

Cabinet
04/June2026



COTSWOLD
District Council

Minutes of a meeting of Cabinet held on Thursday, 4 June 2026

Members present:

Mike Evemy	Juliet Layton	
Patrick Coleman	Mike McKeown	Tristan Wilkinson
Paul Evans	Andrea Pellegram	

Officers present:

Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer)	Peta Johnson, Head of Waste and Environment
Simon Harper, Head of Democratic Services and Elections	Nickie Mackenzie-Daste, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Alan Hope, Head of Strategic Housing, Property and Assets	Jane Portman, Chief Executive Officer
Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer	David Stanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer

Observers:

Councillor

238 Apologies

There were no apologies for absence, but it was noted that Councillor Tony Dale attended remotely and contributed to the discussion of the items on the agenda. The Member was not present for the purposes of quorum or voting and therefore took no part in the decisions made.

239 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest from Members or officers present.

The purpose of this item was to consider the minutes of Cabinet held on 16 April 2026.

It was noted that the spelling of Chipping Campden needed correcting under item 224 Schedule of Decisions. The Chief Executive also requested that her apologies be noted in the minutes.

The recommendation to approve the amended minutes was proposed by Councillor Juliet Layton and seconded by Councillor Andrea Pellegram.

Voting record:

6 For, 0 Against, 1 Abstention.

Councillor Evans abstained, having not been present at the meeting of Cabinet on 16 April 2026.

Councillor Dale, attending virtually, was not eligible to vote.

To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 16 April 2026. (Resolution)		
Cabinet resolved to APPROVE the amended minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 16 April 2026 as a correct record.		
For	Patrick Coleman, Mike Evemy, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram and Tristan Wilkinson	6
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Paul Evans	1
Carried		

241 Leader's Announcements

The Leader welcomed Councillor Paul Evans, ward member for The Beeches, to his inaugural meeting of Cabinet.

There were no other announcements from the Leader.

242 Public Questions

There were no public questions.

243 Member Questions

There were no member questions.

244 Schedule of Decisions taken by the Leader of the Council and/or Individual Cabinet Members

No delegated decisions had been taken by the Leader and/or Individual Cabinet Members since the publication of the agenda for Cabinet 16 April 2026.

245 Issue(s) Arising from Overview and Scrutiny and/or Audit and Governance

Cabinet noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had met earlier in the week and had pre-scrutinised the following items:

- Local Government Reorganisation – Structural Changes Order
- Waste and Environment – Service Design options
- Asset Management – Out-of-District Investment Properties

As a result of this scrutiny recommendations were made. The recommendations and the Cabinet's response are set out in Annex to this item.

The Leader thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its scrutiny and confirmed that its recommendations would be referenced during consideration of the relevant agenda items.

246 Waste and Environment - Service Design Options

The purpose of the item was to set out a package of waste and recycling service design options to support a cohesive, compliant, and efficient approach to service delivery. The report had been produced to enable Cabinet to consider the removal of some services alongside the introduction and simplification of others, recognising that reductions in recycling income can be mitigated by reduced operating costs and operational efficiencies.

Councillor Andrea Pellegram, Cabinet Member for Environment and Regulatory Services, introduced the report and explained that the proposed changes were required to inform the specification of the Council's new waste collection vehicles. They would represent a significant investment by the authority, and align future service provision with legislative changes, including the introduction of Simpler Recycling requirements from 1 April 2027. She noted that the proposals also provided an opportunity to review a number of legacy service arrangements and ensure that the Council's waste and recycling services remained efficient, sustainable and cost-effective.

Cabinet was advised that the recommendations would remove the remaining Bring Bank sites across the district, as the materials collected at those sites were now largely collected through the kerbside recycling service. The changes would reduce operational costs, address issues associated with fly-tipping and misuse of facilities, and were not expected to adversely affect residents' ability to recycle.

The Cabinet Member further explained that the Council proposed to introduce a collection service for plastic bags and wrapping from April 2027 in response to new legislative requirements. It was proposed that no additional sacks would be issued initially, as modelling indicated that uptake would be limited in the early stages and issuing sacks to all households could create unnecessary waste. The arrangements would be monitored and reviewed alongside approaches adopted by other Gloucestershire authorities.

