

Council
15/July2026



COTSWOLD
District Council

Minutes of a meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 15 July 2026

Members present:

Mark Harris (Chair)	Ray Brassington (Vice-Chair)	
Gina Blomefield	Laura Hall-Wilson	Tom Stowe
Claire Bloomer	Paul Hodgkinson	Jeremy Theyer
Naomi Bloomer	Nikki Ind	Craig Thurling
Nick Bridges	Angus Jenkinson	Clare Turner
Patrick Coleman	Julia Judd	Michael Vann
Daryl Corps	Helene Mansilla	Jon Wareing
Tony Dale	Mike McKeown	Ian Watson
Paul Evans	Dilys Neill	Len Wilkins
Mike Evemy	Andrea Pellegram	Tristan Wilkinson
David Fowles	Lisa Spivey	

Officers present:

Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer)	Jane Portman, Chief Executive Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Kirsty Winters, Communications Officer
Simon Harper, Head of Democratic and Electoral Services	Joseph Walker, Head of Economic Development and Communities
Nickie Mackenzie-Daste, Senior Democratic Services Officer	

109 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Tony Slater, Councillor David Cunningham and Councillor Juliet Layton.

110 Declarations of Interest

The Chair invited Members to declare any interests in items on the agenda. There were no declarations of interest made by Members.

111 Minutes

Council considered the minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 March 2026. Councillor Julia Judd requested that the Leader's response letter to a public question regarding the impact of changes to the State Pension on pensioners be circulated to all Members. The Leader confirmed that the request would be followed up.

Councillor Mike Every proposed the approval of the minutes. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Tom Stowe, put to the vote and agreed by Council. RESOLVED that the minutes of Full Council 18 March 2026 were approved as a true and accurate record.

Voting record:

26 For, 0 Against, 5 Abstentions.

To APPROVE the minutes 18 March 2026 (Resolution)		
Council RESOLVED that the minutes of Full Council 18 March 2026 be approved as a true and accurate record.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Every, David Fowles, Laura Hall-Wilson, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Andrea Pellegram, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Ian Watson, Tristan Wilkinson and Len Wilkins	26
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Naomi Bloomer, Daryl Corps, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Jon Wareing	5
Carried		

Council then considered the minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 20 May 2026.

Councillor Mike Every proposed the approval of the minutes. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Tom Stowe, put to the vote and agreed by Council. RESOLVED that the minutes of 20 May 2026 were approved as a true and accurate record.

Voting record:

22 For, 0 Against, 4 Abstentions.

Council

15/July2026

Did not vote: Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson, Councillor Julia Judd, Councillor Lisa Spivey, Councillor Michael Vann and Councillor Len Wilkins.

To APPROVE the minutes 20 May 2026 (Resolution)		
Council RESOLVED that the minutes of Annual Council held on 20 May 2026 be approved as a true and accurate record.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Every, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Andrea Pellegram, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	22
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Naomi Bloomer, Daryl Corps, Helene Mansilla and Jon Wareing	4
Carried		

112 Announcements from the Chair, Leader or Chief Executive

The Chair welcomed Councillor Naomi Bloomer, newly elected as Member for St Michael's Ward following the by-election on 2 July, and Flavia, who was undertaking work experience with Democratic Services.

The Chair noted the passing of Christopher Robert Hallpike, who was remembered with gratitude for his dedicated service to Shipton Moyne Parish Council and the wider community. He would be greatly missed, and sincere condolences were extended to his family and friends.

The passing of former Councillor Sue Herdman was also noted. Councillor Herdman had served as Chair of the Council from 1995 to 1998 and as District Councillor for Churn Valley for 24 years, during which time she had also served on the Planning Committee. Councillors Evans, Harris, Fowles and Coleman paid tribute to her dedicated service, generosity and longstanding commitment to the Council and the local community.

A minute's silence was observed in memory of the former Councillors.

The Chair also reported attending a recent Friends of the Royal Agricultural University event and noted the positive developments taking place at the University.

The Chair invited the Leader to address the Council.

Council

15/July2026

The Leader, Councillor Mike Every, welcomed Councillor Naomi Bloomer to the Council and congratulated Councillor Andrea Pellegram on her election as Gloucestershire County Councillor for Cirencester Park Division.

The Leader advised that a Government announcement regarding the future of local government in Gloucestershire was expected. Members were informed that briefings for staff and Members would be held following the announcement and that further communications would be issued in due course. He emphasised that no immediate changes would result from the announcement and acknowledged that the uncertainty might be causing concern among staff.

