of Q1 in the current financial year (2019-20).*

*Finally, could he confirm that the new Lib Dem administration are aware that longer term central government funding is under review and income to the council could (hypothetically) be reduced in 2021/22 leaving a financial shortfall in the event of particularly severe changes to local government funding? Can he confirm that the CDC MTFS report from February 2019 - 14.13 Section 10 states "The Council has sufficient revenue reserves to be able to develop contingency plans while the impact of changes to central government funding post 2020/21 becomes clearer."*

Response from Councillor Every

'The Council's audited Statement of Accounts is due to be considered by the Audit Committee tomorrow (26 September). As set out in those Statements, at the end of the 2018/19 financial year, the Council held the following balances in financial reserves:

· General Fund Balance	£4,910,148
· Revenue Earmarked Reserves	£8,308,575
· Capital Receipts	£14,611,756
· Capital Grants	£59,749

These balances are as at 31 March 2019 and do not reflect funding commitments, approved by the previous Council, which will impact in later financial years. The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy is a forward looking document which is currently in the process of being updated.

As at 31 March 2019, the Council's investments were valued at £25.5 million. The investment portfolio reflects the cash which the Council holds, both for its own operational purposes and as a result of being the collection agency for Council Tax and Business Rates. Cash is therefore held on behalf of others such as central government, Gloucestershire County Council, Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner and Town and Parish Councils and should not be confused with useable reserves (set out in the bullet points above) which are available for the Council to use to fund activities which support its priorities.

The Council set a budget for 2018/19 which included a contribution of £7,811 to the General Fund Balance. At the end of the year, the actual contribution to General Fund Balance was £9,172, reflecting an underspend against the budget of £1,361.

At the end of the first quarter of 2019/20, the Council reported an underspend against profiled budget of £8,697.

I can confirm that our administration is fully aware of the potential changes to central government funding in 2021/22 and we are working with the Chief Finance Officer on an update of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy. This will include our administration's plan for addressing the financial challenges we face whilst delivering our priorities.

Our plans will be subject to scrutiny through both the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee and a full public consultation process before we agree our revenue and capital budgets when we meet on 26 February 2020.

Later on today's agenda in the debate on motion 7 'Council Finances' I will outline this administration's approach to the budget making process and how we intend to respond to the legacy of the financial decisions made by the previous Conservative administrations.'

Councillor Morgan thanked the Deputy Leader for his response and, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Deputy Leader could confirm that at the start of the year, the Council had no debt and total cash reserves of £13.2mn and also held £7.543mn in property investments.

The Deputy Leader responded that the statements made were correct - the Council did not carry debt and monies had been earmarked for development. The Deputy Leader also informed Councillor Morgan that the Council's revenue position was currently of some concern however.

The Chief Finance Officer informed Members that the response provided by the Deputy Leader was correct and that the Council's Audit Committee Meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> September 2019 would confirm this information in signing-off the Statement of Accounts for 2018/19.

(6) Question from Councillor Mark Annett to Councillor Andrew Doherty, Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health

*"Under Conservative leadership and in the interest of transparency, the full council twice debated changes to garden waste collections in December 2018 and February 2019.*

*At the February meeting the Conservative Group committed to a public consultation later this year to ask the people who pay for the service whether they wanted to continue with a weekly service or change to a fortnightly service.*

*However, I read in a press release that the Liberal Democrat Cabinet has now decided to proceed with a fortnightly service without undertaking any public consultation whatsoever.*

*Whereas the Conservatives involved all members of the council in the decision-making process and planned to consult widely with the public, Cotswold Liberal Democrats decided to restrict debate to their 9 person Cabinet - more than half of whom weren't even CDC councillors a few months ago.*

*Am I right in assuming that Cotswold Liberal Democrats can't be bothered to listen to the views of the people of the Cotswolds who actually foot the bill for the service?*

*Is consultation and transparency now dead at CDC under the Liberal Democrats?"*

Response from Councillor Doherty

'No, it is not.

The question suggests some confusion about the original timing of the consultation and fortnightly service launch. The resolution is clear that consultation would happen after the launch of the fortnightly service. That resolution had cross-party support and seemed a reasonable attempt to assess resident's feelings on the fortnightly service once it was introduced. Nothing in the revised timetable changes that. Without some form of time-travel it seems difficult to get residents' feedback on a change that hasn't yet happened, but I'd be very open to any suggestions on how we might resolve that.'

Councillor Annett thanked the Cabinet Member for his response and, by way of a supplementary question, asked when residents of Campden & Vale would be asked if they wanted a weekly or fortnightly garden waste collection; and if the Cabinet Member could provide the exact date for the consultation and confirmation of the Council's decision and when the item would be presented back to the Council.

The Cabinet Member responded that the exact date for the consultation could not be given at present as the launch date had been moved back to early 2020, but confirmed he would provide this information to all Members as soon as it was possible.