Cabinet was also advised that paper and card collections would be combined into a single recycling stream to simplify the service for residents and reflect changes in the composition of recyclable materials, particularly the increasing proportion of cardboard within the waste stream. The changes would initially utilise the Council's existing recycling sacks and would not result in additional collection costs.

In addition, it was proposed that the standard residual waste bin size for new properties and replacement bins would be reduced from 180 litres to 140 litres, reflecting the district's strong recycling performance and reduced reliance on residual waste capacity. Existing bins would not be replaced as part of this change.

Reference was made to comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which had emphasised the importance of a comprehensive communications plan to support residents through the changes, particularly in relation to the introduction of plastic bags and wrapping collections and the removal of Bring Bank facilities. The Committee had also highlighted the need to minimise any unintended consequences and ensure that residents were aware of the alternative recycling options available.

There were no questions for clarity, so the chair moved to the debate. Members debated the item and made the following points:

- Members welcomed the report and commended officers and the Cabinet Member for the thorough analysis undertaken in developing the proposals.
- Clarification was sought regarding the future treatment and recycling of plastic bags and wrapping, with discussion focusing on the capacity of the recycling industry to process the material and the importance of ensuring suitable end markets were available.
- Members discussed the proposed co-mingling of paper and card and emphasised the need for clear guidance to residents on how materials should be presented to minimise contamination and weather-related issues.

- Support was expressed for the phased reduction in residual waste bin sizes, noting that the change would apply only to new properties and replacement bins and would reflect the district's strong recycling performance.
- Members acknowledged the rationale for removing Bring Bank facilities, recognising that the service was no longer widely required due to the availability of comprehensive kerbside recycling collections.
- The importance of effective communications was reiterated to ensure residents understood the changes and how to continue recycling materials appropriately.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Andrea Pellegram and seconded by Councillor Juliet Layton.

Voting record:

7 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Councillor Dale, attending virtually, was not eligible to vote.

To APPROVE the recommendations around waste and environment service design options (Resolution)

Cabinet RESOLVED to:

1. Agree to the withdrawal of the Bring Bank service.
2. Agree to the proposed approach for how residents would present the new recyclable plastics at the kerbside (i.e. in a tied, self-supplied, single-use sack).
3. Agree to a reduction in the size of the standard issue refuse bin (from 180 litre to 140 litre) on a replacement/ phased basis.
4. Agree to the new arrangement for the combined collection of paper and card.
5. Note the financial implications.
6. Grant delegated authority to the Director of Communities and Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment & Regulatory Services to take the required steps to implement the recommendations above. In terms of timeline: The withdrawal of the Bring Bank sites would take place within this financial year, with savings realised at the start of next year; The collection of additional plastics (plastic bags and wrapping) is planned in line with the requirement of Simpler Recycling i.e. to be in place by 1 April 2027. The reduction in the standard bin size would occur at the same time; A shift to mixing paper and card would occur when replacement recycling vehicles start to be used on the collection services.

For	Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Mike Every, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram and Tristan Wilkinson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0

Carried

247 Asset Management - Abberley House/ Corinium Museum Roof Repair Project

The purpose of the item was to update the Cabinet on the Abberley House Roof Repair Project and to seek delegated authority to proceed with the works post the procurement process.

Councillor Patrick Coleman, Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report and moved the recommendations. Cabinet was asked to approve the expediting of repair works to the roof of Abberley House, home to the Corinium Museum, and to delegate authority to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to obtain quotations, appoint contractors and deal with minor matters arising during the course of the works.

The Cabinet Member explained that officers had identified funding that was expected to be sufficient to undertake the required repairs. He noted the importance of the Corinium Museum to the district and the longstanding cross-party support for investment in the museum and its facilities. Reference was made to the need to protect the historic fabric of Abberley House as a listed building and to ensure that the property remained weatherproof and fit for purpose.

Cabinet was advised that the specialist nature of the building and its roof presented particular challenges. However, confidence was expressed that suitably experienced contractors could be secured, given the availability of specialist heritage construction expertise within the district and the significant number of historic and listed buildings in the area.

In supporting the proposals, the Leader of the Council highlighted the Council's responsibilities as owner of the listed building and the importance of maintaining a watertight roof for the benefit of both the museum and other occupiers of the property. It was noted that the roof's complex design had contributed to the challenges in identifying the required repairs. The Leader also referred to further pre-construction investigations that would consider whether the installation of solar panels could be accommodated as part of the project, subject to heritage and technical considerations.