The Leader referred to the recent death of Ann Widdecombe and emphasised the importance of the safety and security of those holding public office. Members were reminded of the support available through Gloucestershire Constabulary's Op. Ford and encouraged to familiarise themselves with the guidance provided should they have concerns regarding their personal safety or security.

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive Officer.

113 Unsung Heroes Awards

The Chair presented the Council's Unsung Heroes Awards for July 2026, recognising individuals and organisations for their outstanding voluntary service and contribution to their communities.

Awards were presented to:

- Rhys Stevens, in recognition of his fundraising efforts in support of Parkinson's UK.
- Keyna Doran and Vanessa Rigg, for their work through the Campden Edge Youth Arts Charity supporting young people.
- Marie Liptrot, for her longstanding contribution to Blockley Sports and Social Club and the local community.
- Margaret Wright, for her leadership of the River Coln Guardians and her contribution to environmental stewardship and community engagement.

The Chair congratulated all recipients on their achievements and thanked them for their dedication to their communities.

At the conclusion of the item, the Chair invited those recipients in attendance to come forward to receive their certificates and lapel badges.

114 Public Questions

No public questions were submitted.

115 Member Questions

Councillors' written questions, written responses, supplementary questions and supplementary responses can be found in Annex A attached.

116 Committee membership change

Council considered a proposal from the Liberal Democrat Group to appoint Councillor Naomi Bloomer to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with immediate effect, replacing Councillor Ian Watson.

There were no questions for clarity, and no debate on the matter.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the resolution which was proposed by Councillor Mike Every and seconded by Councillor Dilys Neill.

Voting record:

30 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Did not vote: Councillor Len Wilkins.

Committee membership change - APPROVE (Resolution)		
Council resolved to APPROVE the appointment of Councillor Naomi Bloomer to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with immediate effect.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Naomi Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Every, David Fowles, Laura Hall-Wilson, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Andrea Pellegram, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	30
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

117 Making the Cotswold District Dementia Friendly

The Chair invited Councillor Paul Evans, Cabinet Member for Health and Communities to introduce the report and reminded Council of its previous commitment to make Cotswold District a dementia-friendly district.

Council

15/July2026

Councillor Evans highlighted the growing number of residents living with dementia and acknowledged the significant impact the condition had on individuals, their families and friends. The valuable work already undertaken by community organisations, volunteers, health partners and town and parish councils in supporting people living with dementia was recognised. Councillor Evans explained that the proposed programme sought to build on these existing strengths through partnership working, increased awareness and training, improved signposting to support, and ensuring that Council services became more dementia-friendly.

It was noted that engagement with town and parish councils had demonstrated strong support for the Council's ambition while identifying opportunities to improve confidence in directing residents to appropriate sources of support. The proposed programme focused on training, awareness, engagement, service mapping and improvement, alongside funding and facilitation, with the aim of building resilient communities and delivering practical improvements for residents living with dementia and those who cared for them.

The Chair invited questions for clarification.

Councillor David Fowles welcomed the report and expressed his support for the Council's dementia-friendly ambition. He highlighted the importance of raising awareness nationally and asked what engagement was planned with Members of Parliament to promote greater recognition and support for people living with dementia, drawing comparisons with the progress achieved through disability legislation.

Councillor Paul Evans confirmed that the Council's work to become a dementia-friendly authority would complement its wider commitments to supporting people with disabilities. He advised that engagement would take place with local Members of Parliament, Gloucestershire County Council and town and parish councils to promote and support the Council's dementia-friendly approach.

Councillor Dilys Neill welcomed the report and highlighted the importance of engaging with specialist dementia services, including the Dementia Care Team at Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust. She referred to the value of supporting people with dementia throughout their care journey and emphasised the importance of advance care planning, ensuring that key information about an individual's needs and preferences accompanied them if they were admitted to hospital.

The proposal was seconded by Paul Hodgkinson who commented that there remained a lack of understanding about the interventions and support available to people living with dementia and their carers. He emphasised the importance of ensuring that appropriate advice and assistance were readily accessible. He acknowledged the

Council

15/July2026

valuable work of the Council's Wellbeing Team in delivering community initiatives that helped to reduce isolation and encouraged people to remain active and engaged.

There was no further debate on the matter.

The proposer, Councillor Paul Evans, was invited to sum up, but considered the matter had been adequately covered.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the resolution which was proposed by Councillor Paul Evans and seconded by Councillor Paul Hodgkinson.

