



Minutes of a meeting of Full Council held on Wednesday, 25 May 2022.

Councillors present:

	Nikki Ind – Vice Chair	
Stephen Andrews	Joe Harris	Richard Morgan
Tony Berry	Mark Harris	Richard Norris
Claire Bloomer	Stephen Hirst	Nigel Robbins
Ray Brassington	Robin Hughes	Gary Selwyn
Patrick Coleman	Roly Hughes	Lisa Spivey
Rachel Coxcoon	Sue Jepson	Tom Stowe
David Cunningham	Julia Judd	Ray Theodoulou
Tony Dale	Richard Keeling	Steve Trotter
Andrew Doherty	Juliet Layton	Clive Webster
Mike Evemy	Andrew Maclean	
Jenny Forde	Nick Maunder	

Officers present:

Rob Weaver – Chief Executive
Jenny Poole – Deputy Chief Executive
Angela Claridge – Director of Governance & Development
Sarah Dalby – Electoral Services Manager
Kira Thompson – Elections and Democratic Services Support Officer
Stuart Wilson - Leisure Contract Specialist Officer
Jan Britton – Managing Director – Publica
Bill Oddy - Group Manager - Commercial Development, Leadership and Management Team
Claire Hughes – Business Manager - Corporate Responsibility
Caleb Harris – Democratic Services
Wayne Smith – Democratic Services

82 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Gina Blomefield and Dilys Neill

83 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Coleman declared an interest in Item 9, Changes to the Constitution – Update to the Council Procedure Rules, as the decision that would determine whether (or not) he could continue as Chair of the Audit Committee if proposed and re-elected.

Councillor Andrews declared an interest in Item 9, Changes to the Constitution – Update to the Council Procedure Rules, as the decision that would determine whether (or not) he could continue as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee if proposed and re-elected.

Councillor Berry declared an interest in Item 10, Options Appraisal of the Leisure and Culture Management Arrangements, as a trustee of The Friends of Corinium Museum.

84 Minutes

Various amendments to the minutes were discussed as follows:

The report page header was incorrectly showing 16th February 2022. Amended to 16th March 2022.

Minute 62 (para 4) "...resigning the Armed Forces Covenant..." amended to "re-signing the Armed Forces Covenant..."

Minute 63 (para 6) "...centre of town at Ludd Lane." amended to "...centre of town at Love Lane."

Minute 66 "Record of VotingAbsent 4" amended to "Record of Voting...Absent 6"

Minute 69, 70 & 71, have no Voting Records. Amended to include Voting Records

It was considered that the Minute to the Member Questions item did not capture sufficient detail. The Minutes would be amended to provide more detail.

Minute 61 Paragraph 1 removed and replaced with " Cllr Berry stated that he had informed the Leader, prior to the meeting, that the Conservative Group didn't support this motion and in view of this asked that the motion be removed since it would be a purely Liberal Democrat motion not a full Council one. This having been refused, Cllr. Berry stated that the Conservatives would therefore write separately to the Boundaries Commission and separately attend the review."

Councillor Maclean stated that he had given apologies in advance of the Council meeting. The apologies were therefore amended to include Councillor Maclean

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 16th March 2022 were agreed as a true record subject to the amendments being made

Voting Record – For 29, Against 0, Abstentions 3, Absent 2,

85 Announcements from the Chair, Leader and Chief Executive (if any)

The Vice-Chair Councillor Nikki Ind welcomed all Members, Officers and members of the public and press, both in person and online, to the Council meeting and thanked Members for accommodating the format of the day's meetings including the Annual Council meeting at 6.30 PM.

Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council, addressed the Council and started by reflecting on the recent events in Texas where 19 children and their teachers had been killed. Council was also invited to reflect on the ongoing Ukrainian crisis, welcomed refugees that had moved into the District, and thanked Council Officers and Members who had provided support, help and advice.

The Chief Executive, Rob Weaver addressed the Council and reiterated his thanks for all the work that is being done to support the government's Ukraine support schemes and provide local community support to bridge any gaps.

