

Public Document Pack

Council
31/July2024



COTSWOLD
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 31 July 2024

Members present:

Mark Harris - Vice Chair, in
the Chair
David Cunningham
Dilys Neill
Mike Evey
Joe Harris
Roly Hughes
Julia Judd
Juliet Layton
Andrew Maclean
Gina Blomefield

Claire Bloomer
Nigel Robbins
Gary Selwyn
Lisa Spivey
Patrick Coleman
Ray Brassington
Tom Stowe
Tony Slater
Helene Mansilla
Mike McKeown

David Fowles
Jeremy Theyer
Clare Turner
Michael Vann
Jon Wareing
Ian Watson
Daryl Corps
Len Wilkins
Paul Hodgkinson
Angus Jenkinson

Officers present:

Andrew Brown, Democratic Services Business
Manager
Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and
Development (Monitoring Officer)
Ana Prelici, Governance Officer
Robert Weaver, Chief Executive
Mandy Fathers, Business Manager for
Environmental, Welfare and Revenue Service

Claire Locke, Interim Executive Director
Michelle Burge, Chief Accountant
Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic
Services Support Assistant
Caleb Harris, Senior Democratic Services
Officer

12 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Twells, Nikki Ind, Tony Dale and Tristan Wilkinson.

13 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Andrew Maclean noted his name on the report in respect of appointing a temporary Parish Council Member for Upper Rissington but it had been agreed that he had no pecuniary interest.

The Chair then made a statement regarding the Publica Review. The following points were made:

Council
31/July2024

The Publica Shareholder Councils had taken legal advice about whether officers employed by the Publica Group whose roles were in scope for the phase I transition to direct Council employment needed to declare an interest and/or leave the room.

Whilst officers do not have an “interest” in public-law decision making unlike the decision-makers (i.e. Councillors), there was a need to avoid the appearance of bias.

Therefore, officers employed by the Publica Group who were in scope for the phase I transition, such as Democratic Services officers, would leave the room for the duration of the item.

Any officers employed by the Publica Group who were acting as Deputy Statutory Officers or otherwise advising members in relation to the Publica Transition item were able to stay in the room. This was because, in the view of the Council’s Monitoring Officer, the need for Members to receive answers to questions outweighed the risk of any appearance of bias.

14 Minutes

The minutes of the Full Council meetings on 20 March 2024 and 15 May 2024 were considered as part of the published pack.

There were two minor typographical amendments raised by Councillor Neill were noted on 20 March 2024 minutes under the Chair Announcements item which would be updated.

Councillor David Fowles queried where the apologies were for the previous meeting on 15 May 2024. It was confirmed by email after the meeting that these were present in the document but were not in the usual place because of the format of the Annual Meeting agenda.

* Due to a technical error, Councillor Helene Mansilla’s vote was incorrectly noted electronically as ‘Against’ and was corrected verbally to ‘Abstain’.

| Minutes of the Full Council meeting on 20 March 2024 (Resolution) | | |
|--|--|----|
| RESOLVED: That subject to the amendments noted, the Full Council minutes on 20 March 2024 be APPROVED as a correct record. | | |
| For | Gina Blomefield, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Mike Every, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 26 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | Claire Bloomer, David Cunningham, Roly Hughes and Helene Mansilla | 4 |
| Carried | | |

| Minutes of the Annual Council meeting on 15 May 2024 (Resolution) | | |
|--|--|--|
| RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Annual Council meeting on 15 May 2024 be approved as | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|
| a correct record. | | |
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Mike Evemy, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 26 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | David Cunningham, David Fowles, Roly Hughes and Helene Mansilla | 4 |
| Carried | | |

15 Announcements from the Chair, Leader or Chief Executive (if any)

The Vice- Chair started this item by welcoming both Dr Roz Savage MP and Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP and congratulating them on their election to the South Cotswolds and North Cotswold parliamentary constituencies respectively. It was hoped that they could be present at a future Council meeting to engage with Members on national considerations.

The Vice-Chair read announcements on behalf of the Chair who was not able to be in attendance:

The Chair had been in attendance for a number of gatherings on behalf of the Council: Mayor of Evesham Gathering for Civic Leaders, D-Day and Armed Forces Day Commemorations and the Annual Kiribati Tungaru gathering in Chedworth Village Hall.

An update was given on the Chair's Cotswold Way Challenge Walk to commemorate 50 years of Cotswold District Council. 8 out of the 12 stages had been completed alongside other representatives from the charities supported, Council Officers and family members.

The Vice-Chair also noted the following announcements:

- The Unsung Heroes award would be launching for nominations on 1 August to recognise the contributions of volunteers in the District.
- There would be an event on 25 September 2024 for the 50th Anniversary of the Council. The Council delivered over 50 different services within the District that supported communities.

The Leader, Councillor Joe Harris, was then invited to make the following announcements:

- The Leader congratulated both Dr. Roz Savage and Sir Geoffrey Clifton Brown on their election victories. The Leader also noted the importance of the General Election in engaging with residents and encouraging participation in democracy.
- The Leader noted the optimism regarding the new government and the need for the local government sector to be supported during the difficult financial challenges. There

was a need for multi-year funding settlements to be able to make informed decisions on service delivery and capital investments.

- The Leader noted that the housing target from the Government had changed which would require 300 more homes to be built per year. In doing so, some points were noted in relation to housing.
 - Tough decisions were required with communities to deliver more homes to buy and to rent.
 - Affordable housing was required to help those in the District to support communities particularly for those like carers to support the ageing population.
 - The priority for the administration was to deliver more socially rented housing.
 - The Council needed to meet housing targets and if it failed to meet the requirements, the Council could lose control of where and how those homes were built.
 - The whole Council was committed to get feedback from residents but there needed to be honesty about the requirements being asked of the Council.
- There were three Olympians competing in the Paris Olympic Games from the Cotswolds: Laura Collett and Tom McEwen in Equestrian events and Alex Cohoon in the swimming events and the Leader wished to wish them the best of luck.

The Chief Executive was then invited to make any announcements:

- Congratulations were given to the MPs for the North and South Cotswolds on their election victories. Thanks was also given to the Elections Staff who worked so hard to deliver the process.
- Best wishes were given to the Chair, Councillor Nikki Ind's mother who was going in for a minor operation and was the reason for the Chair's absence.
- The Chief Executive wished to provide condolences to the friends and family following the tragic incidents in Southport.

16 Public Questions

The Vice-Chair then invited the first public speaker to ask their question.

Councillor Mike Cameron Davies of Sapperton Parish Council asked a question regarding waste collection issues. Whilst recognising that the recent round reorganisation was required for the Council's budget, it was felt that the Council did not take appropriate action to mitigate the impact on those affected. Frampton Mansell was used as an example of an area where bin collections had not been consistent to the new timetable. The question asked was if the Council agreed that this was a pretty poorly planned and executed change that should not be repeated, and what lessons have been learned from this?

Council
31/July2024

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Mike Evemy, responded as the portfolio holder for waste and recycling and apologised to residents who had been inconvenienced from the changes. It was highlighted that officers within Publica and Ubico had been working hard on implementing the changes. It was affirmed that the planning work for the changes had been underway since November 2023, with the issues arising from the logistics implementing the change. There was a desire to minimise further disruptions on waste collections and it was noted that extra resources had been put in to the project. It was highlighted that missed bin collections had fallen week on week after an initial increase in missed bin collections.

A supplementary question was asked by Councillor Mike Cameron Davies about clarifying how the Council would proceed from here and work in a smarter way and how lessons would be learnt.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Evemy, stated that officers were to rectify any current issues and noted the complexities of the locations of properties in the District. Whilst stating that the change wasn't recognised as being a failure, there would be lessons to be learnt for any future changes required and that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would have a role in scrutinising any such changes.

Ben Eddols asked a public question regarding the proposed Stow and the Swells Neighbourhood Development Plan. It was highlighted that many volunteers' hours had been put into developing the plan since 2011 to improve the local community such as affordable housing, improving parking spaces and finding a permanent space for Stow Town Council. The main part of the plan had been rejected by the Inspector. In addition, Stow Town Council were currently in negotiations with Cotswold District Council regarding the future of the public toilets. It was felt that it was wrong that the residents should cover the £15,000 annual loss through the precept. It was asked why Stow Town Council should exist given the perceived lack of control over events in the communities.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Evemy, wished to pick up the point about the toilets. It was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had conducted a review through the Public Conveniences Working Group. The review had highlighted the need for the service to change and duplicate locations in one locality needed to be addressed. It was explained that discussions were taking place but there were constraints about what the Council could do on the future ownership of assets.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services, Councillor Juliet Layton, answered the point raised on the neighbourhood development plan and recognised the disappointment around the proposed developments being taken out by the examiner. It was noted that the Council and gone through a rigorous process and would go to a referendum in September. Councillor Layton commended the Town Council for their work on the rest of the plan, and said that conversations had been held with officers and the member for Stow around these issues.