Voting record:

31 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Making the District Dementia Friendly - APPROVE (Resolution)		
Council resolved to:		
1. NOTE the progress made since the Council motion in January 2026 and the evidence gathered through engagement with town and parish councils and officers. 2. APPROVE the proposed programme of dementia-friendly work-streams set out in the report. 3. ENDORSE continued partnership working with town and parish councils, health partners, the voluntary and community sector, and local dementia support organisations to take this work forward. 4. REQUEST that a further update be brought back to Council in approximately 12 months setting out progress, emerging opportunities and any resource implications requiring future decisions.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Naomi Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Every, David Fowles, Laura Hall-Wilson, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Andrea Pellegram, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson, Tristan Wilkinson and Len Wilkins	31
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

118 Motion report - Food and Farming

The Chair advised that consideration of the report would be deferred until the September meeting and invited the Leader, Councillor Mike Every, to explain the reasons for the deferral.

Councillor Every advised that he was withdrawing the report in light of the forthcoming Government decision regarding the future of local government in Gloucestershire. He explained that deferring consideration until September would enable a more comprehensive report to be presented, taking into account the outcome of the Government's decision and its implications for the Council's work on food and farming.

The report was therefore withdrawn and would be brought back to the September 2026 meeting of Full Council.

119 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report 2025/26

The Chair invited Councillor Gina Blomefield, Chair Overview and Scrutiny Committee to present the report.

Councillor Gina Blomefield, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, introduced the item and thanked Members of the Committee, the Vice-Chair and Democratic Services for their contribution and support during the year. The Committee's role in providing scrutiny and oversight of the Cabinet as a critical friend was highlighted and it was further noted that its work had been undertaken on a non-political basis.

Councillor Blomefield advised that the Committee had had a busy year, requiring additional meetings to accommodate the volume of matters requiring scrutiny. The Committee's examination of the Local Plan, its review of the health of the retail and hospitality sectors in town centres, and its scrutiny of planning enforcement services, were highlighted. Scrutiny had resulted in a number of recommendations to Cabinet, most of which had been accepted or partially accepted. The Committee's engagement with Freedom Leisure, Ubico and Bromford Housing, were also referred to. The increasing participation of members of the public in Overview and Scrutiny meetings was welcomed.

Looking ahead, Councillor Blomefield advised that the Committee would focus on scrutinising the new Local Plan throughout its preparation, local government reorganisation and the Council's wider policies and priorities, including the budget and Council Plan. The role of the Committee in overseeing key partner organisations was noted as was the participation of the Chair and Vice-Chair in the county-wide Joint Scrutiny Panel for local government reorganisation.

Council

15/July2026

The Chair asked if there were any questions for clarity.

Members expressed their wholehearted support for the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Chair sought a seconder for the proposal.

Councillor Angus Jenkinson seconded the proposal and spoke in support of the recommendations.

Members of the Committee, officers and Cabinet Members were thanked for their engagement and contribution to the scrutiny process. The increasing effectiveness of the Committee and the value of its role as a critical friend were also highlighted, and it was noted that its work had influenced scrutiny activity at county level and would continue to contribute to the work of the Local Government Reorganisation and Economic Scrutiny Committees.

The Chair moved to the debate.

The following views were expressed during the debate:

- Members paid tribute to the Chair, Vice-Chair and Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their commitment and contribution to the Council's democratic process.
- The value of pre-scrutiny was recognised, particularly the opportunity for Cabinet Members and senior officers to engage directly with the Committee and respond to questions before decisions were taken.
- Members noted that the Committee had become increasingly effective and that its approach provided a positive model for scrutiny, with the potential to inform arrangements for any future unitary authority or authorities.
- The importance of ensuring that all Members, including backbench Members, had meaningful opportunities to contribute to decision-making and policy development was emphasised.
- The value of recommendations arising from scrutiny was recognised, with Members noting that such recommendations could identify issues and opportunities that might otherwise not have been considered.
- The Committee's role in providing independent, constructive challenge and ensuring that decisions and policies were fit for purpose was welcomed.
- The importance of Members preparing thoroughly and engaging constructively with the scrutiny process was emphasised.
- The Committee's engagement with local government reorganisation and its contribution to wider county-level scrutiny activity were also welcomed.