86 Public Questions

Council Borrowing of £76.5M

Mr Dunn's question was directed to The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris. He asked "Should the £76.5M that the Council is proposing to borrow, be the subject of a local referendum to enable Cotswold residents to understand the benefits and risks involved in borrowing such a large amount"

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris stated that a referendum would not be held as the proposal to borrow the sum involved was complex and could not be reduced to a binary 'yes/no' decision. The context of the borrowing requirement was provided, along with an assurance that business cases would underpin each initiative that benefitted from the borrowing. There was also a commitment that only initiatives that benefitted the local area and delivered a return on investment would be successful.

Baunton Parish Boundary Change

Mr Milner's question was directed to the Council.

He asked "Given that:

- both CDC and Baunton Parish had undertaken consultation and shown that the local residents didn't want the proposed change,
- it offered no benefits,
- sharing facilities between communities was already routine,
- the area was a tourist destination and facilities were already widely shared,
- moving the households out of the parish caused an unnecessary existential risk to Baunton parish (as the voters number will reduce to 165 and the minimum is 150)

What possible justification is there for this proposal?"

The Leader of The Council, Councillor Joe Harris stated that the Council needed to make an objective view on whether the boundary should change or remain where it is and a debate would be held later in the Council meeting to discuss and vote on this.

Crowdfund Cotswold Grants

Mr Fowles' first question was directed to the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Every. He asked "The Council's Crowdfunding initiative has been a huge success raising nearly £300,000, however there had been some concern that very small projects that had previously received matched funding were no longer applying. Could the Council publish details of all of the projects including, those that were unsuccessful, the average grant, and how this had compared with the Community Projects Fund?

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Every stated that the Community Project Fund had been complicated, bureaucratic and difficult to administer for relatively small amounts of money and did not have the added benefit of encouraging local engagement across the District. In the first round of Crowdfund Cotswold all 19 applications had received funding and details had already been listed on the Crowdfund Cotswold website.

Mr Fowles' second question was directed to The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris. He asked "Unlike Public Questions that tend to get read out in Council meetings, this no longer happens with Members Questions, and therefore in person attendance of Council meetings is required in order to hear these and read the agenda. In the interest of openness and transparency, could the Council revert to requiring all Members to read their questions and also offer members of the Public the opportunity to ask a supplementary question.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris stated that the current process enabled any member of the public to turn up to a Council meeting without prior notice or a requirement to submit questions in advance, and ask up to 2 questions. The Members Questions were printed also in the Agenda that was available on the Council website.

87 Member Questions

The following Members' questions had been submitted and responses provided by Cabinet Members prior to the meeting. Supplementary questions and Cabinet Members responses were made in the Council meeting.

From Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Andrew Doherty, Cabinet Member for the Environment, Waste and Recycling

I understand that a review into the quantity, location and the emptying of public waste and dog bins across the district is being carried out. Can you please provide an update on the progress of this review and indicate when you expect the process to be completed and the findings available.

Response from Councillor Andrew Doherty, Cabinet Member for the Environment, Waste and Recycling to Councillor Tom Stowe

Following scoring of the projects identified within the Environmental Services Innovation Programme (ESIP), the litter bin review hasn't scored that highly because it will be unlikely to generate significant savings or deliver a benefit in the service. The programme resource available is therefore being focussed on higher priority projects and the litter bin review will now be completed in 2023/24.

If there are exceptional issues in certain areas of the district, then officers will deal with these on a case by case basis in the meantime

Supplementary Question from Councillor Tom Stowe to Councillor Andrew Doherty, Cabinet Member for the Environment, Waste and Recycling

Can you guarantee and reassure the town and parish councils and residents that no public litter or dog waste bins will be removed prior to the completion of the review and that any enquiries or localised issues with new bins will be handled in a swift manner?

Response from Councillor Andrew Doherty, Cabinet Member for the Environment, Waste and Recycling to Councillor Tom Stowe

Although it cannot be guaranteed that no public litter or dog waste bins will be removed, this is usually only done in exceptional cases and in consultation with parish councils. Increasing fuel costs have required Ubico to refocus on reducing the impact on the revenue budget so the overarching policy on where and why bins are placed will take longer, but in the meantime Ubico Officers will continue to work with parish council where there are ongoing issues.