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Safety, Councillor Lisa Spivey, wished to pick up the point about communities not being heard and that frustration was understood. It was key that decentralisation of decisions takes place. It was noted that the Town and Parish Council forums did take place in order to engage Town and Parish Councils as the centre of their communities.

Council
31/July2024

Neil Backwith then asked a question about the impacts of the Council's Local Plan on Moreton-in-Marsh. It was noted that a locally organised poll of residents in Moreton-in-Marsh showed a 96% rejection of the proposed Local Plan Update. The question asked to Councillor Joe Harris was if the Council would withdraw the Local Plan and replace it or would it continue with the overdevelopment in Moreton-in-Marsh?

The Leader, Councillor Joe Harris, noted that the Council would not be withdrawing the Local Plan Update. It was noted that there was a consultation on some of the key elements of the proposals. It was stated that Moreton would get more housing in the future but that some of this housing would unlock better infrastructure in the town. It was highlighted that whilst it would be preferable to go with an infrastructure first approach, the current system for planning did not allow for this. It was confirmed that the Council would continue to work with local communities going forward on the Local Plan Update.

The Chair then indicated that the 15 minutes allocated for public speakers had been used, and that therefore the other public speakers present who wished to ask a question were encouraged to submit their questions to Cabinet Members directly and would get an answer from the Cabinet Members in writing.

Councillor David Fowles on a point of order asked whether the Vice-Chair knew under the system how many questions there would be and that it was disappointing for those members of the public who had travelled to the Chamber to ask a question. The Vice-Chair indicated he wasn't aware of how many questions were going to be asked, but advised Councillor Fowles that any procedural points could be discussed at the Constitution Working Group. It was highlighted that the packed agenda required the timings to be kept to.

17 Member Questions

Member Questions with written responses and supplementary responses are attached at the Annex A.

18 Publica Review - Detailed report

The purpose of the report was to consider the Detailed Transition Plan, to note its content and to approve the recommendations therein.

The Chair invited those Publica officers who felt that they should leave the room to do so.

The Chair then invited the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris, to introduce the item. The following points were made:

- There were concerns about the sovereignty of the Council over its staff and the attractiveness of the Council as an employer at the time of introducing Publica in 2017.
- The Leader noted his own vote against the establishment of Publica as an organisation at that time.
- The concerns were noted as being manifested as part of the Council's current day-to-day operations during his time as Leader.
- The misgivings around Publica were not a reflection on the staff who work hard at the Council across a range of areas who support people and businesses across the District.

- The Leader wished to thank all staff for their work and noted that they were the Council's greatest asset to deliver the Council's priorities.
- The Leader noted that the transition of services would put staff at the forefront of the process to ensure they can deliver to the best of their ability.
- Phase I would return staff to the Council and set the Council's brand and identity as it becomes a major employer in the District once again.
- The report outlined the need to define what success looks like for the Council and how the future of the Council's services would look.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee were thanked for their work in scrutinising the report and providing constructive feedback. Following this, the Leader proposed an additional recommendation to the report which read as follows:

7. Note the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and therefore ask officers to work with members to clarify and define what success for the Council and continuing Publica will look like and the values that will underpin this success in order to improve efficiency and enhance services for residents, businesses and community organisations in the district.

- The Leader noted that a lot of the change required would take time but this was the beginning of the journey and the priority was to complete the Phase I transition of staff at pace.
- It was noted that the short-term and medium-term financial assumptions were clear but that unforeseen costs were possible and that mitigation measures would need to be prepared.
- It was highlighted that the transfer of staff would help to prepare the Council for the need to respond to the changes likely to take place in the local government sector.
- This was an opportunity to reset the Council as an employer and to ensure all employees feel valued and empowered in their roles.
- In the 50th Anniversary year of the Council, it was noted that this would be a significant moment in the history of the organisation.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Mike Every seconded the recommendations and made the following points:

- In previous years, outsourcing to the private sector and economies of scale was something that all councils were seeking to do. This was also supported by the UK Government at that time through grant funding.
- Previous arrangements at that time under GO (Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire) Shared Services included transactional services like HR and Payroll under this model.

- Publica was created in 2016 and went live in 2017, taking on the vast majority of services. It was highlighted that in hindsight this could have been seen as a step too far.
- The councils had been left with very little policy and strategic capabilities which made it hard to influence staffing structures and associated spending.
- The Publica Shareholder Councils all had individual circumstances within their own Districts which needed to be met through services. This had become particularly prevalent with the change of administrations in the Shareholder Councils.
- It was reiterated that it wasn't a criticism of the staff within Publica but rather of the model it was operated under.
- Following the review of services by Human Engine and the decisions taken to repatriate services to the Council, senior management in the Councils and Publica had been working closely with the Programme Director to drive the process.
- Publica as a company would still have a role within Council services which would need to be closely managed by the Council.
- The expected cost following the transition was estimated to be around £376,000 per annum which represented a 10% increase over the current cost within Publica. The key factor in this increase was the offering of all staff the Local Government Pension Scheme which the modelling assumed all staff would take up with few opting out.
- There were key principles for success in the Detailed Transition Plan and key performance indicators would be drawn up and monitored. These principles included enabling performance and value for money to be measured, simplify processes, manage resource deployment, and embed cost recovery in services.

Members made various comments around previous concerns of the financial impact of the transition of services. It was also noted that the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had produced previous amendments which were rejected around monitoring the financial costs.

Council noted points raised that the Phase 1 and 2 transitions would have a long-term impact on the cost of delivering services and the scale of services provided.

Council noted that extra transparency around agency staff costs and the whole project costs would be of benefit as promised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Council noted that Senior Management of the Council had worked very hard to deliver the change and to have an 'open-door' to Members for questions.

Council noted issues with staff recruitment because of Publica's lack of access to the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Council noted the findings of the Peer Review which had raised the original concerns around the Publica shared services model.

Council
31/July2024

Council noted that Publica did not need to be totally dismantled to deliver improvements and that any change would need to be done creatively.

The Leader in summing up made the following points:

Councillors across the political divide had shared frustrations around the operation of services under Publica.

The Leader was comfortable that the vast majority of the financial questions had been answered. There would be some unknowns but there was confidence in the work done by the Chief Finance Officer and the Programme Director.

There would be difficult decisions around staffing structures but the Council would have control over future requirements.

There was hope that the new UK Government would give long-term funding certainty, but this wasn't available right now.

It was stated that most councils were moving away from Teckal companies.

While the transition may provide challenges the Council would plan to mitigate these where possible.

It was stated that the transition of services in future years would likely be seen as a positive step for the District.

Publica Review Detailed Transition Plan (Resolution)

RESOLVED: That Full Council:

1. APPROVED the implementation of Phase I of the Publica Transition based on the Detailed Transition Plan and the phasing for the transition.
2. DELEGATED AUTHORITY to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the decision to deal with any final detail matters arising from the Detailed Transition Plan.
3. DELEGATED AUTHORITY to the Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer), in liaison with the Leader, to update the constitution by making any consequential changes required as a result of Phase I of the Publica Transition.
4. AGREED TO carry out a budget re-basing for the 2026/7 financial year so that the funding provided to Publica is proportionate to the services received.
5. NOTED that following the decision on Phase I, preparatory work for Phase 2 will commence and will be the subject of a separate report
6. NOTED the following as included in the Detailed Transition Plan;
Section 2: Transition Planning:
 - Note the Design-Led principles
 - Note the Key Goals for Transition*Section 7: Modelling Assumptions and Outputs:*
 - Note the cost modelling for Phase I.*Section 9: Post-Transition Support:*

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| · <i>Note the need for post-transition support.</i> | | |
| 7. NOTED the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and therefore asks officers to work with members to clarify and define what success for the Council and continuing Publica will look like and the values that will underpin this success in order to improve efficiency and enhance services for residents, businesses and community organisations in the district. | | |
| For | Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Mike Evely, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Lisa Spivey, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing and Ian Watson | 21 |
| Against | Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Tony Slater, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer and Len Wilkins | 8 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | Gina Blomefield | 1 |
| Carried | | |

19 Business And Planning Act 2020 - Update To Pavement Licensing Regime

The purpose of the report was for Full Council to consider the draft Pavement License Policy document for approval following the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act making permanent the pavement licensing regime.