(7) Question from Councillor Stephen Hirst to Councillor Lisa Spivey, Cabinet Member for Housing and Homelessness

*'It is important that the target for the completion of Affordable Homes is achieved.'*

*For the past three years Cotswold District Council whilst under Conservative control have reached and exceeded their Affordable Homes target.*

*Can we please be advised of the projected total of Affordable Homes that will be completed during the 2019/2020 period and whether the annual target will be achieved?'*

Response from Councillor Spivey

'As the previous portfolio holder for Housing, I am sure that Cllr. Hirst is well aware that the target for delivery of affordable homes as set out in the Council's Housing Plan 2016-2020 is 150 per year and I am pleased to say that currently, we expect to exceed that target and deliver 154 affordable homes in the year 2019/2020.

The vast majority of affordable homes delivered in the District under the previous administration were as a result of S106 planning contributions on developer-led sites. The rate of delivery of affordable homes has been dependent therefore on the rate of delivery and sales of market homes. The previous Conservative administration did not have clear policies encouraging the delivery of affordable homes. The delivery of affordable homes was by default rather than by design.

As developments take a number years from planning consent to completion, the higher rate of delivery seen over the last 3 years, in contrast to previous years, is largely as a result of speculative planning applications received when the Council did not have an adequate 5 year land supply or an adopted Local Plan. This failure to implement a Local Plan meant that for years the District was at the mercy of predatory developers. The Conservatives may have been the party nominally in charge of the Council, but they were certainly not in charge of the number of homes built in the District, both affordable and market. A failure which has seen some of our towns, notably Moreton and Tetbury, grow rapidly without the proper infrastructure in place to support development.

Approximately 270 of the affordable homes delivered over the past 3 years were not planned, but on sites where the Council had refused planning consent and subsequently lost on appeal. Without these, the Council would not have met its target in 2016/17 when 117 of the 262 affordable units completed were on appeal sites.

This administration has made it clear, through its manifesto and its emerging corporate strategy that it is committed to the direct delivery of social rented homes to the residents of this District.'

Councillor Hirst thanked the Cabinet Member for her response and, by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Cabinet Member agreed with him that affordable homes were a great mixture of housing types and did not refer solely to socially-rented.

In response, the Cabinet Member explained that she did not agree with the statement made and explained that there were a lot of misconceptions surrounding affordable housing within the District. She added that she accepted that there were different types of ownership but that there was a genuine affordability issue in the District which needed addressing.

(8) Question from Councillor Stephen Hirst to Councillor Rachel Coxcoo, Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy

*'Already our Market Towns are bulging at the seams with estates of new homes. There is a feeling that these towns have already achieved sufficient new homes for many years to come without parallel increases in school places and local infrastructure. Will the new administration take this situation into account when reviewing the existing local plan?'*

Response from Councillor Coxcoo

'I understand the concerns you raise and it highlights the importance of ensuring the Council has an up to date Local Plan that proactively meets the needs of the local community and businesses. As you will be aware, the lack of five year housing land supply and an out of date Local Plan (between 2011 to 2018) placed control into the hands of developers at the expense of local community aspirations and infrastructure.

This Council is committed to reviewing the Local Plan to ensure that we provide the community with a strong voice to direct development. The review will also empower the community to identify the type and scale of infrastructure that they believe is required in their towns and villages. The Community Infrastructure Levy, which went live in June 2019, also provides a new tool and source of funding to deliver much-needed infrastructure. Areas that have a Neighbourhood Plan will receive 25% of the locally collected Levy (15% for areas without a Neighbourhood Plan) to spend on their infrastructure priorities.'

Councillor Hirst thanked the Cabinet Member for her response and by way of a supplementary question, asked if the Cabinet Member agreed with him that the Local Plan was not delivered late, and sought confirmation that any revisions intended to be made by the Council's administration would be delivered on time.

The Cabinet Member responded that she did not agree that the Local Plan was adopted on time and explained that the late delivery had caused a number of issues in relation to developments in Moreton-in-Marsh and Tetbury. The Cabinet Member added that a review of the Local Plan was required as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had changed and it was therefore the Council's administration's intention to project manage the review and to ensure it was delivered on time.

**CL.31 PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

**CL.32 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY CABINET - 2<sup>ND</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019**

The Council received a report detailing decisions taken by the Cabinet at its Meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2019.

The Leader informed Members that he considered it important for all Members to be kept informed of decisions taken by the Cabinet and that the Cabinet Members were willing to respond to any queries from Members in relation to the items.

A Member questioned whether, as all decisions had been supported unanimously, there had been sufficient debate on the items prior to any decisions being made. In response, the Leader explained that the Cabinet system was one that the current administration had inherited and that the system would be reviewed by the administration in the future.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**CL.33 SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 23<sup>RD</sup> JULY 2019, 3<sup>RD</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019 AND AUDIT COMMITTEE DECISIONS - 25<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2019**

The Council received a report detailing decisions taken by the Committees at their respective Meetings since the last Council Meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**CL.34 PETITIONS**

No petitions had been received.