The Leader invited any questions for clarity and then moved to the debate. Members debated the item and made the following points:

- Members welcomed the progress made by officers in identifying the issues and bringing forward proposals to undertake the necessary repairs.

- Support was expressed for the Council taking a proactive approach to maintaining its assets and protecting an important listed building and cultural facility.
- Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that the repair works provided a long-term solution and addressed the underlying causes of the roof defects.
- It was noted that investing in the repairs at this stage would help protect the building, reduce the risk of further deterioration and avoid potentially greater costs in the future.
- Members welcomed the intention to explore opportunities for the installation of solar panels as part of the project, where this could be achieved without compromising the historic character of the building.

Having nothing more to add the recommendations were proposed by Councillor Patrick Coleman and seconded by Councillor Paul Evans.

Voting record:

7 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Councillor Dale, attending virtually, was not eligible to vote.

To APPROVE the recommendations for the Abberley House/ Corinium Museum roof repair project. (Resolution)		
Cabinet RESOLVED to:		
1. Agree that repair work to the roof is to be expedited 2. Delegate authority to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to receive quotations for the repair work and to instruct work to be carried out and to deal with minor matters arising during the works.		
For	Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Mike Every, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram and Tristan Wilkinson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

248 Local Government Reorganisation - Gloucestershire Structural Changes Order

The purpose of the item was to outline the governance, legal framework, and key arrangements for the Gloucestershire Structural Changes Order, and to seek Cabinet's agreement to submit representations to Government on behalf of Cotswold District Council.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mike Every, introduced the report and advised that Gloucestershire councils had received a formal request from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) seeking representations on the proposed Structural Changes Order relating to local government reorganisation in Gloucestershire. These representations would inform the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government in determining the final content of the Order.

Cabinet was advised that the consultation had been issued shortly before the expected decision on the preferred reorganisation model and that responses were required by 16 June 2026, allowing a limited period for consideration. Members noted that the Government's decision on the preferred model for local government in Gloucestershire was expected later in the summer.

The consultation sought views on a range of implementation matters, including governance arrangements, transitional structures, electoral and warding patterns, naming conventions, and the operation of joint committees and shadow or preparatory authorities.

The report set out the principal options under consideration, including: a single unitary authority for Gloucestershire; an east–west split; and a Greater Gloucester and residual Gloucestershire. It also outlined governance mechanisms, including the choice between a “preparing authority” model (formerly continuing authority) and a shadow authority model.

The Leader explained that, following further consideration since the original business case, the Council's proposed response supported the “preparing authority” model on the basis that it provided a simpler transitional arrangement, avoided duplication of councillor structures, and reduced estimated additional costs of approximately £600,000–£700,000 compared with a shadow authority approach. It was acknowledged, however, that this model presented challenges in establishing a distinct organisational culture for any new authority, which would need to be addressed as a priority.

Cabinet noted that Overview and Scrutiny had considered the matter and that its comments had been incorporated into the draft response. Gloucestershire councils were working within existing meeting schedules to prepare responses to the consultation and submissions would be collated into a single county-wide representation, with areas of agreement reflected as a shared position and areas of divergence clearly identified with supporting rationale.

It was also noted that, subject to Government approval, joint implementation arrangements would be established in advance of legislation being enacted, including

Cabinet

04/June2026

joint committees or implementation executives comprising representatives of county and district councils.

There were no questions for clarity, so the Leader moved to the debate.

Members debated the report and raised the following points:

- The constrained timescale for response and limited opportunity for wider engagement, including with town and parish councils.
- That, while consultative, final decisions rested with central Government, and the importance of ensuring local views were clearly represented.
- Concerns regarding the pace of the process and potential long-term implications for local governance and service delivery.
- The importance of sustainable and effective governance structures, with reference to differing structural options, including Greater Gloucester.
- Support for simplification of local government and the opportunity for wider transformation of service delivery rather than structural merger alone.
- The need to maintain continuity of statutory services during transition, including adult social care, children's services, housing, and waste services.