Councillor Juliet Layton introduced the report and made the following points:

- The Planning and Licensing Committee as a consultee approved the draft policy at its meeting on 12 June 2024.
- The report contained the draft policy following the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act which made Pavement Licensing a permanent regime.
- The original regime was introduced in 2020 under the Business and Planning Act to extend the trading area for food and drink to outside spaces during the Coronavirus Pandemic. Businesses would need to apply to the Council for a licence to utilise this.
- The Council had issued 12 licences across the District.
- The draft policy reflected changes in legislation which included:
 - increasing the consultation period to 28 days
 - expanding licence validation to 24 months
 - increasing the capped fee to £500 and the renewal fee to £350.
- Expanding enforcement powers for the Council.

- Licences granted prior to 30 March 2024 would be valid until the end of the expiration date.
- A cost recovery principle underpinned the draft policy with a new licence costing £185 for a new 24 months licence and £150 for a renewal.
- It was stated that this move would give certainty for business in the District.

Councillor Ray Brassington seconded and made the following points:

- Any objections to a pavement licence application would be reviewed by officers in consultation with himself as Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee.
- The change to a 28 day consultation period was welcomed to improve responses from the public.

Council noted the encouraging policy from the Covid Pandemic on pavement licensing for communities in an orderly way.

Council noted the entrepreneurs in the Cotswold using pavement licences which would be of benefit to businesses.

Council asked about the 14-day public consultation and how that was carried out. The Business Manager - Environmental, Welfare & Revenue Service answered and stated that Highways and other public bodies would be consulted. It was noted these applications were also posted online for residents to raise any objections. Council asked about the 28 day minimum consultation and whether this was enough time. The Business Manager answered that the statutory consultees did respond quite efficiently normally to these applications.

Council noted the clarity for businesses in the District that the policy would provide.

| Business And Planning Act 2020 - Update To Pavement Licensing Regime (Resolution) | | |
|--|--|----|
| RESOLVED: That Full Council: I. APPROVED the draft Pavement Licensing Policy and Fees, attached at Annex A. | | |
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 30 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | None | 0 |

20 Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2023/24

The purpose of the report was to receive the annual report of the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2023/24 Civic Year.

Councillor Blomefield as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee introduced the report:

- Thanked the members of the Committee who had contributed to the work of the Committee over the past year. Specifically Councillor Selwyn as Vice-Chair and Councillor Clare Turner who had stood in as a Vice-Chair.
- The Chair also thanked the officers involved in the running of the Committee.
- It was noted that this was the first time a report had been received by Full Council in respect of the work done by the Committee.
- The report highlighted the progress made by the Committee, in particular in relation to Task and Finish Groups and the special meeting held with Great Western Railway.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had also made a positive contribution through the recommendations to Cabinet. Many of these recommendations had been accepted as part of the recommendations.

Council noted thanks from Cabinet Members for the development of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to being an effective 'critical friend' of the Executive.

Council noted the difference made by Public Conveniences Working group in its work regarding the future of public conveniences through cross-party working.

Many Members commended the chairing skills of Councillor Blomefield in guiding the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and improving the work of the Committee.

It was highlighted that the questions by Committee members to Cabinet Members as the leading policy makers helped to examine proposals to Cabinet and Council.

Councillor Blomefield in summing up noted about liaising with the Leader and other Cabinet Members to discuss more in advance about the work of the Committee through work planning sessions.

RESOLVED: Full Council NOTED the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2023/24.

21 Decision taken under Urgency Powers

The purpose of the report was for Council to note the decision taken by the Chief Executive using Urgency Powers.

The Leader, Councillor Joe Harris introduced the report and made the following points:

Council
31/July2024

- The Full Council meeting date had changed due to the General Election pre-election period which moved other meetings such as Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- As Full Council needs to agree its own meeting date changes and was unable to, the Chief Executive used the Urgency Powers within the Constitution to action the change.

There were no comments on this item.

RESOLVED: Full Council NOTED the decision taken.

22 Appointment and Remuneration of Independent Persons

The purpose of this report was to appoint Independent Persons for standards matters and approve allowances payable.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris, introduced this item and made the following points:

- The Localism Act 2011 required that at least one independent member was appointed to assist the Monitoring Officer in assessing code of conduct complaints against District and Town and Parish Councillors.
- There had been an uptick in complaints, particularly in relation to Town and Parish Councillors.
- Independent persons could advise the Councillor accused of breaching the Code of Conduct and this was usually not required.
- The large increase in complaints required the Council to reinforce its arrangements for assessing these complaints.
- One of the Independent Members also sat on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel.
- Two of the Independent Persons would be re-appointed but two new Independent Persons would be appointed following a retirement. This followed a recruitment campaign and interview where Robert Cawley and Melvin Kenyon met the requirements needed.

The Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer) was then invited to speak to the item and made the following points:

- The increase in complaints was highlighted in the report to the Audit and Governance Committee on 23 July 2024.
- The independent persons were important individuals to support the process for maintaining standards.

Councillor David Fowles seconded and noted the hard work of the Director of Governance and Development in dealing with complex cases. A question arose regarding the format of

Council
31/July2024

meetings with the independent persons given their distance from the area. The Director of Governance and Development noted that most of the contact was via video conference but for Standards Hearings, these would need to be held in person. It was also confirmed the mileage paid would be at the same rate as for Councillors.

Councillor Mike Evemy wished to note for the record that Michael Paget-Wilkes was known to him as he played in the same tennis club. However, he did not otherwise socialise with him and this would not be a pecuniary interest.

Appointment and Remuneration of Independent Persons (Resolution)

RESOLVED: That Full Council

1. AGREED to appoint Robert Cawley and Melvin Kenyon and re-appoint Michael Paget-Wilkes and Phyllida Pyper as Independent Members, effective from 1.08.2024. All appointments to be a maximum of four years i.e. to 31.07.2028;
2. APPROVED that the Independent Persons are paid an annual allowance of £1000 per annum on a monthly basis, plus a mileage allowance equivalent to the rate paid to elected Members;
3. AUTHORISED the Director of Governance & Development (Monitoring Officer) to commence a recruitment campaign prior to the expiration of current appointments and to enable reports to be presented on future appointments.

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 30 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | None | 0 |
| Carried | | |

23 Appointment of a Temporary Parish Council Member to Upper Rissington Parish Council

The purpose of the report was to appoint Independent Persons for standards matters, commence a subsequent recruitment campaign, and approve allowances payable.

The Leader, Councillor Joe Harris proposed the recommendations within the report and outlined the following points:

- Parish Councils must be quorate to operate and make decisions which meant a minimum of 3 Members or 1/3 of its membership.
- Section 91 of the Local Government Act dealt with situations where a Town/Parish Council becomes inquorate, making provisions for the District Council to co-opt a member of its own on to the Town or Parish Council.

Council
31/July2024

- Upper Rissington Parish Council was now inquorate after the resignation of several members of its own Council.
- Councillor Andrew Maclean would therefore be co-opted on to the Council in order for the Council to co-opt new members.
- The clerk of Upper Rissington Parish Council had advised that there was interest in the community and that it should be able to become quorate shortly.
- Council had approved a procedure in 2021 to allow appointments to be delegated to the Chief Executive in order for Council to co-opt.

Councillor Tom Stowe seconded the proposal and made the following points:

- Councillor Maclean was thanked for stepping up to the role.
- There was a question about problems in recruitment of Town and Parish Councils and whether this was a wider trend. The Director of Governance and Development replied anecdotally that there did seem to be a wider national trend in recruiting this voluntary role. It was also a prominent issue locally given that Cotswold had a large number of Town and Parish Councils in the District.

Councillor Maclean noted there was a large number of younger people in the village due to the siting of an ex-RAF base.

Appointment of Temporary Town or Parish Council Members (Resolution)

RESOLVED: That Full Council

1. AGREED to make an order under Section 91 of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act') appointing Councillor Andrew Maclean as a temporary member of Upper Rissington Parish Council enabling Upper Rissington Parish Council to become quorate;
2. NOTED that the appointment shall be effective until Upper Rissington Parish Council is quorate (i.e. it has four members of the Council in place, excepting the temporary appointee);
3. APPROVED the draft procedure at Annex A, delegating authority to the Monitoring Officer to make orders and make temporary appointments to Town/Parish Councils as required, under the powers in Section 91 of the Act.