**CL.35 PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OF THE WAGGON AND HORSES PUBLIC HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, CIRENCESTER TO FIVE FLATS**

The Case Officer informed Members that the application had been referred to the Council following a failure to reach a decision by the Planning and

Licensing Committee at its Meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The Case Officer explained that a previous application at the site had been refused at the March 2019 Planning and Licensing Committee Meeting and that there had been no physical changes to the application that had been submitted in March 2019, but that a further viability report had been submitted. The Case Officer displayed a site map and location plan, proposed site block plans and photographs of the site from various vantage points and explained the recommendation was for approval of the application.

Councillor Patrick Coleman (in his capacity as a Cirencester Town Councillor), Mr. James Brown (Objector), Mr. Stuart Tarr (Supporter) and Mr. Ian Woodward-Court (Agent) were then invited to address the Meeting.

The Ward Member, Councillor Joe Harris, was then invited to address the Meeting. Councillor Harris explained that he had approached the application with an open mind but that he considered the points made by Councillor Coleman in regard to the loss of a public facility providing both food and accommodation in an upcoming part of the town to be valid. He added that the part of the town the site was situated in did require some more facilities for local residents, but that approval of the application should not be seen as the only way of acquiring these improvements. Councillor Harris informed the Council that the current property was small and somewhat unwelcoming and that the biggest issue for the site was the close proximity of the main London Road and the fact there was also no garden at the property. Councillor Harris concluded by explaining that two viability studies had been undertaken, and that once permission had been granted, the public facility provision would not return. He urged Members to consider both sides for supporting and refusing the application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the price which the property had been marketed at was not a material planning consideration; the development had been marketed as a car-free development; residents of the flats would not be entitled to parking within the controlled parking zones and yearly parking passes for a nearby Council-run car park were available for around £100 per annum; the appeal process linked to the previously-refused application would require the Case Officer to submit a written statement on the Council's behalf defending its decision by 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019 which would then be passed to the Planning Inspector and a decision made approximately six weeks later; whilst not required by Local Plan policies, the viability assessment had been submitted in support of the planning application and was therefore considered to be material to Members' considerations; all five flats had windows and four of the five flats had proposed external space; a condition could be imposed by the Council in regard to increasing cycle storage provision for two, as opposed to the current one, spaces per flat; the Council currently did not have policies regarding over-heating analysis and therefore it could not impose conditions in relation to this; the Applicant had indicated to the Case Officer that approval of the application by the Council would result in the appeal on the previously-refused application being withdrawn; there was no requirement, in policy terms, to justify the loss of the public house as a public facility as the site was located outside of the town centre boundary; a bin storage facility was included with the current proposal; and the public house had not been operational since early 2018.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

A Member commented that as the Council had already voted to refuse the previous application, this decision should still stand and added that the site could provide a source of accommodation and refreshments to the town, which would be required more in the future.

A Further Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

Various Members expressed their support for refusal of the application and drew attention to the fact that a number of pubs within the town had closed in recent years and that the nearby Barn Theatre and availability of parking in the Beeches Car Park were key factors that could ensure the future success of the property.

A Member stated that whilst she was minded to vote in favour of the application, she wished the Proposition to include the increase in cycle storage provision to two spaces per flat and that the waste and recycling for the properties as outlined should be kept in perpetuity.

The Proposer and Secunder of the Proposition agreed to these amendments.

Other Members commented that, whilst the loss of pub was regrettable, the fact the development would result in five affordable flats close to the town centre should be encouraged. Those Members also stated that some local residents had expressed the view that they did not consider the pub returning to its original use to be the best option for the site and the fact that the Council could not force people to use the pub to warrant its continuation was a key determining factor.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Council again but explained he had no further comments to make.

**RESOLVED that the application be approved, as recommended, subject to an increase in cycle storage to two spaces per flat and the proposed waste and recycling storage being kept in perpetuity.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 9, abstentions 6, absent 3.**

CL.36 FUTURE JOINT WASTE PARTNERSHIP AND WASTE MANAGEMENT PROVISION

The Council was requested to agree to end the current formal Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee and to 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 introduced the item and, in doing so, extended his thanks to Officers for their work in relation to this item and summarised that he hoped the recommendations would lead to a less-formulated model going forward. He then proposed the report and recommendations to Council for approval.

In response to various questions from Members, the Cabinet Member explained that the previous Committee, whilst active, had not fully achieved what had been proposed and that there was a general agreement that a change in direction was now required; the recommendations would hopefully provide an opportunity for the Council to work more closely with Ubico, though there were challenges around the geography of the District and County as a whole; and the eventual aim of the Waste Partnership would be more joined up working in the delivery of waste services across the County.

**RESOLVED that, the Council:**

- (a) allows 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, the detail of which may be subject to a further report in due course;**
- (c) withdraws from the Joint Waste Team on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2019 and requests that Publica provide the waste management function from 14<sup>th</sup> December 2019;**
- (d) puts 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 resolution (c) above.**

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

**CL.37 FUNDING FOR CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY**

The Council was requested to approve funding for specialist consultants to produce reports to inform the Council's Climate Change Strategy and actions and for a Strategic Climate Change Manager post to deliver a Climate Change Strategy and action plan for the Council.