From Councillor Tony Berry to Councillor the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Mike Every

Council
25/May2022

The cash payment option for car parking was due to be finally removed in the latter part of last year, but is still available in a number of car parks in Cirencester. Please could you advise Council if this is the policy change that the Conservative Group have been encouraging, or just a missed target date.

Response from the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance Councillor Mike Every to Councillor Tony Berry

Due to data connectivity concerns within parts of the District the phased approach to roll out cashless in all our car parks has been delayed. A trial of upgraded software will be undertaken in Rissington Road and Old Station car parks. The aim of the trial is to ascertain whether the software will reduce waiting times for customers and speed up payments at the payment machines for those who pay by card. The trial will commence on 24 May for a two week period (ending 7 June) Full monitoring of the machines in both car parks will be carried out during this period; following which, reports will be forwarded to the Cabinet and Deputy Chief Executive with findings from the trial. Should the trial provide assurance that the updated software will provide a speedier car payment service to customers an amended timetable to 'roll-out' cashless in all car parks will be put forward for consideration. I'm unsure what the Conservative policy is as I note with interest the Conservative-run County Council are phasing out cash payments on their parking machines.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Tony Berry to the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Mike Every

If the data connectivity speeds continue to be an issue across the District does that mean you would leave the cash facility open?

Response from the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Mike Every to Councillor Tony Berry

The car parking card and phone payment facility is the same or similar to other payment facilities available across the country and a trial is currently underway to speed up the payment process by batching payments for later processing rather than verifying with each payment. Payment using the App is popular and even where cash payment is still available, people are migrating to card and phone payment therefore if the trial is successful we will be moving to remove cash payment as soon as possible.

From Councillor Gina Blomefield to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris

The Conservative Group would very much like to give our thanks of appreciation to Jenny Poole who is leaving her role as both Chief Financial Officer and Deputy Chief Executive Officer at the end of July to enjoy a sabbatical with her husband. We are sorry to see her go after eighteen years of excellent service to Cotswold District Council. Are we correct in understanding that the candidate being sought to replace Jenny will be offered both roles and the same remuneration package?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris to Councillor Gina Blomefield

I can confirm that the Council is actively recruiting a replacement for Jenny on a like for like basis and at the same level of remuneration.

Council

25/May2022

From Councillor Stephen Hirst to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris

Since the commencement of the Covid-19 Pandemic CDC Officers have been encouraged to work from home with only occasional contact with the office.

Now that the Pandemic is easing Officers should now be returning to work in the relevant offices. Could the Leader please advise Council when it is expected that all officers will be returning to work, particularly in those departments such as Planning where direct contact with members of the public is so important to quickly progress applications in the necessary time frames?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris to Councillor Stephen Hirst

Thank you for your question. I would refer you back to the report that Cabinet agreed in December 2021, which stated that an Agile Working Policy had been adopted and set out the business and staff benefits to a more flexible approach to working. Cabinet agreed to move forward with changes to the Trinity Road Offices based on a reduction in the Council's workspace, with most staff working remotely for broadly 50% of the time. Throughout the pandemic our staff have continued to meet the needs of residents and businesses across all of our services. Whilst we will now permanently see a reduction of staff in the offices, we continue to offer direct contact with the public, with site visits taking place and members of the public able to attend the offices in person if they wish to, although we are increasingly seeing residents switch to virtual forms of contact by choice.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Stephen Hirst to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris

In support of your action to introduce Ukrainian refugees to the District, will you be inviting all Members to the sessions so we can all welcome and get to know our new neighbours?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joe Harris to Councillor Stephen Hirst

No firm plans have been put in place yet but as soon as they are, all Members will be invited. The event will be community focussed rather than official to make them feel welcome.

88 Update to the Council's Corporate Plan (2020-2024)

The purpose of this item was to introduce the update of the Council's Corporate Plan, which was adopted by the Council on 23 September 2020.

Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council, introduced the report and summarised the 3 priorities included in the Liberal Democrat manifesto (Providing Genuinely Affordable Housing, Take Real Action on Climate Change and Deliver a Sustainable Local Economy), and how these now informed the updated Corporate Plan.

The Council commented that none of the problems facing the Council had been included and many of the successful Council's initiatives had originally been developed by the Government, the County Council or other organisations or are not due to be delivered until 2024.

Council
25/May2022

The Council commented that the difficulties recruiting Planning Officers is a nationwide issue and any criticism of the Council's Planning Service was demoralising for hard working Planning staff.

The Council commented that the Corporate Plan was easy to read and understand, and that it was encouraging to see vacancy of retail premises in the centre of Cirencester had fallen from 11% to 5%, significantly below the national average of 14%.

The Council commented that Planning Officers are not currently required to include planning conditions that specifically respond to the climate change crisis and advised the Council that there had never been a better time to introduce these requirements.

The Council commented on the easy accessibility of the Corporate Plan and that specific details of each initiative would be considered and defined by Committees and Working Groups when appropriate.

The Council agreed that the recruitment of Planning Officers was very difficult across the country, leading to some Councils choosing not to accept any future planning applications, but this was not the case at Cotswold District Council. The vibrancy of the Cotswolds as a great place to live, work, and shop was also celebrated.

The Council commented that although the planning regulations encourage consideration of measures that contribute to reducing climate change they do not specifically require them to be included. Comments were also made challenging the importance of car-friendly, town-centre initiatives in other towns and cities.

The Council commented that the issue with the high number of planning applications being handled by a reduced number of Planning Officers would inevitably create backlogs and delay decision making and this needed to be resolved. Support was also given for adequate parking for residents with mobility issues and those living in rural areas.

The Council welcomed the improved design of the Corporate Plan but noted that some of the successful initiatives being delivered were put in place by the previous administration and newer initiatives appeared to be aspirational without clear timescales for their completion.

The Council commented that it was important that the Corporate Plan was both clear and accessible, and this had been achieved, and noted that Planning and Parking appeared to be the only issues that concerned opposition Members. It was also stated that a referendum on the Recovery Investment Strategy was not needed, as the election that will be taking place within the year will enable all residents to decide whether the current administration's priorities policies were supported or a new Administration should take over.

'Councillor Berry questioned why overall borrowing in the Recovery Investment Strategy had increased when borrowing for social housing had reduced

Councillor Every commented that CIPFA had recently stated that borrowing to lend on to social housing providers would not be allowed. The potential borrowing limit had been increased in the updated Strategy to meet the higher income figures required to balance the revenue budget in the updated MTFS.

Council
25/May2022

The Council commented that the development of Housing in Kemble was controlled by the Bromford Housing Association, and the Council had consistently encouraged them to commence work as soon as possible to deliver socially rented homes.

The Council enquired whether Cotswold District Council had actually delivered the new homes or was this done through partner organisations. Councillor Spivey confirmed the Council no longer had housing stock and new housing was being delivered through other association and market developers. The Council's priority to deliver affordable social housing would however ensure the correct type of housing would be developed.

The Council stated that across the country, Councils of various administrations were delivering for their residents, and was disappointed that opposition Members had not suggested positive improvements or supported the Corporate Plan and suggested their alternative Corporate Plan would include cuts to Council services.

RESOLVED: Having considered the Corporate Plan Update, the Council agreed to its adoption.

Voting Record – For 18, Against 13, Abstentions 1, Absent 2,

89 Community Governance Review

The purpose of this report was for Council to consider the consultation responses and approve the final recommendations of the Community Governance Review for each of 6 areas across the District.

In addition, to consider a request from Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council to change in their governance arrangements

Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council presented the report and recommended that each of the 6 proposals should be considered individually with the Electoral Services Manager providing context, background and expert advice.

The Council agreed to consider and vote on each application individually and once completed, consider and vote collectively to make the required electoral and legal changes.