The Chief Executive confirmed that senior officers across Gloucestershire were working collaboratively on the programme and that a strong partnership approach was in place. Despite differing political perspectives, there was a shared commitment to producing a coherent county-wide submission. Officers would collate responses into a single document for submission by the deadline, identifying areas of agreement and any differences in approach.

Members supported the approach of a coordinated county response and emphasised the need for clarity, consistency, and timely decision-making given the scale and complexity of the programme.

An amendment to the wording of the first recommendation was noted.

The (amended) recommendations were proposed by Councillor Mike Every and seconded by Councillor Tristan Wilkinson.

Voting record:

7 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Councillor Dale, attending virtually, was not eligible to vote.

To APPROVE the recommendations (as amended) of the LGR Gloucestershire Structural Changes Order response (Resolution)
Cabinet RESOLVED to: 1. Endorse the Cabinet response document as the basis for its response to the questions set out by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local

Government (MHCLG) regarding Gloucestershire's Structural Changes Order 2. Delegate authority to the Leader of the Council to submit formal representations to MHCLG by their deadline of 16 June 2026.		
For	Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Mike Every, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram and Tristan Wilkinson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

249 Asset Management - Out-of-District Investment Properties

The purpose of the item was to seek Cabinet's approval to pursue options for the disposal of out-of-district investment properties.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Mike Every stated that the public should not be excluded from consideration of the item and that it would be taken in open session. Members were reminded that exempt annexes were included in the agenda, but that discussion should be limited to the contents of the main report only.

It was noted that the item had previously been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which had met in private session, and members of the committee had indicated support in principle for the recommendations.

Councillor Patrick Coleman, Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report in relation to the Council's three out-of-district investment properties, which were acquired in 2010 following funding approval in 2009 to generate a stable rental income stream. The properties comprised retail assets within the commercial sector and that their financial performance had declined in recent years. Reference was made to wider market conditions, including structural changes within the retail sector following the COVID-19 pandemic and evolving consumer behaviour, which had contributed to reduced returns and increased risk exposure. This reduced level of income had already been reflected within the Council's medium-term financial planning.

It was reported that, in light of reduced income, increased risk exposure, and prevailing market conditions, continued retention of the assets would be likely to generate declining returns. Disposal was therefore considered appropriate in accordance with the Council's Asset Management Strategy. The disposal would also contribute, in a limited way, to simplifying the Council's asset base in the context of potential local government reorganisation.

Cabinet

04/June2026

It was further noted that officers had undertaken detailed work to assess asset performance and market conditions, including indicative valuations and rental income trends.

Cabinet was advised that the proposal was to actively market the properties for disposal, rather than commit to sale, with any offers received to be assessed through the Council's established governance and decision-making processes.

The Leader moved to the debate and members raised the following points:

- Members highlighted the constrained and volatile nature of the retail property market and the associated financial risks, including exposure to void periods and ongoing maintenance liabilities.
- It was noted that recent performance demonstrated declining net income, with income reducing from approximately £300,000 per annum at acquisition to around £188,000 in the current year.
- Members emphasised that the Council should focus on its core service delivery responsibilities rather than retaining a geographically dispersed investment property portfolio.
- It was suggested that market conditions provided an appropriate opportunity to test investor appetite for disposal, noting that any decision to proceed would be subject to offers received and further formal approvals.
- Members recognised the work undertaken by officers in assessing valuations, income projections, and market conditions to support decision-making.

The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that recent financial performance had shown marginal or negative net returns in prior years, and that projected income remained dependent on full occupancy and stable tenancy arrangements. He advised that the retail sector remained highly volatile, with continued risk of rental reduction and void periods, and that the current position represented an appropriate point at which to test the market. He stated that any disposal would be subject to the Council's constitutional governance processes.

The Cabinet Member for Finance concluded that the assets had historically generated income but that changing market conditions and increased financial risk now supported a review of ownership, with a view to testing the market for potential disposal.

Members expressed support for the approach and emphasised the importance of focusing Council resources on core priorities.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Patrick Coleman and seconded by Councillor Mike Evemy.

Cabinet

04/June2026

Voting record:

7 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Councillor Dale, attending virtually, was not eligible to vote.