The Cabinet Member for Planning Policy, Climate Change and Energy introduced the item and explained that the recommendations were in line with the decisions made by the Council at its July 2019 Meeting and would also help with the administration's plans for a partial review of the Council's Local Plan in the future. The Cabinet Member then proposed the report and recommendations to the Council for approval.

A Member expressed concern that the Council had not been presented with details of the Climate Change Manager's role/responsibilities and detailed job description and that he felt this information was vital before any decision could be made on the appointment. In response, the Cabinet Member explained that she was happy to circulate this information to all Members in addition to the two tenders that had also been obtained in respect of the consultancy work.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance stated that he considered it important for the studies to establish a baseline position and future opportunities to be commenced prior to the new Officer starting.

**RESOLVED that the Council agrees to:**

**(a) a variation to the Publica contract and an increase in budget of £70,000 per year for a new Strategic Climate Change Manager post to deliver against the Council's Climate Change declaration, with funding for the post to come from the Council Priorities Fund earmarked reserve initially and the longer-term funding requirement for the post to be incorporated within the Council's budget setting process, and;**

**(b) a one-off budget in the range of £85,000 to £105,000 to procure studies from specialist consultants to establish the Council and District emissions baseline, develop a credible emissions reduction trajectory and conduct a District-wide renewable energy study to inform future actions; the budget to be funded from the Council Priorities Fund earmarked reserve.**

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

**CL.38 CORPORATE STRATEGY 2019-2023 AIM AND PRIORITIES**

The Council received a report detailing the new aim and priorities of the Council, which in turn would set the direction for the new Corporate Strategy 2019-2023. Dependent upon approval by the Council, further work would be undertaken on the Corporate Strategy document for presentation back to the Council in May 2020.

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and explained that the Council's administration had a comprehensive plan for the District and one that it wished to put into action. He explained that the current revenue budget of the Council was 'perilous' and that the aim for the Council's services was to ensure they were proactive and not reactive. The Leader added that the aims to respond to the climate change emergency and the requirement to build more social rented homes within the District would also require the trust and support of town and parish councils, in addition to relationships needing in some cases to be rebuilt with the District Council. In concluding, the Leader explained that the three principles as outlined regarding transparency, investment in the District and the need to listen and act would be detailed more in the plans which would be presented to the Council by May 2020 and which would also reflect best practice. The Leader then commended the report and recommendation to the Council for approval.

Councillor Morgan, as Leader of the Conservative Group, expressed concern that the Council had only been presented with a small amount of information to determine a way forward and that the proposals included a delay in publishing the Council's Corporate Plan to May 2020. He commented that he therefore wished to propose an Amendment to the recommendation such that the administration should adopt the aims and objectives of the Liberal Democrat Manifesto as part of the Council's Plan. The Amendment was duly Seconded.

Councillor Andrews, in Seconding the Amendment, explained that he did not consider the document presented to represent a strategy and the fact that he considered that as the administration had been in power for over 100 days and not produced documentation, this should be considered a failing. He added that adopting the Liberal Democrat Manifesto would enable Members

to ensure the administration could be assessed against the aims in which it hoped to achieve during its Council term.

The Deputy Leader informed the Council that the Manifesto had guided the Council's administration's own Strategy but that Members of the administration were working with Officers to ensure a Plan was developed which had been subject to the appropriate Member challenge. He also urged the Council to reject the Amendment as Proposed by Councillors Morgan and Andrews.

Various Members expressed support for the Amendment and explained that with regard to rebuilding trust, they as Ward Members had earned the respect of those residents within their Wards and wished the administration to acknowledge this.

Councillor Morgan as the Proposer of the Amendment was invited to address the Council again and explained that at the July 2019 Council Meeting, the Conservative Group had rescinded their own Corporate Plan and that it was now time to start work upon the Liberal Democrat Corporate Plan.

On being put to the vote, the Amendment was LOST. The record of voting was as follows - For 11, Against 17, Abstentions 2, Absent 4.

The Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Public Safety then Proposed a Further Amendment. She explained that there was no single organisation that could guarantee good health and wellbeing; but that it was something everyone strived for. She informed the Council that the Further Amendment related to the fifth priority so as to read, 'Help residents, businesses and communities to access the support they need to ensure a high level of health and wellbeing'.

The Amendment was duly Seconded by the Leader.

Various Members expressed their support for the Amendment as proposed.

The Cabinet Member was invited to address the Council again but explained she had no further comments to make.

On being put to the vote, the Amendment was CARRIED. The record of voting was as follows - For 30, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 4.

The Leader was invited to address the Council again and explained that he was willing to work constructively with all Members of the Council and that support for the Strategy would enable a good starting point to rebuild the Council.