The proposer, Councillor Gina Blomefield, was invited to sum up. Members, officers and Cabinet Members were thanked for their contributions and the importance of Overview and Scrutiny as an integral part of the Council's governance arrangements was

Council

15/July2026

reiterated. She welcomed the collaborative approach taken by the Committee and expressed support for the report.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the resolution, which was proposed by Councillor Gina Blomefield and seconded by Councillor Angus Jenkinson.

Voting record:

31 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Overview & Scrutiny Report - APPROVE (Resolution)		
Council resolved to:		
1. APPROVE the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report 2025/26.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Naomi Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Laura Hall-Wilson, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Andrea Pellegram, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson, Tristan Wilkinson and Len Wilkins	31
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

120 Notice of Motion

The Chair invited Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson to speak as the proposer of the motion.

Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson introduced the motion and paid tribute to women, babies and families who had experienced trauma, loss or unsafe care during childbirth.

Councillor Hall-Wilson explained that the motion had been prompted by the publication of the Ockenden Maternity Review and the Baroness Amos National Maternity and Neonatal Investigation, including findings relating to Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

Drawing on her own experiences of maternity services and discussions with local mothers and advocacy groups, she highlighted concerns regarding the need for improved triage, greater attention to women's concerns and better communication throughout pregnancy and childbirth.

Council

15/July2026

Councillor Hall-Wilson acknowledged the dedication of maternity staff but emphasised the need for urgent action to address longstanding issues within maternity services. She referred to the importance of reinstating home births, reopening the Aveta birthing unit in Cheltenham, maintaining 24-hour maternity services at Stroud and restoring postnatal beds. She recognised that the Council was not responsible for the provision of maternity services but stated that it had an important role in representing the views of residents and urging NHS leaders to implement the recommendations of the relevant reviews.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for clarity. No questions were raised.

The Chair sought a seconder for the motion. Councillor Dilys Neill seconded the motion and spoke in support of the recommendations. Drawing on her experience as a paediatrician, former GP and member of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, she highlighted the importance of safe and compassionate maternity care and the need for women to feel listened to and supported throughout pregnancy and childbirth. She referred to the pressures facing maternity services, including workforce shortages and reduced provision outside Gloucester Royal Hospital, and emphasised the importance of effective communication between community and hospital services. She welcomed the actions arising from the Ockenden and Amos reports, including improved workforce planning, accountability, safe triage and addressing inequalities and discrimination, and particularly highlighted the need to listen to women and ensure access to second opinions where concerns remained.

The Chair moved to the debate.

The following views were expressed during the debate:

- Members expressed strong support for the motion and highlighted the importance of learning from previous failings and ensuring that improvements to maternity services were delivered. The importance of maintaining local maternity provision, including services at Stroud and Cheltenham, and providing choice in relation to place of birth was emphasised, particularly given the rural nature of the District and the distances some residents may need to travel to access services.
- Members welcomed the work already being undertaken by NHS organisations and Gloucestershire County Council's Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee but emphasised the need for continued scrutiny and accountability. The pressures facing maternity staff, including workforce shortages and excessive workloads, were acknowledged, alongside the need to ensure that staff were adequately supported.
- The importance of listening to women and ensuring that their concerns were taken seriously was repeatedly emphasised. Members also highlighted the need for maternity services to be inclusive and accessible to all those using them and

Council

15/July2026

for appropriate and inclusive language to be used when discussing maternity care.

- Members also noted the wider importance of addressing inequalities in healthcare and ensuring that residents in rural areas had equitable access to safe and high-quality maternity services. The contribution of NHS staff and the dedication and professionalism of maternity teams were recognised.

Councillor Mike Evemy, Leader of the Council, thanked Councillors Hall-Wilson and Neill for bringing forward the motion and welcomed the clear actions it proposed. He confirmed his support for the motion and advised that, if approved, he would meet with his counterpart at Gloucestershire County Council to discuss how the two councils could work together to support improvements to maternity services. He also confirmed that he would meet with the proposer and seconder in advance of those discussions to ensure their views informed the meeting.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the resolution, which was proposed by Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson and seconded by Councillor Dilys Neill. The motion was carried unanimously.

Voting record:

30 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

Did not vote: Councillor Andrea Pellegram .