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|----|
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 29 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | Andrew Maclean | 1 |
| Carried | | |

24 Notice of Motions

The one motion tabled was titled Cotswold Lakes.

Councillor Juliet Layton introduced the motion and made the following points:

- This motion was to ask that Council acknowledge the desire of the Cotswold Lakes Trust for the change of name from Cotswold Water Park to Cotswold Lakes. It would also formalise the name change within the constituent authorities of which Cotswold District Council was one.
- In April 2024, Councillor Layton and Councillor Every were invited as the local ward members to discuss with businesses and the Trust about changing the name along with Council tourism officers.
- The steering group had consulted Town and Parish Councils within the locality and all were supportive of the proposals.
- It was noted that about the named Cotswold Water Park caused some confusion.
- The decision had been taken by the Trust to market the area more appropriately.
- The motion was to formalise the name into the constituent authorities.

Councillor Mike Every seconded and made the following points:

- Councillor Every noted that other Councillors attended the meeting with the Trust to discuss the proposal.
- The motion was a public statement in supporting the change.
- The business involved would be changing its name to adapt to the new name as they recognised the benefits of doing so.
- New signs would be required over time and this would be done as signs were replaced in partnership.
- The Council would update its Local Plan and other documents to support this.

Council asked if there would be cost implications for Cotswold District Council. Councillor Every clarified that the signage change could cost some money, but this would need to be clarified as to which organisation owned the signs. There was a street signage budget and any old signs being replaced would be updated to the new name.

It was noted by the Vice-Chair that the name was changing anyway but it was whether the Council supported this change.

Council noted the importance of putting the Cotswold Lakes on the map in regarding to its landscape and the work of the Cotswold Lakes Trust.

It was highlighted that it was important to get the partner authorities and other parties required together to make the name change happen.

| Cotswold Lakes (Motion) | | |
|--------------------------------|--|----|
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 30 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | None | 0 |
| Carried | | |

25 Next meeting

The next meeting of Full Council was confirmed to be on 25 September 2024 at 2pm.

26 Matters exempt from publication

The Chair then moved the following motion which was seconded by Mike Evemy

RESOLVED: That Full Council exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of item 16 in accordance with provisions of section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Voting Record

30 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions, 4 Absent/Did not vote

| To move into private session (Motion) | | |
|---|--|----|
| RESOLVED: That Full Council exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of item 16 in accordance with provisions of section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. | | |
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 30 |
| Against | None | 0 |

Council
31/July2024

| | | |
|-----------------------|------|---|
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | None | 0 |
| Carried | | |

27 Decision on future regeneration of The Old Station and Memorial Cottages, Cirencester

The purpose of the report was to consider the Asset Plans for the Old Station and Memorial Cottage buildings produced as part of the Council's Asset Management Strategy and consider disposal of these buildings in line with those Asset Plans.

Full Council discussed the report in private session.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Mike Evely and seconded by Councillor Joe Harris.

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Decision on future regeneration of The Old Station and Memorial Cottages, Cirencester (Resolution) | | |
| RESOLVED: That Full Council: | | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AGREED that the Old Station and Old Memorial cottages are disposed of, as two separate assets, in line with the Asset Management Strategy adopted at Cabinet in May 2024 and the Asset Plans appended to this report. 2. DELEGATED AUTHORITY to the Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance to approve the final terms of the sale including sale price. | | |
| For | Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, Mike Evely, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Roly Hughes, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Andrew Maclean, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Nigel Robbins, Gary Selwyn, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins | 30 |
| Against | None | 0 |
| Conflict Of Interests | None | 0 |
| Abstain | None | 0 |
| Carried | | |

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.55 pm

Chair
(END)

Member Questions for Council – 31 July 2024

Any supplementary questions are noted within the document where applicable

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>Question 1 from Councillor Jon Wareing to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council (on behalf of Councillor Dale)</p> <p>The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) defines over-tourism as “the impact of tourism on a destination, or parts thereof, that excessively influences perceived quality of life of citizens and/or quality of visitor experiences in a negative way”.</p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member responsible for the Economy and Council Transformation agree with me that Bourton-on-the-Water suffers from over-tourism on this basis, and will he commit to ensuring that Bourton can develop an approach to sustainable tourism whilst building a more resilient economy with retail services for the residents of Bourton and the wider North Cotswolds? This should include prioritising parking for residents and looking to support parking for visitor traffic on the periphery of the village.</p> | <p>I share Cllr Wareing’s concerns about over-tourism in Bourton-on-the-Water.</p> <p>Bourton-on-the-Water is a popular destination, evidenced by high visitor footfall. While we lack specific survey data on perceptions of over-tourism, we acknowledge the strong sentiments of residents regarding the negative impacts on their quality of life due to excessive visitor numbers.</p> <p>Balancing the needs of local businesses benefiting from tourism with the quality of life of residents is crucial. Our administration has taken initial steps to address this issue, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tourism Levy on Parking: We have introduced a tourism levy on car parking in Bourton-on-the-Water, specifically allocated for initiatives to mitigate the impact of tourism on the village. This is a unique measure within our district. 2. Visitor Dispersal and Public Transport Promotion: Our Tourism Team actively discourages additional visitors to Bourton and promotes other parts of the district to spread the visitor load. We also encourage the use of public transport whenever possible. <p>However, more comprehensive measures are needed. To begin addressing these challenges, I will ask the Chief Executive to arrange a meeting with you to discuss and develop effective strategies for Bourton-on-the-Water.</p> <p>Potential Approaches and Ongoing Initiatives:</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan Review: The ongoing review of our local plan may offer opportunities to influence planning policy in favour of sustainable tourism. • Parking Strategy Review: Cotswold District Council is reviewing its parking strategy to optimize the use of council assets for the benefit of both residents and the local economy. Input from residents, town and parish councils, and visitors has been sought to address immediate and long-term needs. <p>Cllr Paul Hodgkinson, who is leading this effort, is well-versed in the issues facing Bourton as the local county councillor. Collaboration with Gloucestershire County Council will be essential in addressing broader parking issues.</p> <p>While there is no simple solution to the problems outlined by Cllr Wareing, Cotswold District Council is committed to supporting Bourton-on-the-Water in its pursuit of sustainable tourism and a more resilient local economy.</p> |
| <p>Question 2 from Councillor Dilys Neill to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>Here is a quote from the submitted Neighbourhood development plan for Stow & The Swells</p> <p>MAIN PLANNING ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the mid Twentieth Century a substantial amount of social housing was built in two major developments – King Georges Field and the Park estate. A substantial number of | <p>Thank you, Cllr Neill, for raising these crucial issues affecting Stow. The Council is committed to addressing the challenges of providing genuinely affordable housing, particularly social rented housing.</p> <p>National policies like Right to Buy, and the lack of restrictions on second home ownership and short-term lets, have significantly reduced the availability of family housing in Stow, making remaining properties unaffordable for many, especially young families.</p> <p>Stow’s hilltop location and its designation within the AONB present significant challenges for new housing development due to national policies aimed at</p> |

these properties have passed into private hands under the Right to Buy and have not been replaced. There is only limited turnover in the remaining social housing.

- Stow, a compact hilltop community within the AONB, has a tight development boundary. Most developments in recent years have been minor infill developments within the development boundary. Stow's attractiveness has resulted in high prices well beyond the reach of almost all local residents. There has been an increase in the number of second homes. The private rented sector has seen a significant shift towards holiday lettings pricing local people out of that market also. This has forced many young people away from Stow leaving an increasingly ageing population.

- Stow's working age population has fallen over the last decade and the Primary School rolls have declined with an increasing number of pupils coming from outside the parish. Only two significant developments have been permitted outside the development boundary both of which have been restricted to retirement living. Taken together the McCarthy and Stone development north of Tesco and the Brio development on Stow Hill (for which approval was given on appeal) will add some 200 elderly residents to

Stow's population (currently about 1900).

- There is a strong case for seeking to improve Stow's sustainability by providing a significant number of houses that local people, people of working age and essential workers can afford. This can only be achieved by substantial development of affordable housing, primarily social rented,

protecting the landscape. However, where opportunities arise, the Council is dedicated to capitalizing on them to benefit the community.