1. Ampney Crucis – Driffield

The Electoral Services Manager introduced the proposal to 'draft a recommendation to move the current parish boundary line' that cuts through a property and its land that leaves part in Ampney Crucis and part in Driffield.

Recommendation

Following consultation, and In light of the lack of consensus and additional proposals from Ampney St Mary, it was recommended that further consultation is carried out with the parish councils/meeting and local residents to understand their views more fully with final recommendations brought to Council on 20th July 2022.

The Council noted that there was currently a lack of consensus and additional consultation was required.

Council

25/May2022

RESOLVED: The Council agreed with the Officer's recommendation that further consultation should be carried out and final considerations should be brought to Council in July

Voting Record: For 32, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 2,

2. Coberley – Withington

The Electoral Services Manager introduced the proposal that Coberley Parish Council had submitted to move the property known as Needlehole from Withington into Coberley. This request was originally made a few years ago, and this was the first opportunity for it to be considered

Recommendations

It was recommended that the boundary between Coberley Parish and Withington Parish is amended to bring the property known as Needlehole into the parish of Coberley. If agreed, details of the recommendation would be submitted to the Boundary Commission for England for their consideration in amending the Ward boundary between Ermin and Sandywell.

The Council noted that although 4 buildings would be included in the move, only one of these was a dwelling.

The Council noted that the roads on the associated map could give the impression that the property was part of Withington, but that the topography of the land made it part of Coberley.

RESOLVED: The Council agreed with the Officer's recommendation that the boundary between Coberley Parish and Withington Parish should be amended to bring the property known as Needlehole into the parish of Coberley, and details of the recommendation should be submitted to the Boundary Commission for England for their consideration in amending the Ward boundary between Ermin and Sandywell.

Voting Record: For 32, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 2,

3. Birdlip, Brimpsfield and Cowley Boundaries

The Electoral Services Manager introduced the proposal following a request from Cowley Parish Council that draft recommendations were drawn up to split the parish into two, to create Birdlip Parish Council and to continue with Cowley Parish Council.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the parish of Cowley is split to create two new councils; Birdlip Parish Council and Cowley Parish Council, and the boundary between the new Birdlip Parish Council and Brimpsfield Parish is altered to include the properties at Parsons Pitch/Hawcote Hill into the new Birdlip Parish Council area

It is also recommended that Birdlip Parish Council has 7 councillors and Cowley Parish Council has 5 councillors; and Legal Services put the necessary procedures in place to effect this change with elections to the two new councils taking place alongside the ordinary elections on 4 May 2023

The Council noted that the historic Cowley Parish area had been defined by the importance of the Cowley estate and village, with workers cottages at Birdlip originally marking the boundary

Council

25/May2022

of the estate. The development of the A417 into a major highway, and Birdlip developing into a vibrant village that was now twice the size of Cowley, had changed the needs and priorities of the two communities.

The Council noted that although the split would leave only 100 residents in Cowley Parish, the CEO of the Gloucester Association of Parish and Town Councils (GAPTC) had confirmed that as an existing parish council, Cowley Parish Council, could remain in existence to serve the smaller parish area.

The Council noted that Cowley Parish Council would continue to exist until the parish council decided to dissolve it, and that electoral and legal support would be provided to help establish Birdlip Parish Council and elect its Members.

RESOLVED: The Council agreed that the parish of Cowley is split to create two new councils; Birdlip Parish Council and Cowley Parish Council, and the boundary between the new Birdlip Parish Council and Brimpsfield Parish is altered to include the properties at Parsons Pitch/Hawcote Hill into the new Birdlip Parish Council area

The Council also agreed that Birdlip Parish Council would have 7 councillors and Cowley Parish Council would have 5 councillors, and Legal Services would put the necessary procedures in place to effect this change with elections to the two new councils taking place alongside the ordinary elections on 4 May 2023

Voting Record: For 32, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 2,

4. Northleach-with-Eastington

The Electoral Services Manager introduced the proposal from Northleach-with-Eastington Town Council requesting consideration was given to moving the boundary between itself and Farmington Parish Meeting.

The Council noted that the proposal did not affect any properties and that Farmington Parish Meeting was against the proposed changes.