Motion - To improve maternity services across Gloucestershire (Resolution)

Full Council resolved to:

1. **AGREE** that every family should have access to safe, high-quality maternity care and genuine choice over where and how they give birth to improve outcomes for mothers and babies both during labour and postpartum. Restoring confidence in maternity services requires strong partnership working between local government, the NHS and other stakeholders therefore Cotswold District Council should use its influence to ensure that the concerns of residents are clearly communicated to those responsible for planning and delivering maternity services.
2. **REQUEST** that the Leader meet with the Cabinet Member who leads on Health at Gloucestershire County Council at the earliest opportunity to discuss the current challenges facing maternity services across Gloucestershire and to seek agreement on how both councils can work together to advocate for improvements to maternity provision, including:
 - a. the restoration and development of services at Stroud Maternity Unit;
 - b. action to address workforce shortages, particularly the recruitment and retention of midwives needed to provide safe and reliable home birth services; and
 - c. implementation of the recommendations relevant to Gloucestershire arising from the recent report led by Baroness Amos.

3. WRITE JOINTLY, where appropriate, to NHS Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, the Integrated Care Board and the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, setting out the concerns of local authorities and seeking clear plans and timescales for improving maternity services. 4. REPORT BACK to Full Council on the outcome of these discussions and any actions agreed to support improvements in maternity services for the residents of Gloucestershire.		
For	Gina Blomefield, Claire Bloomer, Naomi Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Evemy, David Fowles, Laura Hall-Wilson, Mark Harris, Paul Hodgkinson, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Julia Judd, Helene Mansilla, Mike McKeown, Dilys Neill, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling, Clare Turner, Michael Vann, Jon Wareing, Ian Watson, Tristan Wilkinson and Len Wilkins	30
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

121 Next meeting

The Chair confirmed that the next two meetings of Full Council would be:

1. Extraordinary Council 12 August 2026 starting at 6.00 pm
2. Full Council 23 September 2026 starting at 6.00 pm

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.41 pm

This page is intentionally left blank



Member Questions for Council – 15 July 2026

	Member asking question	Question	Cabinet Member	Response
1	Cllr Daryl Corps	Please confirm how much money is currently held in the Council's Planning Appeals Reserve, often described as the planning 'fighting fund'? How much of that sum is ring fenced specifically for defending planning appeals, and how much, if any, has been spent or committed since the fund was established?	Cllr Juliet Layton	A balance of £0.720m is currently held in the Council's Planning Appeals Reserve. The reserve was established in 2024/25 following an underspend of £25k against the planning appeals budget. A further £0.710m was transferred into the reserve in 2025/26, funded from the over-achievement of planning fee income. To date, £15k has been drawn down from the reserve to fund an overspend within the planning appeals budget. There are currently no specific commitments against the remaining balance. However, the reserve continues to provide an important safeguard against the increasing financial risks associated with major planning applications. The ongoing increase in planning applications, and the associated growth in fee income, is being driven largely by major housing development proposals. Many of these schemes are speculative in nature and therefore carry a higher risk of planning appeals where permission is refused. In addition, decisions to grant permission may be subject to judicial review.



				Given the scale and complexity of such developments, any resulting appeals are more likely to be considered through informal hearings or public inquiries than by written representations. These processes can result in significant additional costs for the Council, including legal, professional and expert witness fees. Retaining the reserve therefore provides financial resilience against potentially substantial and unpredictable planning appeal and litigation costs. As with all Council Earmarked Reserves, the adequacy of reserves is reviewed annually as part of the budget setting process with recommendations on reserves included in the report to Cabinet and Council in February 2027. The adequacy of the reserves is formally considered as part of the Chief Financial Officer's Section 25 Statement which members should have due regard to when considering the budget.
1b	Cllr Daryl Corps Supplementary question	What value does the administration place on protecting the Cotswolds? What criteria are used to decide whether a particular place, landscape or community is important enough to justify using the Planning Appeals Reserve?	Cllr Mike Every	Moreton was not considered unworthy of being defended. An appeal should only be pursued where there is a reasonable chance of success. Before deciding to withdraw from the Moreton appeal, the council obtained independent external advice, which concluded that the council was likely to lose. Pursuing the appeal could therefore have resulted in costs of tens or potentially hundreds of thousands of pounds. The council does have funding available to fight planning appeals, as custodians of