**RESOLVED that, subject to the agreed amendment, the new Aim and Priorities be agreed.**

**Record of Voting - for 17, against 11, abstentions 2, absent 4.**

**CL.39 CORINIUM MUSEUM - STONE AGE TO CORINIUM PROJECT - URGENT BUSINESS**

The Council received an urgent report detailing the proposed request to increase the Council's capital contribution to the project. The Chair deemed the matter to be urgent as the issue was not known at the time of agenda despatch and a decision was required in advance of the next scheduled Council Meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Public Safety introduced the item and explained that the Museum was in the Council's ownership and was an asset to both the town and the District as a whole. She added that every day that the project was delayed added to the total cost and that the contribution was part of a £1.7m total project; for which £1.2m had been sourced from the Heritage Lottery Fund and other grants. The Cabinet Member concluded that approval of the grant would benefit everyone and would help to ensure the Museum continued to be held in high regard internationally for the work it undertook.

In response to a Member's question, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance explained that whilst the project had been agreed to by the previous Council administration, there was a need to conclude the works at the Museum; and whilst contingency planning had ensured there were available costs for both additional foreseen and unforeseen works, the Museum was an asset to the Council and therefore required further investment to ensure its legacy.

The Business Manager (Contracts) explained that the additional costs highlighted in the report were as a result of ground conditions and requirements for below ground structural works which were the biggest single item on the Risk Register and that a number of invasive investigations had been undertaken, with a trial pit dug to try and mitigate this risk. The anticipated worst case option had been priced by contractors. However, once deep excavations were undertaken, it had become apparent that the ground conditions were far worse than anticipated and significant underpinning would be required.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the bulk of the contingency funding had been used up; the costs would have been higher had no contingency planning been undertaken; and the application for further funding was a top-up to the contingency funding. Fundraising was still ongoing but funding for this additional work could not be fundraised in the short term owing to the time constraints and the increased costs caused by any further delay.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (a) an increase in the Capital Programme 2019/20 of £135,000 for the Museum project be approved;**
- (b) the additional costs be funded from Capital Receipts.**

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

**CL.40 ISSUES/REPORTS ARISING FROM THE CABINET**

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

**CL.41 ISSUES/REPORTS ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND/OR AUDIT**

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

**CL.42 NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

The Chair reported that she would allow all Motions to be debated at the Meeting and, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, with the exception of Motion 11 of 2019/20 re: Leisure Facilities in Fairford and Tetbury which would stand referred to Cabinet, owing to the expenditure requested and the requirement for more background detail.

(i) Motion 6 of 2019/20 re European Union

Proposed by Councillor Joe Harris, Seconded by Councillor Andrew Maclean:

*'Council notes that officers have been doing their best to prepare the Council for leaving the European Union on 31 October 2019 and commends them for their efforts so far.*

*Council also notes that, despite extra government funding and a weekly webinar with the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, their job has been made harder by a lack of clarity from HM Government about what leaving the European Union will look like. This makes it much harder to know how to prepare.*

*Council expresses its frustration at this situation and supports the Leader's letter dated 28 August 2019 to Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP requesting clarity.*

*Council believes that a 'no deal' withdrawal from the European Union would pose an unacceptable risk to the Council's strategic and financial resilience.*

*Council believes that its best interests and those of its residents and businesses are served by remaining in the European Union as the majority of the District's residents decided in the referendum held in June 2016.'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Joe Harris explained that the main issues currently facing modern society were climate change, terrorism and economic uncertainty and all required urgent international attention. He added that the current political situation at Westminster was causing national dispute and that whilst the Brexit referendum had taken place over three years previously, the issues were still ongoing. Councillor Harris informed the Council that the possible impact on local government from a 'no-deal' Brexit could be profound and could result in an inability to access a workforce to tackle the social care crisis and rising costs putting pressure on an ever-decreasing Council budget. Councillor Harris added that whilst he had attended various

central government sessions advising local councils of preparations they might need to make, these sessions had failed to advise on issues such as EU citizens residing within the District, exporting the District's recycling and future finances. He informed the Council that a Brexit Risk Register had been drawn up by Officers detailing the possible threats to the Council and explained that he had also written to the District's MP, Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown, but had received no reply. Councillor Harris concluded the biggest issues would be centred on the Council's recycling service and the rights of EU citizens living within the District, on which urgent action was required immediately.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Maclean explained that he was very pleased to be asked to second the Motion and that he considered it as a way of ensuring the Council came together to help tackle any challenges which could potentially arise. Councillor Maclean expressed his personal concerns that many of his constituents were employed in roles that were dependent on the EU Supply Chains and concluded by stating that he wished to urge Members to support the Motion to enable the Leader of the Council to lobby central government on behalf of the Council, its Members and residents.

The Leader of the Conservative Group expressed the view that the Motion was politically-motivated and advised that his group would be abstaining from the vote. As such, he asked that the Motion be put to the vote.

Councillor Joe Harris was invited to address the Council again. In doing so, he explained that the Brexit situation would affect everyone and the Motion should be supported to highlight the potential risks and issues.

**RESOLVED that the Motion be supported.**

**Record of Voting - for 17, against 0, abstentions 13, absent 4.**

Note:

At this juncture, the Deputy Leader of the Council wished to Propose that Exempt Agenda Item (18) be dealt with as the next item of business, owing to the time pressures of the Officer attending the Meeting to present this item. He explained that, whilst this would require a vote to exclude any public and press currently from the Meeting, those interested in returning to the Meeting could do so, once this item had been discussed and debated.