Steps Taken and Planned Initiatives:

1. **Housing Needs Survey:** An independent housing needs survey for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) identifies a need for 37 affordable homes in Stow, including 17 for social rent, 5 for affordable rent, and 15 for affordable ownership by 2031.
2. **New Affordable Housing Approvals:** In December 2023, planning permission was granted for 37 affordable homes at Land north of Oddington Road, with 22 affordable rented and 15 shared ownership homes. Additionally, land for 15 co-housing units is earmarked for the Stow Community Land Trust.
3. **Recent Developments:** In July 2022, 18 energy-efficient social rent homes were completed at Chamberlayne Close, replacing 16 outdated sheltered housing units.
4. **Partial Local Plan Update:** The ongoing update includes policies to lower the development size threshold for affordable housing contributions and increase the percentage requirement for affordable housing within developments. It also aims to increase the availability of smaller, more affordable housing types.
5. **Local Plan Policy S13 Review:** The Council is considering further updates to emphasize Stow's housing and community needs, highlighting the necessity for more affordable homes.

outside the current development boundary.

Our primary school received an impressive Ofsted report last month, yet the numbers on role have fallen to less than 100, they can take 140 children. Last year, they had to lose a teacher & unless something is done to allow more families to live in Stow, the viability of the school is threatened.

In addition to the shortage of genuinely affordable housing, the neighbourhood plan sight to address the lack of employment opportunities in Stow & parking.

Our Market Square the jewel in the crown of Stow's built development is spoilt by the fact that it is effectively a large car park.

The neighbourhood plan's proposal for a strategic site for housing, a car park & a community hub which included employment opportunities was turned down by the inspector. I have been the Ward Councillor for Stow since 2016, & have been told by members of this administration as well as the previous administration & officers from the forward planning team that these concerns, particularly housing, should be a priority for this council. Yet year by year, under the SHELAA process, sites put forward around Stow are turned down.

My question to the Cabinet member with the responsibility for the local plan is what are you going to do to support the residents of Stow in terms of allowing more affordable, & in particular social, housing to be built?

6. **Development Strategy and Site Allocation Plan:** Extending the Local Plan period to 2041, this strategy aims to identify additional land for housing. For example, the site at 'Land adjoining Tall Trees, Oddington Road' is under consideration for development, potentially including affordable homes.
7. **Exploring Nearby Options:** The Council is exploring affordable housing developments in accessible nearby locations, such as Moreton-in-Marsh, to support Stow's housing needs.
8. **New Housing Strategy:** This comprehensive strategy addresses housing affordability by increasing genuinely affordable housing and improving energy and water efficiency to reduce household bills.
9. **Support for the NDP:** The Council has actively supported the Stow and the Swells NDP, despite challenges in securing major development sites. Council officers remain committed to assisting the NDP, which will soon proceed to a referendum.
10. **Advocacy and Policy Changes:** The Council has actively participated in national policy consultations, advocating for changes to address local issues. This includes introducing a 100% council tax premium on substantially furnished second homes.

The Council will continue to explore all available options and take necessary actions to support the residents of Stow by enabling the development of more affordable and social housing.

I'd welcome a meeting with you and Alan Hope, the Council's new Strategic

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Housing Manager, to look at how we identify and deliver more social rented and other affordable homes in Stow.</p> |
| <p>Question 3 from Councillor Chris Twells to Councillor Mike Evely, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Please set out the number of missed refuse and recycling collections, broken down by ward, since the new refuse collection timetable was introduced on 24 June 2024.</p> <p>It would be helpful to have a percentage figure as well as the number.</p> | <p>Please find below a list of the number of missed containers per ward for the first five weeks of the new collection cycle. The number of containers missed has continued to fall over this period.</p> <p>We recognise that there has been a small percentage of missed collections and apologise to any residents affected for the inconvenience that this may cause. We are working with UBICO to ensure mitigation is put in place to avoid problems going forward.</p> |

Containers missed by week

| Count of Ward | Column Labels | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| Row Labels | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Grand Total | No Properties | |
| Abbey | 142 | 45 | 25 | 5 | 43 | 260 | 1273 | |
| Blockley | 15 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 21 | 63 | 1393 | |
| Bourton Vale | 73 | 14 | 58 | 12 | 39 | 196 | 1373 | |
| Bourton Village | 40 | 11 | 85 | 2 | 51 | 189 | 1606 | |
| Campden and Vale | 99 | 14 | 55 | 13 | 58 | 239 | 3113 | |
| Chedworth and Churn Valley | 64 | 105 | 17 | 46 | 17 | 249 | 1146 | |
| Chesterton | 16 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 37 | 1053 | |
| Coln Valley | 55 | 16 | 10 | 22 | 27 | 130 | 1270 | |
| Ermin | 209 | 220 | 87 | 108 | 8 | 632 | 1205 | |
| Fairford North | 29 | 5 | 37 | | 27 | 98 | 1131 | |
| Fosseridge | | 54 | 1 | 19 | 3 | 77 | 1393 | |
| Four Acres | 11 | 1 | 6 | | 11 | 29 | 963 | |
| Grumbolds Ash with Avening | 23 | 83 | 53 | 53 | 46 | 258 | 1195 | |
| Kemble | 9 | 48 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 77 | 1389 | |
| Lechlade, Kempford and Fairford South | 101 | 20 | 57 | 10 | 21 | 209 | 3018 | |
| Moreton East | 10 | 38 | 2 | 36 | 2 | 88 | 1602 | |
| Moreton West | 1 | 94 | | 51 | 1 | 147 | 1361 | |
| New Mills | 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 13 | 31 | 1093 | |
| Northleach | 20 | 49 | 2 | 43 | 9 | 123 | 1442 | |
| Sandywell | 61 | 50 | 88 | 113 | 2 | 314 | 1274 | |
| Siddington and Cerney Rural | 7 | 32 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 65 | 1555 | |
| South Cerney Village | 1 | 50 | 1 | 13 | | 65 | 1255 | |
| St Michael's | 87 | 1 | 84 | | 23 | 195 | 1417 | |
| Stow | 51 | 22 | 24 | 13 | 33 | 143 | 1594 | |
| Stratton | 72 | 115 | 23 | 29 | 1 | 240 | 1201 | |
| Tetbury East and Rural | 9 | 64 | 63 | 35 | 19 | 190 | 1454 | |
| Tetbury Town | 5 | 4 | 5 | | 1 | 15 | 1166 | |
| Tetbury with Upton | 1 | 12 | 30 | 35 | 42 | 120 | 1107 | |
| The Ampneys and Hampton | 32 | 33 | 3 | 65 | 8 | 141 | 1263 | |
| The Beeches | 20 | | 4 | | 1 | 25 | 1256 | |
| The Rissingtons | 1 | 8 | | 17 | 1 | 27 | 1132 | |
| Watermoor | 69 | 2 | 44 | 4 | 23 | 142 | 1507 | |
| Grand Total | 1341 | 1221 | 898 | 793 | 561 | 4814 | 45200 | |