		Why was the recent appeal in Moreton not considered worth fighting for?		public money, the council must ensure value for money and cannot pursue appeals where there is little or no prospect of success. The decision was based on the circumstances of the individual application, not on the community concerned. The Local Plan currently under development will be important in reducing speculative development.
2	Cllr Gina Blomefield	The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) provides important additional funding for Town and Parish Councils and arises from statutory levies on new build housing and extensions to existing properties. If a Town or Parish has an existing Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) they receive 25% of the CIL amount with the rest going to the District Council funds and without an NDP they receive 15%. With the prospect of a huge increase in new developments across Cotswold District this could provide a useful additional revenue stream for local infrastructure projects. I understand that the criteria for CIL applications is being reviewed. It would be helpful if Town and Parish Councils could be briefed on this so that	Cllr Juliet Layton	The Council's new CIL bidding process will be published at the beginning of August and will apply to the 'Strategic Fund' which is collected, held and allocated by CDC. As part of the new process our Infrastructure Delivery Team will advise on how to improve bids, which could include strategic projects brought forward by Town and Parish Councils, where they fall short of the requirements for a valid bid. This updated process does not affect the funds transferred to Parish and Town Councils through the Neighbourhood CIL arrangements and they should follow their own processes to secure value for money. There are no current plans to brief town and parish councils on the new criteria and guidelines, but this information will be available on the Council's website.



		they can make plans in an organised way to spend their CIL money to best benefit their communities. Can you give me an update on when the new CIL criteria will be published?		
2b	Cllr Gina Blomefield Supplementary question	Could the council organise a briefing meeting for Town and Parish Councils covering all aspects of CIL, including the money held by parish councils? Some newer councillors may lack knowledge about CIL, and some parishes are holding significant sums that they have not yet decided how best to use.	Cllr Mike Every	A briefing meeting for Town and Parish Councils can be considered. Many Town and Parish Councils are already aware of their CIL money, how long they have to use it and when it may need to be returned. However, the council can review the communication and information provided to Town and Parish Councils when CIL monies are allocated, including guidance on how and when the money needs to be used. Action: The matter will be taken back to officers for further consideration and discussed with Councillor Layton.
3	Cllr Laura Hall-Wilson	While persuading residents to recycle more is a noble ambition, the overall waste a household produces is unlikely to go down. With smaller black bins what increased provision will there be to hold recycling (i.e. replacing the white and blue bags) Additionally in my ward almost fortnightly recycling is left because the truck is full before it has	Cllr Andrea Pellegram	The smaller bin policy will apply at the point the collection of plastic bags and wrapping is rolled out. Smaller bins will be provided for new properties and as existing bins become damaged and require replacement. This rolling programme of replacement will take many years to complete. Plastic bags and wrapping makes up 7.2% of the residual waste according to a waste composition analysis carried out in December 2024. A further 31.8% of the residual waste is food. By recycling these materials, residents should be able to manage with a smaller residual waste bin.