The Proposition, was duly Seconded by the Leader.

**RESOLVED that the Proposition be supported.**

**Record of Voting - for 29, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 4.**

**CL.43 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 paragraph (3) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the said Act (Information relating to financial or business affairs) and that the public interest in maintaining the**

**exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information concerned.**

**Record of Voting - for 29, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 4.**

**CL.44 PROPERTY MATTER**

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

The Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the item and explained that a large volume of work had been undertaken by the Cabinet Members for Car Parks and Town and Parish Councils, and Health, Wellbeing and Public Safety, owing to their involvement with the Council's Parking Board. He then proposed the report and recommendations to the Council for approval.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the application had not been presented to the Council's Planning and Licensing Committee, so the proposal was subject to permission being granted; no discussions had been undertaken as yet with local businesses regarding parking, but this would shortly be undertaken by Officers and reference made to this, should the planning application be submitted; there was no income to the Council from the proposals as the plans related to decant parking and were part of the wider Cirencester Parking Project; and the landowner had agreed to a temporary permission for three years as it was the belief of Officers that the landowner had other, long-term, plans for the site.

A Proposition, that the Officer recommendations be supported, was duly Seconded.

**RESOLVED that the Council:**

- (a) enters into negotiations for a new lease of parking at site;**
- (b) allocates £180,000 from the Council Priorities Fund for the costs over the three year lease period;**
- (c) delegates 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, 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 22, against 5, abstentions 3, absent 4.**

**CL.45 CONTINUATION OF MEETING**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, as the Meeting had exceeded the four hour limit identified within the Constitution, Council was asked to consider whether the Meeting should continue or be adjourned.

**RESOLVED that the Meeting be continued.**

**Record of Voting - for 27, against 2, abstentions 1, absent 4.****CL.46 NOTICE OF MOTIONS (CONTINUED)****(ii) Motion 7 of 2019/20 re: Council Finances**

Proposed by Councillor Mike Every, Seconded by Councillor Patrick Coleman:

*'This Council notes:*

- *that its Revenue Budget Medium Term Financial Strategy endorsed in February 2019 by the previous administration contained £1m in unidentified savings for 2020/21 and also required the Council to use £900k from its General Fund Balance;*
- *that its revenue budget is highly dependent upon the scheme for retention of business rates and New Homes Bonus;*
- *That the New Homes Bonus can vary greatly or even be withdrawn by HM Government in each year's funding announcement;*
- *That the value of the retained business rates is highly likely to significantly reduce when the scheme is reset; and*
- *that the share of its revenue from the Council Tax paid by its residents is just 8% compared with the average for Gloucestershire districts of 10% and the national district council average of 11%.*

*This Council is committed to building its financial stability and resilience and recognises that this requires the Council to grow its income as well as manage its costs. It is also committed to providing a range and levels of services that the District's residents, businesses and community organisations expect and deserve.*

*This Council believes that it can grow income and meet its policy goals through making better use of its capital and revenue reserves as well as by prudent financial management.*

*This Council therefore instructs the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance to work with Officers to present a proposed budget for 2020/21 which:*

- *strengthens the Council's financial stability and resilience*
- *identifies opportunities to increase revenues and/or reduce costs to close the £2million budget gap*
- *explores opportunities to use its investments and access to low cost finance to meet its policy goals.'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Every explained that a number of Members had been newly elected in May 2019 and had therefore not been part of the Council's budget-setting process in February 2019. He explained

that, despite the hard work of both Members and Officers, the launch of the new waste service would now be delayed to March 2020, which whilst regretful, would save the Council approximately £600,000. Councillor Every added that whilst the government had deferred a decision on business rates for a further year, the decisions of the previous Council administration would have a substantial bearing given that only a small percentage of Council Tax was returned to the Council. In concluding, Councillor Every explained that residents should expect high quality services of the Council and by supporting the Motion, Members could ensure this was achievable.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Coleman explained that he considered the Council had been well-served by Financial Officers, who had struggled against some government decisions, and that issues regarding lack of Revenue Support Grant and average house prices in the District were key reasons why the Council needed to be fully aware of its financial position.

A Member expressed concern at comments made in regard to the poor financial position of the previous Council administration and that he did not consider it to be truthful and that this was supported by the fact the Council had no debt and a total of £13.2m in reserves. He added that the view of the administration in regard to Publica was worrying as the company was set to deliver savings for all partner Councils.

The Chief Finance Officer informed the Council that the government had delayed decisions on a variety of matters which had caused problems for contingency planning. She added that the Council did need however to recognise the challenge of funding the new waste service and other projects and stated that support across all political parties would be beneficial to addressing these challenges effectively.

Councillor Every was invited to address the Council again. In doing so, he explained that Finance Officers had advised the administration regularly on such matters and that decisions were taken accordingly. In addition, he explained the Council was not being asked to spend money, but instead prepare for difficult decisions ahead and to plan accordingly. He therefore commended the Motion to the Council for support.