Containers missed by week

| Ward | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Abbey | 11.15% | 3.53% | 1.96% | 0.39% | 3.38% |
| Blockley | 1.08% | 0.57% | 0.65% | 0.72% | 1.51% |
| Bourton Vale | 5.32% | 1.02% | 4.22% | 0.87% | 2.84% |
| Bourton Village | 2.49% | 0.68% | 5.29% | 0.12% | 3.18% |
| Campden and Vale | 3.18% | 0.45% | 1.77% | 0.42% | 1.86% |
| Chedworth and Churn Valley | 5.58% | 9.16% | 1.48% | 4.01% | 1.48% |
| Chesterton | 1.52% | 0.09% | 0.76% | 0.66% | 0.47% |
| Coln Valley | 4.33% | 1.26% | 0.79% | 1.73% | 2.13% |
| Ermin | 17.34% | 18.26% | 7.22% | 8.96% | 0.66% |
| Fairford North | 2.56% | 0.44% | 3.27% | 0.00% | 2.39% |
| Fosseridge | 0.00% | 3.88% | 0.07% | 1.36% | 0.22% |
| Four Acres | 1.14% | 0.10% | 0.62% | 0.00% | 1.14% |
| Grumbolds Ash with Avening | 1.92% | 6.95% | 4.44% | 4.44% | 3.85% |
| Kemble | 0.65% | 3.46% | 0.43% | 0.86% | 0.14% |
| Lechlade, Kempsford and Fairford South | 3.35% | 0.66% | 1.89% | 0.33% | 0.70% |
| Moreton East | 0.62% | 2.37% | 0.12% | 2.25% | 0.12% |
| Moreton West | 0.07% | 6.91% | 0.00% | 3.75% | 0.07% |
| New Mills | 0.73% | 0.18% | 0.64% | 0.09% | 1.19% |
| Northleach | 1.39% | 3.40% | 0.14% | 2.98% | 0.62% |
| Sandywell | 4.79% | 3.92% | 6.91% | 8.87% | 0.16% |
| Siddington and Cerney Rural | 0.45% | 2.06% | 0.26% | 1.22% | 0.19% |
| South Cerney Village | 0.08% | 3.98% | 0.08% | 1.04% | 0.00% |
| St Michael's | 6.14% | 0.07% | 5.93% | 0.00% | 1.62% |
| Stow | 3.20% | 1.38% | 1.51% | 0.82% | 2.07% |
| Stratton | 6.00% | 9.58% | 1.92% | 2.41% | 0.08% |
| Tetbury East and Rural | 0.62% | 4.40% | 4.33% | 2.41% | 1.31% |
| Tetbury Town | 0.43% | 0.34% | 0.43% | 0.00% | 0.09% |
| Tetbury with Upton | 0.09% | 1.08% | 2.71% | 3.16% | 3.79% |
| The Ampneys and Hampton | 2.53% | 2.61% | 0.24% | 5.15% | 0.63% |
| The Beeches | 1.59% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 0.00% | 0.08% |
| The Rissingtons | 0.09% | 0.71% | 0.00% | 1.50% | 0.09% |
| Watermoor | 4.58% | 0.13% | 2.92% | 0.27% | 1.53% |
| Total | 2.97% | 2.70% | 1.99% | 1.75% | 1.24% |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Question 4 from Councillor Chris Twells to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Please could the Leader confirm when he expects to meet the new Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government, and the main issues he intends to raise in any meeting?</p> | <p>I haven't yet met with the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government however I hope to in the next few months as part of my role at the Local Government Association.</p> <p>Issues I intend to raise are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government funding - the sector and our council needs certainty about how much money we'll be getting from Government over the next few years. I'll be pressing for a 'multi-year funding settlement' so we're able to put our medium-term financial strategy on a firmer footing. • Affordable housing – many councils like Cotswold want to deliver more affordable housing to help tackle the affordable housing crisis. I'll ask for more power and resources to deliver social rented homes, particularly support for council's that don't have any housing stock. • Devolution – I'll seek a commitment from Government to work with both county and district councils as equal partners whose expertise, local networks and knowledge – for example supporting local economic development, housing and planning - are key to a successful outcome, and for district councils to have a seat at the table of Combined County Authorities and be constituent members of them. |
| <p>Question 5 from Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Has the Council and UBICO investigated the use of HVO fuels for its refuse collection fleet?</p> | <p>The Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and has a desire to transition the waste fleet to zero carbon energy by 2030. HVO is a potential way of facilitating the transition.</p> <p>Cllr Evemy and Cllr McKeown have held meetings with officers and are working to explore ways to replace our current fleet with zero carbon alternatives.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>The waste collection fleet currently use standard forecourts to refuel vehicles, therefore HVO (Hydrogenated Vegetable Oil) is not a viable option. Officers are reviewing whether a fuel tank can be used at the depot for refuelling and a business case will then be prepared on this.</p> <p>All vehicles on the waste fleet can use HVO as an alternative fuel without implication for the vehicles' performance or warranty but the cost of HVO has been significantly more expensive than standard diesel, although there are significant environmental benefits, principally including a reduction in carbon emitted from vehicle tailpipes.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary Question from Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Councillor Stowe recognised the financial case for HVO fuel use was not clear, but emphasised that other local authorities had made the switch for the environmental benefits that their use brings. Councillor Stowe then asked:</p> <p>Given that the Council declared a climate emergency several years ago, why has it taken the administration 5 years to investigate this, and adopt or discount the idea?</p> | <p>Councillor Evemy noted that he could only speak to his time as the portfolio holder for waste and recycling services when he took over 12 months ago. It was highlighted he was made aware of and had discussions with the relevant officers. It was noted that some Councils had taken on HVO fuels but it was noted that HVO fuels do have significant financial implications in order to move to this fuel and to operate it with the vehicles. It was outlined that whilst the administration was open to the idea, the aim was to eventually move to a 100% zero emission electric fleet whilst balancing this against the financial pressures the Council is facing.</p> |
| <p>Question 6 from Councillor David Fowles to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Several months ago, I asked a supplementary question about Cotswold News to which I did not receive an answer. Given the Administration's pledge to be 'green to the core' please could you confirm that the latest issue of Cotswold</p> | <p>The paper used to produce Cotswold News is 'FSC certified' and carbon balanced. This ensures that the paper used is sustainably produced and minimises the impact on the environment.</p> <p>The advice we have received is that this is an environmentally sustainable solution while also providing the required quality for the publication at an affordable cost.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>News was produced on 100% Recycled Material and the paper and production were Carbon Balanced to ensure the environmental impacts of the publication were kept to a minimum?</p> | |
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor David Fowles to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council</p> <p>Councillor Fowles noted that FSC certified whilst being sustainably sourced is not 100% recycled paper which is the most environmentally friendly producing this. The supplementary question was in two parts:</p> <p>At what cost is the ambition of being ‘green to the core’ and whether the most sustainable model would be a digital subscriber based model for Cotswold News as opposed to the current model?</p> | <p>Councillor Joe Harris responded by saying that he didn’t agree with assertions about the current model as the magazine was about reaching the most vulnerable people who can’t access digital channels which can’t be targeted. It was noted that communications from the Council needed to be on multiple fronts. It was stated that the Council would explore sustainable paper options but the financial costs for any change needed to be examined carefully before proceeding.</p> |
| <p>Question 7 from Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>Following recent news in the National Press that CDC has pledged to “identify suitable areas for wind energy development” in the district, given the constraints on development across much of the district as evidenced in the ongoing Local Plan update, where do you foresee these Wind Farms being built?</p> | <p>A Renewable Energy Strategy is being prepared that will provide the evidence base for the identification in the Local Plan of broadly suitable areas for renewable energy development.</p> <p>The Strategy and the Local Plan will have full regard to the constraints on such development. Planning for renewable energy in Cotswold District will assist in delivery of the Council’s Corporate Plan. Preparation of a Renewable Energy Strategy as part of a Local Plan is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para 160).</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>Councillor Stowe noted that policy CC25B2.35 within the draft Local Plan aimed to have a minimum target of 21% of the District’s electricity consumption from renewable generation. His question was:</p> <p>Please can you confirm how much land is required to meet this target by either solar or wind energy?</p> | <p>Councillor Layton noted that she did not have that information to hand but would write him with an answer. It was noted that renewable energy generation would need to take place in the right location in order to manage them and to make them as efficient as possible. It was also highlighted that the UK Government’s policy change had only just be announced and officer’s were still processing the impact of the Council’s draft Local Plan policies.</p> |
| <p>Written Response to Councillor Stowe sent on 27 August 2024 by email.</p> <p>I am sorry that there has been a little delay in coming back to you with an answer to your question to Council with regards to wind turbines. Officers had to do some research and ask questions to consultants. The response from the Forward Planning Team can be found below:</p> <p>In response to Cllr Stowe’s question regarding the amount of land required to accommodate the equipment needed to generate at least 20% of the District’s energy requirements from wind and solar energy by 2041, it is not possible to respond in quantifiable terms to the question posed.</p> <p>The reasons are that it is not possible to predict/forecast the total amount of equipment required as, for example, different sizes of turbines or solar PV arrays take up a different site area and it is not known in what size the future equipment would come forward. In addition, some equipment may be placed on existing buildings, the size of the equipment required could change over time as technology becomes more efficient and it might be that alternative technologies replace the need for wind and/or solar energy.</p> <p>If there is anything further Cllr Stowe would like to ask, officers would be happy to assist.</p> | |
| <p>Question 8 from Councillor Jeremy Theyer to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>At a recent Audit and Governance Committee meeting, concerns were raised around Gas Safe and Electrical Safety</p> | <p>Since the audit the council's property team has started using the Uniform software system to record all property information including compliance data such as when gas and electrical safety checks were last undertaken, when the next tests are due and what the outcomes and actions (where required) of those tests were. The system will be used to trigger alerts several months before routine tests are due so</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Tests on some CDC buildings. Please can you confirm the Council has robust systems in place to ensure these tests are up to date and recorded in line with Health & Safety legislation to ensure our buildings are safe for visitors and staff?</p> | <p>these are not missed. The Audit team are being kept informed of progress against the audit recommendations.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary Question from Councillor Theyer to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>Councillor Theyer asked whether Council properties were up to EPC standards and whether there was plan to ensure all properties were compliant with any future regulations?</p> | <p>Councillor Evemy stated that a written response would be provided as the information was not available to him.</p> |
| <p>Written Response to Councillor Theyer sent by email on Friday 2 August 2024</p> <p>All of the Council’s tenanted properties comply to the current legislation. The expectation is that the Government will enact further legislation to set a higher standard of B by 2030, but this has so far not emerged. The Council has approved an Asset Management Strategy under which we are reviewing properties based on a number of factors including their EPC and carbon efficiency.</p> | |
| <p>Question 9 from Councillor Julia Judd to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>In March this year we were told that a number of interested parties had been in touch in response to the ‘Call for Interest’ regarding the Council owned Old Station building.</p> | <p>Unfortunately, none of the interested parties came forward with a viable scheme.</p> <p>There is an exempt report on this Council agenda considering the Old Station.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>At least £150,000 has already been spent to address urgent repairs and the building is in a poor state of repair, it would be prudent therefore to find a way forward to progress matters as soon as possible in order to avoid further expense.</p> <p>Have any of the interested parties come forward with a viable scheme which can be taken forward?</p> | |
| <p>Question 10 from Councillor Gina Blomefield to Councillor Mike Evemy, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance</p> <p>At a recent Cabinet meeting a decision was taken to appoint an external company to market the space at Trinity Road that had been made available for commercial letting. What progress has been made?</p> | <p>The Council is entering into a management agreement with local company Watermoor Point who provide serviced office accommodation.</p> <p>The space has been redecorated and has now been fitted out with desks, chairs and ICT. It is anticipated that the Management Agreement will be finalised by the first week in August and tenants will then start to move into the building.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary Question</p> <p>Councillor Blomefield asked a supplementary question what the difference was in expected income from the letting of office space using Watermoor Point against the previous budgeted figure from the original proposal in March 2022?</p> | <p>Councillor Evemy noted that this was discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee when the report was presented to them around the change in financial assumptions. But it was noted that he would provide a written answer to the question.</p> |