		finished its round, again with an anticipated increase in materials to be recycled, what provision will there be in the fleet to accommodate the extra needed to be collected?		FIGURE 4: AVERAGE COTSWOLD HOUSEHOLD RESIDUAL WASTE COMPOSITION (KG/HH/WK AND %) <table><thead><tr><th>Waste Type</th><th>Weight (KG/HH/WK)</th><th>Percentage (%)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>KITCHEN ORGANICS</td><td>1.67</td><td>31.8%</td></tr><tr><td>PAPER</td><td>0.53</td><td>10.2%</td></tr><tr><td>CARD</td><td>0.26</td><td>5.0%</td></tr><tr><td>SANITARY WASTE</td><td>0.59</td><td>11.2%</td></tr><tr><td>PLASTIC FILM</td><td>0.38</td><td>7.2%</td></tr><tr><td>DENSE PLASTIC</td><td>0.30</td><td>5.8%</td></tr><tr><td>TEXTILES</td><td>0.38</td><td>7.2%</td></tr><tr><td>MISC COMBUSTIBLE</td><td>0.25</td><td>4.7%</td></tr><tr><td>MISC NON-COMBUSTIBLE</td><td>0.27</td><td>5.1%</td></tr><tr><td>GLASS</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.9%</td></tr><tr><td>METALS</td><td>0.18</td><td>3.4%</td></tr><tr><td>FINES</td><td>0.10</td><td>1.9%</td></tr><tr><td>WEEE</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.5%</td></tr><tr><td>HAZARDOUS</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.3%</td></tr><tr><td>GARDEN ORGANICS</td><td>0.26</td><td>5.0%</td></tr></tbody></table> There is still paper and card in the residual bin and there may be more paper and card in the future where manufacturers shift from making packaging from plastic to using paper/ card. These changes are being considered in the design of the new recycling vehicles (compartment size/ level of compaction) and should therefore enable more efficient use of the vehicles and fewer instances such as you describe.	Waste Type	Weight (KG/HH/WK)	Percentage (%)	KITCHEN ORGANICS	1.67	31.8%	PAPER	0.53	10.2%	CARD	0.26	5.0%	SANITARY WASTE	0.59	11.2%	PLASTIC FILM	0.38	7.2%	DENSE PLASTIC	0.30	5.8%	TEXTILES	0.38	7.2%	MISC COMBUSTIBLE	0.25	4.7%	MISC NON-COMBUSTIBLE	0.27	5.1%	GLASS	0.05	0.9%	METALS	0.18	3.4%	FINES	0.10	1.9%	WEEE	0.02	0.5%	HAZARDOUS	0.01	0.3%	GARDEN ORGANICS	0.26	5.0%
Waste Type	Weight (KG/HH/WK)	Percentage (%)																																																		
KITCHEN ORGANICS	1.67	31.8%																																																		
PAPER	0.53	10.2%																																																		
CARD	0.26	5.0%																																																		
SANITARY WASTE	0.59	11.2%																																																		
PLASTIC FILM	0.38	7.2%																																																		
DENSE PLASTIC	0.30	5.8%																																																		
TEXTILES	0.38	7.2%																																																		
MISC COMBUSTIBLE	0.25	4.7%																																																		
MISC NON-COMBUSTIBLE	0.27	5.1%																																																		
GLASS	0.05	0.9%																																																		
METALS	0.18	3.4%																																																		
FINES	0.10	1.9%																																																		
WEEE	0.02	0.5%																																																		
HAZARDOUS	0.01	0.3%																																																		
GARDEN ORGANICS	0.26	5.0%																																																		
3b	Cllr Laura Hall-Wilson Supplementary question	Will households receive a larger recycling bin to accommodate the increase in recycling, and how will the waste collection fleet cope with the additional recycling when vehicles are	Cllr Andrea Pellegram	The new waste service will begin rolling out from the beginning of April. Households will be able to recycle flexible plastics, but no additional bins will be provided for these materials. Instead, residents will be asked to use their own plastic bags to contain flexible plastics and wrapping. Changes in shopping behaviour are resulting in less paper waste and more																																																



		already sometimes full before completing their rounds?		cardboard, and this has been taken into account. Paper and cardboard are already collected separately from residual waste, and households will retain their two existing receptacles. The new waste collection fleet has been designed using modelling of future waste flows and will have larger vehicle containers for cardboard. Less paper waste is expected.
4	Cllr Daryl Corps	Residents across the district raised serious concerns during the Local Plan consultation. For transparency and openness for residents, can the administration provide any examples at this point of where public feedback has resulted in material changes to the emerging plan?	Cllr Juliet Layton	There have been consultations on the Local Plan in 2022, 2024 and 2025. All comments have been fed into the following iterations of the plan and its policies. Comments from the Regulation 18 consultation last year were fed into the master planning work and had a direct impact on the layout and scale of new strategic sites.
4b	Cllr Daryl Corps Supplementary question	Can the council identify one specific site, policy or housing figure that was materially changed as a result of public feedback, including what it was before and after the consultation? Residents want to know whether their views have genuinely been listened to rather than consultation simply being a "suggestion box".	Cllr Juliet Layton	The draft local plan is due to be published on Friday 24 July, allowing residents and members to see what changes have been made as a result of the consultation. Responses to the consultation will also be published. A consultation summary was published earlier in March. The purpose of the Regulation 18 consultation was to obtain feedback, while the Regulation 19 consultation is intended to lead to the production of the Local Plan. The changes made in response to consultation can therefore be assessed when the draft Local Plan and accompanying papers are published.



5	Cllr Gina Blomefield	Housing associations play an important role in the Cotswolds providing social and affordable housing to residents. Bromford is CDC's largest provider but there are a number of other smaller players. There is a deep concern that the supply is insufficient for the demand. Can I have an update of the amount of new stock added to Cotswold District Council's affordable and social housing? Please also provide the number of social housing units sold on by social housing associations on the open market?	Cllr Juliet Layton	Social and affordable housing new stock delivered in Cotswold District: <table><tr><td>2024/25</td><td>56</td></tr><tr><td>2025/26</td><td>57</td></tr></table> Disposals by registered social housing providers in Cotswold District: Private Registered Social Housing Providers (RPs) are required by Section 176 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008, to notify the Regulator of Social Housing (the regulator) (RSH) about any disposal of a dwelling that is social housing. RPs are not obligated to notify the Local Authority. The RSH website data identifies that the total number of disposals by RPs in Cotswold District in 2024/25 was 20 (of which 12 were by Bromford Flagship – see below). The data is not yet available from RSH for 2025/26 (issued late October). Bromford Flagship is by far the largest RP in Cotswold District, being responsible for approximately 70% of all social and affordable housing in the District. Their disposals in the CDC area are as follows: <table><tr><td>2024/25</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>2025/26</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>2026/27 (YTD)</td><td>2</td></tr></table>	2024/25	56	2025/26	57	2024/25	12	2025/26	8	2026/27 (YTD)	2
2024/25	56													
2025/26	57													
2024/25	12													
2025/26	8													
2026/27 (YTD)	2													