**RESOLVED that the Motion be supported.**

**Record of Voting - for 19, against 12, abstentions 0, absent 4.**

(iii) Motion 8 of 2019/20 re Affordable Housing

Proposed by Councillor Lisa Spivey, Seconded by Councillor Jenny Forde:

*'The Council notes that there is a housing affordability crisis in the Cotswold District with the median private sector rent at £850 (i) and average house purchase price at £375,305 (ii) coupled with lower than average earnings from local jobs means housing affordability is a significant challenge for residents in the District.*

*The Council notes that the new Liberal Democrat administration has pledged to tackle this affordability crisis and to put in place measures to ensure the delivery of genuinely affordable homes across the District.*

*The Council notes that in the emerging corporate plan this delivery is a priority of the Council.*

*The Council further notes that the current methods of delivery, led by private developers whose primary objective is to make a profit for their shareholders, may not be the best way to provide housing.*

*The Council notes that on the 3<sup>rd</sup> July it unanimously passed a motion declaring a Climate Emergency and, as part of that, a commitment was made to review the Local Plan to ensure that climate change is a strategic priority for planning and new development.*

*The Council notes that as of 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019, 1,821 households were seeking social housing in the District.*

*The Council resolves to review its housing strategy with a specific emphasis on:*

- *sustainable development, building homes fit for the future, both in terms of construction standards and end user fuel efficiency;*
- *implementing policies specifically for younger people earning average wage or below;*
- *investigating methods of providing its own housing and the practical and financial implications of doing this.*

*The Council requests its Officers to carry out a full review of housing allocations to make sure that people in most need are prioritised and that the Council is effectively relieving its statutory duties and delivering for its residents.*

*Sources:*

*(i) Private Rental Market statistics calculated by the Valuation Office Agency, based on summary of monthly rents between 1 April 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019;*

*(ii) UK House Price Index as of June 2019'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Spivey explained that the Council's administration fully supported a comprehensive review of the housing strategy and explained that everyone was entitled to the right to a safe home. She added that the average house price within the District was £428,000 which equated to fourteen times the average salary in the District. Councillor Spivey added that the crisis, if left unchecked, would push many residents in the District to homelessness and that many might be forced to leave the District in which they had grown up. She informed the Council that only 328 socially rented homes had been built in the District, owing to the dependence upon developers, and that the Council must begin to deliver for the residents it represented. She concluded by urging the Council to support the Motion to ensure the delivery of the types of homes that were required.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Forde explained that whilst some truly affordable homes were being built within the District, many other issues linked to homelessness, especially mental health. She explained that a housing stock analysis should be undertaken by the Council and to enable this, commended the Motion to Council.

A Member commented that every Council should wish to review its housing policies on a continuous basis and explained that the Council had been providing decent homes for many years and that a constant review was ongoing.

Another Member informed the Council that she considered reference to second homes and holiday homes be included within the Motion.

The Proposer and Secunder agreed to this request to amend the Motion accordingly.

Councillor Spivey was invited to address the Council again. In doing so, she explained that she was pleased the Motion had received support from the Council and that she hoped the Motion would enable important procedures to be put in place to tackle the issues raised.

**RESOLVED that, subject to the inclusion of a reference to second homes and holiday homes, the Motion be supported.**

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

(iv) Motion 9 of 2019/20 re A417

Proposed by Councillor Ray Brassington, Seconded by Councillor Juliet Layton:

*'This Council notes with grave concern the ongoing congestion and pollution and the accidents and fatal collisions that have taken place on and around the section of the A417 between Cowley Roundabout and the Brockworth bypass.*

*It further notes the noise from the concrete-surfaced section of the road as it runs through the District and the impact this has on many of our communities.*

*This Council reaffirms its support for the proposal from Highways England to replace the section of the road between Cowley Roundabout and the Brockworth bypass with a dual carriageway which will then be continuous from the M4 to the M5 and supports this much needed project.*

*This Council recognises that the improvement of this road will lead to an increase in traffic volumes and therefore that road noise will increase unless mitigating actions are taken.*

*It notes that Highways England will be consulting on the details of the scheme this autumn and encourages its residents, businesses and community groups to respond to this consultation taking the*

*opportunity to highlight any concerns about the noise and other environmental impacts of this scheme and requesting Highways England to take action to address these.'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Brassington explained that he had nothing further to add to the Motion as presented, but hoped that the Council would fully support the principles of the Motion.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Layton commented that she too had no further comments to make, but echoed the hope that the Motion would gain the support of all Members.