To APPROVE the recommendations of the Asset Management - Out-of-District Properties Report (Resolution)

Cabinet RESOLVED to:

1. Approve the recommendation to actively market all three out-of-district investment properties for disposal.
2. Delegate to the Strategic Head of Housing, Property and Assets to progress negotiations with support from the Assistant Director –Legal Services.

For	Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Mike Every, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram and Tristan Wilkinson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

250 Matters exempt from publication

Cabinet did not enter private session for Agenda Item 12, Asset Management; Out-of-District Investment Properties and did not discuss the exempt annex.

251 Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting of Cabinet was confirmed as 1 July 2026 at 6.00pm.

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.15 pm

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Area	Gloucestershire	Supporting Comments
LGR Model	1 Unitary Model	
Preparing Authority	Preparing authority	Support for the preparing authority model reflects the simplicity of this model compared with the shadow authority model and the additional cost and complexity of that approach. The challenge of setting a new culture in a preparing authority is recognised and must be a top priority for the new council if this model is chosen.
New Authority names and former councils	Gloucestershire Council Gloucester City Council (GC), Forest of Dean District Council (FODDC), Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC), Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC), Stroud District Council (SDC), Cotswold District Council, (CDC) Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)	
Joint committee(s)	Joint Committee of 12 persons: 6 from GCC 6 from District/Borough Councils (1 from each)	An equal representation from the county council and the district/borough/city authorities will ensure that all councils will have a voice and that decisions can be made effectively.
Voting arrangements	Majority voting of those present Each member (including the Chair of the committee) has one vote. The person presiding at the meeting has a casting vote, in addition to any other vote the person may have.	
Chair	GCC leader with district leader deputy	

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Political Balance	Not specified	As any balancing for political purposes would need to come within the Gloucestershire CC nominees, we believe it is for GCC to make a recommendation on this.
Returning Officer	County Council CEO	
Timing of Joint Committee	Not later than 14 days of the Order coming into force Dissolved on the day following each shadow authority holds its first meeting.	
Warding	Existing county council divisions – 55 divisions, 2 members per division making 110 members	The electoral arrangements were in the proposal and we remain supportive of them.
Transition of civic/ceremonial functions	No view	
Alignment of T&P elections	Supported, however we would expect government to seek views from T&PCs as separate legal entities to the seven councils.	
Implementation Team		
Timing	Not later than 21 days after the coming into force of this Order.	
Implementation team members	One Team comprising officers from county council and each of the district councils The leader of the implementation team is the Chief Executive of the county council The deputy leader of the Implementation Team is one of the Chief Executives from one of the district/borough councils.	

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Area	Gloucestershire		Supporting Comments
LGR Model	2 Unitary Model		
Preparing Authority	N/A - two new legal entities which require all seven preceding councils to TUPE and novate contracts to etc		
New Authority names and former councils	East Gloucestershire Council Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC), Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC), Cotswold District Council, (CDC), part of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)	West Gloucestershire Council Gloucester City Council (GC), Forest of Dean District Council (FODDC), Stroud District Council (SDC), part of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)	In the absence of any other proposals, we support the geographic descriptors for the councils.
Joint committee(s)	East Gloucestershire Council Joint Committee 12 persons: 6 from GCC, within the footprint 6 from District/Borough Councils (2 from each in East)	West Gloucestershire Council Joint Committee 12 persons: 6 from GCC within the footprint, 6 from District/Borough or City Councils (2 from each in West)	An equal representation from the county council and the district/borough/city authorities will ensure that all councils will have a voice and that decisions can be made effectively.
Voting arrangements	- Majority voting of those present - Each member (including the Chairman of the committee) has one vote. - The person presiding at the meeting has a casting vote, in addition to any other vote the person may have.		
Chair	Leader from the county council or from a district or borough council. Deputy chair also required and would be from the alternative ie if a county chair then deputy is district	Leader from a district or city council. Deputy chair also required and would be from the alternative i.e. if a county chair then deputy is	