The Council noted that no evidence of litter or road safety issues had been produced by either Northleach-with-Eastington Town Council or Farmington Parish Meeting.

Recommendation

As there was no clear consensus for this change and no properties were affected, it was recommended that no changes were made and the boundary should remain as it is.

RESOLVED: The Council agreed with the Officer's recommendation that, as there was no clear consensus for this change, and no properties would be affected, that no changes were made and the boundary remained as it was.

Voting Record: For 32, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 2,

5. Westonbirt-with-Lasborough

The Electoral Services Manager introduced the proposal that a number of properties currently in Shipton Moyne and Tetbury Upton were moved into Westonbirt-with-Lasborough. The proposal was requested by Westonbirt-with-Lasborough Parish Council as they felt that these properties were more aligned to Westonbirt-with-Lasborough.

The Council noted that there was no compelling reason to move the properties to a different parish and the residents of the Shipton Moyne (that would be affected) did not support the move.

The Council noted that should the Council be minded to agree to the move taking place, then this would have an impact on ward boundaries, which may need to be changed.

Recommendation

It was recommended that the boundary remained the same and the proposal was refused.

RESOLVED: The Council agreed with the Officer's recommendation that the boundary remained the same and the proposal was refused.

Voting Record: For 31, Against 0, Abstentions 1, Absent 2,

6. Stratton (Cirencester) – Baunton

Councillor Robbins introduced the proposal that, following a request from Cirencester Town Council, the Community Governance Review look at the boundary between Cirencester and Baunton which runs along Baunton Lane. The proposal was to move the properties currently in Baunton Parish into the Cirencester Town Council area.

The Council noted that the residents of the properties affected, currently benefited from being part of Cirencester, and all that the town provided, but did not contribute to the town's precept through their Council Tax charges.

The Council noted that the residents of the properties currently paid precept payments to Baunton Parish Council and, should the move be approved, Cirencester Town Council had agreed to pay a grant equal to the amount of precept that would be lost (around £750 per year) for a period of 4 years, to enable Baunton Parish Council to adjust to the lost income.

The Council noted that the residents believed their views (not move the properties) should take precedence, as the move provided no benefit for them and risked the long-term sustainability of Baunton as a parish.

The Council noted that the Council Tax charge of the residents affected would increase by around £200 per year.

The Council were reassured that the boundary changes would not affect the Council's planning policy or change the criteria and development regulations applying to development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty land behind the houses that are affected.

The Council noted that the distance between the last houses in Baunton village and Stratton was 48 metres and the distance between the same house and the first of the houses that would be affected was over 500 metres.

Recommendations

It was recommended that the Council consider the outcome of the consultation and the recommendation and decide whether the boundary should be changed.

Council

25/May2022

RESOLVED: Having considered the outcome of the consultation and discussed the proposal, the Council agreed that the properties on and near to Baunton Lane (indicated on the associated map) were moved from Baunton Parish area to Cirencester Town.

Voting Record: For 18, Against 12, Abstentions 1, Absent 3,

RESOLVED: Following consideration and decisions and votes taken by the Council in respect of the 6 proposals, the Council authorises the Electoral Services Manager to request the Local Government Boundary Commission to change District Wards and County Divisions to reflect the changes made to Parish boundaries and authorise the Head of Legal Services to make a Reorganisation of Community Governance order to implement the changes agreed by Council

The Council also agrees to increase the number of Parish Councillors on Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council from 11 to 13.

Voting Record: For 30, Against 0, Abstentions 1, Absent 3,

90 Changes to the Constitution - Update to the Council Procedure Rules

The purpose of this report was to seek agreement to make two changes to the Council Procedure Rules, Part D, of the Constitution that would remove the requirement that no member of the Council holds the office of Chair of the Council, or Chair of a Committee, for a continuous period of more than three years. Additionally, that Council introduces a new requirement that the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee must always be a member from an opposition.