**RESOLVED that the Motion be supported.**

**Record of Voting - for 27, against 1, abstentions 1, absent 5.**

(v) Motion 10 of 2019/20 re Carbon Neutral

Proposed by Councillor Stephen Hirst, Seconded by Councillor Ray Theodoulou:

*'This Council notes that:*

*\* Gloucestershire County Council recently debated a motion to ensure that all new public buildings commissioned are carbon neutral throughout their entire life-span (with GCC funding Gloucestershire-based carbon offsetting to capture any technically unavoidable performance gap).*

*\* On 3 July 2019 Cotswold District Council declared a climate emergency and committed to making CDCs own activities net-zero carbon as soon as possible, aiming for an 80% reduction against a 1990 baseline by 2030, and 100% reduction by 2045, with no reliance on offsetting or the trading of carbon credits.*

*Council therefore commits to:-*

*\* Starting immediately, ensuring that all new CDC public buildings will be carbon neutral throughout their entire lifespan.*

*\* Ensuring the new multi-story carpark in Cirencester is carbon neutral throughout its entire life-span.'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Hirst explained that when the Council had declared a climate change emergency at its Meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019, there was an agreement to move towards a carbon neutral target and, in this context, he felt that the Council should seek to achieve this in the construction of the propose Waterloo Multi-Storey Car Park.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Theodoulou commented that he considered the Motion should receive support from all Council Members.

Councillor Coxcoon explained that whilst she was pleased to see the Motion presented to Council, she wished to propose an Amendment which she considered would not impose a barrier on any of the aims as outlined in the Motion. Councillor Coxcoon explained the Amendment related specifically to (i) removing reference to Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) funding from the third bullet point of the Motion and (ii) adding a further bullet point relating to future developments. As such, the two bullet points would read as follows:-

Amended Bullet Point 3

- *Starting immediately, ensuring that all new CDC public buildings will be carbon neutral throughout their entire lifespan (with Gloucestershire-based carbon offsetting to capture any technically unavoidable performance gap).*

New Bullet Point 5

- *Legally bind developers, or work with procured developers, to ensure that all residential and commercial developments on CDC disposed land are carbon neutral throughout their entire life-span (with developers funding Gloucestershire-based carbon offsetting to capture any technically unavoidable performance gap).'*

This Amendment was duly Seconded; at which juncture the Proposer and Seconder of the original Motion confirmed that they were satisfied to incorporate the Amendment within their Motion.

In response to a specific Member's question, the Chief Finance Officer and Legal Officer jointly reported that the Council owned a small amount of land which was of no significance to the Motion and that the Motion referred to any new buildings that the Council was involved with.

Councillor Hirst was invited to address the Council again, but explained he had no further comments to make other than to reaffirm that he was content to incorporate the Amendment within the original Motion.

**RESOLVED that the amended Motion be supported.**

**Record of Voting - for 29, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 5.**

(vi) Motion 11 of 2019/20 re Leisure Facilities in Fairford and Tetbury

Proposed by Councillor Richard Norris, Seconded by Councillor Stephen Andrews:

*'Local communities in Tetbury and Fairford have been left devastated by the recent and sudden closures of their leisure centres. Both communities are working hard to find solutions to try and keep their leisure centres open for local residents and local community groups. As leisure facilities are so crucial to the mental and physical wellbeing of residents, this council fully supports efforts by local communities and so will offer financial support if requested.'*

*This Council resolves to:*

*Offer a grant of up to £25,000 for each leisure centre (£25,000 for Tetbury and £25,000 for Fairford) to help transition from their previous organisation structure to their new structure. This grant will be available immediately and will be in place for the next 24 months. Funding can be spent on anything related to the present and or future labour and equipment needed for the successful start-up of each centre. For clarification:-*

- monies cannot be spent on past leisure centre operations or outstanding debts;*
- will be subject to the submission of a proposal by the local community organisation; and,*
- will be with the agreement of the school that in principle the facilities will be made available to the local community organisation.*

*The grant can be spent on:-*

*\* Funding to purchase, update or develop new booking and administration systems (including software, hardware and any increase labour costs associated with new administration procedures).*

*\* Funding for marketing activities so local communities are informed about the new opening and ongoing availability of the centres.*

*\* Funding to purchase and install new doors and locking systems if necessary (for example a magnetic key fob system or card swipe systems).*

*\* Funding to purchase any new security systems deemed necessary (for example CCTV).*

*\* Funding to purchase new insurance deemed necessary by the new organisations.*

*\* Funding to purchase or replace any old or damaged equipment.'*

In Proposing the Motion, Councillor Norris explained that the Motion requested the Council set aside grant money of up to £25,000 for both Fairford and Tetbury, against which grants could then be provided for assistance in setting up new enterprises. Councillor Norris suggested that applications should be submitted to the Cabinet Member for approval, who should ensure that a satisfactory business case had been made to offer grant support to an organisation.

In Seconding the Motion, Councillor Andrews informed the Council that, owing to the slight amendment to the Motion, a report would be submitted to the Cabinet detailing more fully the requests as outlined in the Motion.

**RESOLVED that the Motion stand referred to Cabinet.**

**Record of Voting - for 28, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 6.**

CL.47 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 28, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 6.**

The Meeting commenced at 2.02 p.m., adjourned between 4.00 p.m. and 4.10 p.m., and again between 5.32 p.m. and 5.35 p.m., and closed at 7.55 p.m.

Chair

(END)

Unconfirmed