5b	Cllr Gina Blomefield Supplementary question	Could Registered Providers of social and affordable housing (RP's) be asked to provide figures showing reductions in their housing stock, even though they are not obliged to notify the local authority? Could the figures also be separated between social and affordable housing and included in future service performance reports?	Cllr Mike Evemy	The council already has some information on housing stock held by registered providers and can seek further information where available. It is not clear whether all registered providers have already been asked to provide these figures, so this will be checked with officers. The council has some information relating to Bromford but does not currently have equivalent information for all other providers. The possibility of obtaining further information and improving the reporting of social and affordable housing figures can therefore be explored. (Action)
6	Cllr David Fowles	Prior to your appointment, we expressed concern that following the removal of waste bins in laybys across the Cotswolds, residents have complained, that contrary to the Administration's view that if there were no bins, visitors and residents would take their waste home; the waste is being left behind in lay-bys. Your administration undertook to do a review with Ubico. Please could you provide an update?	Cllr Andrea Pellegram	Litter bins have not been removed from all laybys. There are 103 litter bins in laybys across the District. Some have been removed but only in cases where the bins were being repeatedly stolen or vandalised. These bins were removed due to vandalism and cost issues. The bins in laybys are scheduled to be cleared and litter picked once a week; there are a handful of layby bins which get cleared twice a week. For example, A40, A429, Burford Road and A46 Tetbury There are limited issues with the bins which are still in situ including fly tipping and overflowing bins, but this is mostly seasonal and are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The bins tend to overflow more in the summer months due to heavier traffic with the increased visitors to the area and more fly tipping over Christmas etc.



6b	Cllr David Fowles Supplementary question	Are lay-bys without bins being monitored? Where bins are provided, can the frequency of collection be increased, particularly during the summer when bins are overflowing? Can residents be reassured that lay-bys without bins are being monitored and that overflowing bins will be emptied more frequently?	Cllr Andrea Pellegram	Lay-bys are being monitored as part of a new review process. Ubico teams have been trained to use new software called Alloy, which enables them to assess whether bins are overflowing using a red, amber and green system. The council is beginning to use this system to monitor the situation. The number of bins can also be increased where necessary. Where a parish clerk requests an additional bin, the council can provide one and Ubico will empty it.
7	Cllr David Fowles	During the recent by election for Cirencester Park division, residents asked questions about plans to improve the town. Please could you update me on the status of the Cirencester Town Centre master plan and the working group which was set up to drive the plan forward?	Cllr Juliet Layton	The Cirencester Master Plan was delayed in the Spring of 2025 due to changes to the Environment Agency flood maps which identified the Waterloo Car Park as a higher flood risk. No further work could be undertaken on the master plan until investigations were made into the development potential of the site. This work dovetailed into the Local Plan Reg 18 consultation and, due to the likely significant increase in new homes in the Cirencester environs, it is considered prudent to include the overarching principles of the draft master plan in the new Local Plan and revisit the detail of the master plan after the local plan submission has been finalised.



7B	Cllr David Fowles Supplementary question	What has happened to the Cirencester Town centre Masterplan since 2019? Why, after several years, is there still no viable master plan, and is it acceptable to rely on the Waterloo car park despite the flooding issues?	Cllr Mike Every	Progress on the Cirencester Town Centre Masterplan has taken longer than expected. The process has been affected by the global pandemic and issues relating to proposals for the Waterloo car park. Work has continued on the plan, alongside progress on the Neighbourhood Plan and its Regulation consultation. The forthcoming local plan will establish the wider framework for the development of Cirencester as a whole. Once the local plan establishes the wider development context and requirements for the town, the specific requirements of the town centre can be considered. Following completion of the local plan process, the intention is to produce a Town Centre Masterplan that sits alongside the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.
----	--	--	-----------------	---