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

	or borough and vice versa. [Members of the Joint Committee from the County Council have to be for an electoral division within "East Gloucestershire". The Chair of the Joint Committee can only be the Leader of the Joint Committee if they represent a ward in the area of "East Gloucestershire"]	district/borough/city and vice versa. [Members of the Joint Committee from the County Council have to be for an electoral division within "West Gloucestershire". The Chair of the Joint Committee can only be the Leader of the Joint Committee if they represent a ward in the area of "West Gloucestershire"]	
Political Balance	Not specified		As any balancing for political purposes would need to come within the Gloucestershire CC nominees, we believe it is for GCC to make a recommendation on this.
Returning Officer	CEO from one of the districts or boroughs within the footprint	CEO from one of the districts or boroughs within the footprint	
Timing of Joint Committee	Not later than 14 days of the Order coming into force Dissolved on the day following each shadow authority holds its first meeting.		
Warding	East: 26 wards, based on existing County Council divisions, each electing 2 councillors (52 in total). Existing division names to be retained.	West: 29 wards, based on existing County Council divisions, each electing 2 councillors (58 in total). Existing division names to be retained.	The electoral arrangements were in the proposal and we remain supportive of them.

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Transition of civic/ceremonial functions			
Alignment of T&P elections	Supported, however we would expect government to seek views from T&PCs as separate legal entities to the seven councils.		
Implementation Team			
Timing	Not later than 21 days after the coming into force of this Order		
Implementation team members	- One Team comprising officers from county council and each of the district councils - The leader of the implementation team is the Chief Executive of the county council - The deputy leaders of the Implementation Team are one for East - a CEO officer from one of the three district/borough councils comprising the footprint and one for West - a CEO officer from one of the three district/borough councils comprising the footprint.		

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Area	Gloucestershire		
LGR Model	2 Unitary Model		
Preparing Authority	N/A - two new legal entities which require all seven preceding councils to TUPE and novate contracts to etc		
New Authority names and former councils	Greater Gloucester Council Gloucester City Council (GC) , part of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), Stroud District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council and part of FODDC	Gloucestershire Council Part of Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC), Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC), Cotswold District Council, (CDC), Forest of Dean District Council (FODDC), Part Stroud District Council (SDC), part of Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)	
Joint committee(s)	Greater Gloucester Council- Joint Committee 12 persons: 6 from GCC, from within the footprint 6 from District/Borough/City Councils (3 from Gloucester City Council, 1 from Stroud District Council, 1 from Tewkesbury Borough Council 1 from FODDC)	Gloucestershire Joint Committee 10 persons: 5 from GCC, from within the footprint 5 from District/Borough Councils (1 from each)	An equal representation from the county council and the district/borough/city authorities will ensure that all councils will have a voice and that decisions can be made effectively.
Voting arrangements	- Majority voting of those present - Each member (including the Chairman of the committee) has one vote. - The person presiding at the meeting has a casting vote, in addition to any other vote the person may have.		

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

Chair	Greater Gloucester - Leader from Gloucester City Council Deputy – Cabinet member from county [Members of the Joint Committee from the County Council have to be for an electoral division within "Greater Gloucester" area. The Chair of the Joint Committee can only be the Leader of the Joint Committee if they represent a ward in the area of "Greater Gloucester"]	Gloucestershire – Leader from the county council with deputy district or borough [Members of the Joint Committee from the County Council have to be for an electoral division within "Gloucestershire" area. The Chair of the Joint Committee can only be the Leader of the Joint Committee if they represent a ward in the area of "Gloucestershire"]	
Political Balance	Not specified		As any balancing for political purposes would need to come within the Gloucestershire CC nominees, we believe it is for GCC to make a recommendation on this.
Returning Officer	CEO from Gloucester City for Greater Gloucester	CEO from county council	
Timing of Joint Committee	Not later than 14 days of the Order coming into force Dissolved on the day following each shadow authority holds its first meeting.		
Warding	Based on existing 18 City Council wards and new wards for the surrounding parishes coming in (based	Based on County Council divisions, two members per division with one division only having one member as will be split with Greater Gloucester	

Cotswold District Council Cabinet Response

	on parish council building blocks)		
Transition of civic/ceremonial functions			
Alignment of T&P elections	Supported, however we would expect government to seek views from T&PCs as separate legal entities to the seven councils		
Implementation Team			
Timing	Not later than 21 days after the coming into force of this Order		
Implementation team members	- One Team comprising officers from county council and each of the district councils - The leader of the implementation team is the Chief Executive of the county council The deputy leaders of the Implementation Team are one for Greater Gloucester – CEO of Gloucester City and one from one of the five district/borough councils comprising the footprint of Gloucestershire		