| <p>Written Response sent to Councillor Blomefield by email on Friday 2 August 2024</p> <p>The February 2024 Cabinet report provides the answer to your question in paragraph 6.4:</p> <p>“The projected income is lower than that originally estimated when the business case for releasing office space was prepared. This is due to the broader economic picture, the changing rental market over the last 18 months and the fact attempts to secure one or two larger tenants to</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>enable direct letting of all available space, has not been successful. The MTFs includes income/savings of £151,000/year. Whereas service office accommodation is projected to deliver in the region of £114,882/year.”</p> | |
| <p>Question 11 from Councillor Daryl Corps to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>What is the status of the Moreton-in-Marsh Working Group set-up in respect to the Local Plan update?</p> | <p>It is intended to set up the Moreton-in-Marsh Working Group following a Moreton Planning for Real event, which is being organised for late September or early October 2024.</p> <p>The Planning for Real event will assist in the selection of the Working Group members.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor Daryl Corps to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>Councillor Corps asked what was the criteria for selecting residents to be on the Moreton-in-Marsh Working Group and to attend the Planning for Real event? It was noted that the Working Group needed to be a broad mix of individuals.</p> | <p>Councillor Layton noted that there was a list drawn up of individuals the Council wished to invite to the event that represented a range of stakeholders to oversee by GRCC. It was highlighted that the group would oversee the work being undertaken.</p> |
| <p>Question 12 from Councillor Tony Slater to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>The CDC Local Enforcement Plan 2022 states that “Planning Enforcement is a vital function of the Council’s overall planning strategy and service. It underpins the planning decisions and policies of the Council, while helping protect the district’s built and natural environments.”</p> <p>Although performance against targets is not included in the quarterly performance figures, it is clear, and acknowledged on the CDC website, that despite their best efforts the</p> | <p>We will be reviewing the Local Enforcement Plan in Autumn 2024 which will include considering whether quarterly reporting on performance within the Planning Enforcement Team would be appropriate and if so which measures should be included.</p> <p>It is widely recognised that there is currently a national shortage of trained and experienced Planning Enforcement Officers. It is hoped as the member recognises that returning planning and planning enforcement to the Council, will aid recruitment and retention. In addition, the Council has is taking the opportunity to support career development from within, that will hopefully provide the next generation of planning enforcement officers.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>enforcement team faces huge challenges in providing an effective service across the district due to a critical lack of resources.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the transition of Publica back to CDC has the potential to attract suitable candidates, but this in itself will not resolve the issue.</p> <p>Please can you advise what actions the administration is taking locally to resolve the shortage of skilled staff in the department and will you pledge to include statistical information in the quarterly performance report against the published targets in the Enforcement Plan?</p> | |
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor Tony Slater to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>The initial signs for a long term solution was welcomed. It was noted in 2022 that Councillor Judd provided details around the Army Veterans Charity and the skills that could be offered to the enforcement role. It was noted that this could be a good source for future employees for these positions. The question was:</p> <p>Would Councillor Layton like the details of this proposal to look at this option for recruitment?</p> | <p>Councillor Layton welcomed the idea and said she would look at the details of any proposal sent to her carefully.</p> |
| <p>Question 13 from Councillor Gina Blomefield to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> | <p>A point of clarification is that the statutory timeframe to determine planning applications is 8 weeks, 13 weeks or 16 weeks respectively. Other planning related applications, notifications and prior approvals have different statutory determination periods of 8 weeks or less and most of these are not subject to the call-in process.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>In April, CDC introduced a new planning protocol with the intention of making the process more efficient so decisions could be made in most cases within the statutory six-week period. As part of this process, pro forma Call Ins were introduced whereby a ward member could call in an application early in the process if they felt there might be serious concerns. This pro forma Call In could be annulled later if these concerns were found to be unwarranted or addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>As Members we received a Briefing on this in April and were told that Town and Parish Councils would shortly also be given training on the new protocol so that they understood the importance of examining planning applications as soon as possible after validation and quickly raising any concerns they might have with their ward councillor.</p> <p>As far as I am aware from the Town and Parish Councils in my area, they have not been invited to attend training on the new protocol yet. Planning is a core service provided by CDC and Town and Parish Councils have an important role to play in assessing planning applications.</p> <p>When do you plan to provide this important training on the new planning protocol to the Town and Parish Councils?</p> | <p>It is important to recognise that the call-in procedure is for District Councillors to request an application be considered by the Review Panel as to whether it would be appropriate to be considered by the Planning and Licensing Committee.</p> <p>Town and Parish Councils are notified of and consulted on every application in their area that the District Council receives and can submit their comments to be considered as part of the assessment of the individual application. There has been no change to the consultation process for Town and Parish Councils.</p> <p>Town and Parish are not able to call in planning applications, it is Ward Members who are to do so and must submit their request within 28 days of the application being valid. This is a longer period for Ward Members to consider whether they wish to call in an application than the former process which gave only 7 days and there are now two meetings of the Review Panel each month rather than one previously.</p> <p>A presentation to Town and Parish Councils could be scheduled for early Autumn 2024 if there is sufficient interest.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor Gina Blomefield to Councillor Juliet Layton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services</p> <p>It was noted that engagement with Town and Parish Councils was valued by the administration. Please could</p> | <p>Councillor Layton stated that there wasn't certainty about the amount of interest for training. It was highlighted that Members would now have 28 days to respond to planning applications. It was noted that Town and Parish Forums could be used to discuss the Planning Protocol.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>assurance be given that Town and Parish Councils would be provided training on the Planning Protocol as important sources of knowledge in the District to spot any issues arising?</p> | |
| <p>Question 14 from Councillor David Fowles to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council</p> <p>During the recent General Election, the North Cotswold Conservatives received a number of complaints from voters who had applied for postal votes and found that their packs did not include ballot papers. This was immediately reported to the CDC elections office who stated that the packs had been collated by hand and that there were no omissions. Whilst we don't wish to criticise the highly professional organisation of the election by the Elections department there is always the chance of human error. That said, we were instructed to tell postal voters to return their postal vote packs and new ones would be issued. The Liberal Democrat candidate Cllr Hodgkinson stated on social media that he was also aware of others who had reported problems and that there should be a review carried out. Given it is of paramount importance to get the process 100% accurate, would the leader support a cross-party review into the postal voting process?</p> | <p>At the Parliamentary election, around 28,000 postal votes were issued across the two constituencies, North Cotswolds and South Cotswolds and around 90% of these were returned.</p> <p>When preparing postal packs for issue, the team receive printed packs with the postal vote statement and return envelopes in them. The ballot paper is then added to the pack by hand. Around 70 staff working in pairs are given small batches of around 150 packs to issue. Each batch is issued and checked before being sealed. The packs are then issued to Royal Mail for delivery.</p> <p>Unfortunately, some people mislay their ballot papers when opening the pack.</p> <p>When this happens, we ask them to return the whole pack to us for a replacement to be issued. Postal vote replacements were issued for a number of reasons including packs which didn't arrive, packs which were spoilt in some way by the electorate and those where the ballot paper had been mislaid.</p> <p>Where electors contacted the team, they were given instructions on the process for obtaining a replacement. In total around 100 replacement packs were issued across the two constituencies – this is a similar figure to previous Parliamentary elections.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above I don't believe there is need for a cross-party review into the postal voting process nor do I believe it would be appropriate.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary from Councillor David Fowles to Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council</p> | <p>Councillor Joe Harris said no and emphasised that Members should not get involved in the administration of the working of elections. It was noted that in the event there were significant issues, these needed to be investigated by officers</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Councillor Fowles noted that it was a subject of interest to Members, and it wasn't seen as harmful to examine this as part of an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group. It was noted that there were upcoming elections in 2025, this would become important with the differences in votes. It was highlighted that review in processes would potentially help make sure that people check their ballot packs. Councillor Folwes asked if the issue could be taken to a Task and Finish Group?</p> | <p>rather than Members. It was stated that officers weren't aware of significant issues. It was emphasised that residents would need to report to the Elections Team if they don't receive a ballot paper.</p> <p>The Chief Executive also provided a reply on the question. The Chief Executive provided assurance to Members that the team look incredibly carefully at the packs going out and was confident in the processes being carried out by staff. Therefore it was felt that a review was not a good use of resources.</p> |
| <p>Question 15 from Councillor Andrew Maclean to Councillor Mike McKeown, Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability</p> <p><i>(Submitted after the deadline for a guaranteed written response before the meeting)</i></p> <p>Climate Emergency UK (CE UK) was set up in response to the climate emergency declarations that councils started making from the end of 2018. CE UK began by collecting these declarations, and the Climate Action Plans that followed, on its website. They published the Council Climate Plan Scorecards in January 2022, measuring the strength of councils' written climate action plans.</p> <p>CE UK have created a Climate Action Plan Explorer (CAPE) and the Climate Action Plan Checklist with the support of Friends of the Earth, Ashden, the Centre for Alternative Technology and APSE Energy. This outlines the elements of a strong Climate Action Plan and highlights best practice from councils all over the world. Using CAPE and the</p> | <p>No, I do not believe the Climate Action Scorecard is a fair reflection of CDC's performance. While we certainly have room for improvement, the Council has been actively delivering projects that contribute significantly to carbon reduction since the Liberal Democrat administration took over in 2019.</p> <p>The Scorecard assessment is conducted by volunteer researchers, meaning if our actions and projects are not easily identifiable on the Council's website, the scores may not accurately reflect all our activities.</p> <p>Earlier this year the Council Leader, via the Local Government Association, met with a representative from Climate Emergency UK and raised concerns about their mechanism for compiling the data.</p> <p>At this meeting the CEUK representative recognised that the way they compile data can understate the efforts of many councils.</p> <p>Many councils comparable to Cotswold District Council raised similar concerns.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we are addressing this issue by compiling comprehensive responses to all the questions that the Council will be scored against and will</p> |