Councillor Joe Harris, Leader of the Council introduced the report and commented that the rules were an anomaly and it was not usual for Councils to limit the term that Members held the office of Chairs of Committees. It was also not considered best practice to have a Member from an incumbent administration's party serving as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Council Procedure Rules, Part D of the Constitution are amended with immediate effect to remove the requirement that no member of the Council holds the office of Chair of the Council, or Chair of a Committee, for a continuous period of more than three years, and introduce a requirement that the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee must always be a Member from the opposition.

Voting Record: For 24, Against 0, Abstentions 6, Absent 4,

91 Options Appraisal of Leisure and Culture Management Arrangements

The purpose of this Report was to inform Council of the Leisure and Culture Management Options Appraisal outcomes and to seek authority to commence the procurement process for the appointment of Leisure and Cultural Services Contractors.

Councillor Forde presented the report and provided context for the requirement for the Leisure and Culture Management Options Appraisal to ensure leisure and cultural services continue to be available across the District. The current Leisure and Cultural management contracts were due to end on 31st July 2023, and the Council was now required to discuss and agree how these services would be managed thereafter.

Council

25/May2022

RESOLVED: That Council considered the outcomes of the Leisure and Culture Management Option Appraisal, and granted authority for the commencement of a procurement process for the appointment of Leisure and Culture Management Contractors, for the operation of the Council's Leisure and Culture facilities, as outlined in this report.

Voting Record – For 31, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 3,

92 Approval of the Cabinet Decision For Use Of Funds From The Capital Programme

The purpose of this report was to seek approval for the use of funds in the Capital Programme for the delivery of a capital investment project, as detailed in this report and supporting documentation, by SLM Everyone Active (SLM).

Councillor Forde presented the report that essentially enabled the Council to provide (already committed) capital funding for the procurement of leisure equipment at leisure facilities that are managed for the Council by partner organisations. The Council would retain ownership of the assets (equipment) when the contract ended.

The Council commented that the investment in the Council's existing leisure facilities was welcomed however the strategic options paper had revealed that leisure facilities were lacking in Fairford and Tetbury, and it was important that similar investment and support should be provided to these areas.

The Council asked if leasing of equipment had been considered. The Leisure Contract Specialist Officer stated that leasing had not been considered as part of this procurement.

The Council notes that there was a gym in Fairford.

The Council agreed that Tetbury and Fairford should not be forgotten and support and funding should be provided across the District and not just focussed in Cirencester. As there were no longer any Council owned leisure facilities in Tetbury, it was requested that consideration was given to Council/NHS/CCG funded subsidised membership of either or both of the 2 privately owned gyms in Tetbury for residents whose health and wellbeing would be improved by access to these facilities.

The Council noted that all areas of the District would receive support and the leisure centre in Cirencester helped to subsidise other leisure services in Bourton-on-the-Water and Chipping Campden.

The Council noted that subsidised access to leisure facilities (through the NHS and other organisations) could be effective, and the increase in social prescribing may be a way of achieving this and, considering the growth of the competitive leisure market, it was unlikely that Council's would be providing all leisure services in the future.

The Council requested details of how Cirencester Leisure Centre benefits other centres, and it was agreed these details would be provided to all Members

The Council noted that although leisure services were provided by other organisations, these services were still widely associated with the Council and for reputational reasons the Council would end up having to step in if things go wrong.

Council

25/May2022

RESOLVED: That Council approved the use of funds from the Capital Programme and the following recommendation(s):

- a) That SLM is given approval to complete the Capital Investment project.
- b) That SLM's proposed Option (I) as set out in Annex A is approved with the remainder of the Capital budget being retained for investment in Leisure Equipment.
- c) That the authority approve expenditure of the retained balance of the Capital budget, if Option (I) was supported, and final approval would be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing once the procurement has been completed.

Voting Record – For 30, Against 0, Abstentions 0, Absent 4,

93 Notice of Motions

No notices of motion were received for the Council to consider.

94 Next meeting

The Annual Council Meeting would take place later on 25th May 2022 at 6.30 PM.

The next meeting of the Council would be held on Wednesday 20th July 2022

The Meeting commence at 2.00pm and closed at 5.23pm

Chair

(END)