Checklist, CE UK assessed the quality of all UK councils' written climate action plans.

CE UK hope that the Council Climate Action Scorecards will:

- Effectively hold councils to account on their claimed climate action and provides credible and transparent data on council climate action in the UK.
- Allow councils to use the results of the Council Climate Action Scorecards to improve their current Climate Action Plans and implement effective policies to help them reach net-zero in a just way within their current constraints.

Unfortunately CDC is not one of the best performing councils with a score of only 24% with 3 areas of particular concern: Transport (2%), Planning and Land Use (8%) and Biodiversity (0%).

Would you agree that the Scorecard is an accurate reflection of the progress we have made towards achieving our climate emergency goals? Have you got any firm plans in place that would make a significant difference to this score? And most importantly what can we learn from this Scorecard that will help us improve our performance in achieving our goals in responding to the Climate Emergency?

publish this information on our website under [Climate action - Cotswold District Council](#) to facilitate easy access for researchers and residents.

There is a lot of positive activity being undertaken by the Council to address the Climate Emergency:

1. **Cotswold Climate Investment:** Raised £500,000, a model of best practice I've presented at Climate Emergency UK events.
2. **NetZero Carbon Toolkit:** Published practical guidance for house builders, architects, and homeowners to achieve net-zero carbon homes, covering steps from pre-planning to construction, including retrofitting advice - [How to achieve net zero carbon homes - Cotswold District Council](#)
3. **EV Charging Infrastructure:** We've rolled out EV chargers to support EV adoption and secured additional grant funding this year to expand this network.
4. **Solar Panels and Batteries Installation:** Installed on Trinity Road, saving taxpayers over £40,000 annually and reducing our carbon footprint by over 30 tonnes a year.
5. **Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme:** Received over £1.2M in funding used to fit heat pumps and energy efficiency measures, such as heat recovery systems and LED lighting, to leisure centres and council buildings.
6. **Retrofit Program:** Secured funding from the Southwest NetZero Hub in collaboration with Cheltenham Borough Council, Forest of Dean District Council, and Climate Leadership Gloucestershire, which I chair. The program, launching this autumn, includes hiring a Retrofit Officer to educate and encourage the community to retrofit homes with heat pumps, solar

panels, and insulation.

7. **Warm and Well Partnership:** Providing free energy advice and access to funding for retrofitting low-income, inefficient homes to reduce energy costs and carbon footprints - [Warm and Well - Cotswold District Council](#)
8. **Local Plan Revision:** A key part of our revised local plan work is to introduce new planning policies aimed at reducing CO2 emissions and energy costs by promoting improved development planning and more efficient, fossil fuel-free buildings. Something the previous Tory government took little action on.
9. **Climate Board:** Establishing the Climate Board to drive action across all portfolio areas.
10. **Cotswold Climate Action Network:** Recently set up to increase public engagement and action, with more details to be announced shortly.
11. **Cotswold Home Solar:** Launched last year to promote the uptake of solar panels and batteries in Cotswold homes - [Cotswold Home Solar - Cotswold District Council](#)
12. **New Web Pages:** Creating web pages to detail our climate actions for Climate Emergency UK and residents, alongside a Climate Action Guide for residents and businesses on how to reduce their CO2 footprint and energy costs.
13. **Waste Fleet Transition:** Working with UBICO to transition our waste fleet to electric vehicles before 2030, addressing our biggest source of council emissions.

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>I am confident that the new climate scorecard marking starting this month will reflect our ongoing efforts more accurately. Our improved organisation, significant actions and clear communication of our activities should significantly enhance our score.</p> |
| <p>Supplementary Question from Councillor Andrew Maclean to Councillor Mike McKeown, Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability</p> <p>Councillor Maclean welcomed the changes to the website. It was noted that there was a low score particularly in the area of sustainable transport. It was noted that the decommissioned railway line between Bourton and Kingham had a study awaiting sign-off for use as a recreational path. Councillor Maclean asked if action could be taken fast so that sustainable transport options could put into place as soon as funds become available?</p> | <p>Councillor McKeown stated that he would provide a written response on the details mentioned but agreed with the concept of sustainable transport of projects. It was noted that the Council was working with Gloucestershire County Council to promote other projects like a Kemble to Cirencester Cycle Path which would help delivery in this area.</p> |
| <p>Written Response sent by email to Councillor Maclean on 5 August 2024</p> <p>Cotswold District Council (CDC) has received the necessary funds for the Bourton to Kingham Cycleway Feasibility Study from Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), Great Western Railway (GWR), and the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. The Feasibility Study is being undertaken by Sustrans. The invoice from Sustrans will be paid on Tuesday 13th August and will arrive in their bank account no later than Thursday 16th August. Sustrans have been kept up to date with progress with paying the invoice. The Feasibility Study is already at an advanced draft stage. CDC's former Sustainable Transport Lead, who used to work on this project, has offered to volunteer her time to provide feedback on the draft Feasibility Study.</p> | |

This page is intentionally left blank