



**Minutes of a meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on  
Monday, 1 June 2026**

Members present:

|                         |                           |             |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Gina Blomefield (Chair) | Clare Turner (Vice Chair) |             |
| David Cunningham        | Michael Vann              | Ian Watson  |
| Tony Slater             | Jon Wareing               | Lisa Spivey |

Officers present:

|                                                                              |                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer) | Jane Portman, Chief Executive Officer                           |
| Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer                                    | David Stanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer |
| Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer                           | Peta Johnson, Head of Waste and Environment                     |

Observers:

Councillor Mike Evemy and Andrea Pellegram

**OS.330 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Angus Jenkinson and Clare Bloomer.

**OS.331 Substitute Members**

Councillor Nick Bridges substituted for Councillor Clare Bloomer. Councillor Clare Turner substituted as Vice-Chair.

**OS.332 Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interests were made.

**OS.333 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 13 April 2026 were discussed. Councillor David Cunningham proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Clare Turner seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2026.

### **OS.334      Matters Arising from Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair thanked Officers for the further information received following the previous Committee meeting. Further information was still awaited on the Car-Free Cotswolds Initiative, Cotswold District Council's use of weed killers, and the process for bidding for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds once arrangements were finalised.

### **OS.335      Chair's Announcements**

The Chair welcomed Simon Harper, the new Head of Elections and Democratic Services.

### **OS.336      Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

### **OS.337      Member Questions**

A written question from Councillor Jenkinson had been received and answered. The response explained why Cotswold District Council had adopted a different approach to the Spatial Development Strategy from that taken by Stroud District Council.

### **OS.338      Report back on recommendations**

There were no recommendations made to Cabinet.

### **OS.339      Local Government Reorganisation - Structural Changes Order**

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

The Chair advised members to focus on the following three questions:

- Preparing Authority or New Shadow Authority.
- Should political balance be applied to the Implementation Executive / Joint Committee?
- The name of the new council or councils.

The report was introduced by Councillor Mike Evely, Leader of the Council and Jane Portman, Chief Executive Officer who highlighted the following points:

- Cabinet needed to consider the three proposed scenarios in advance of the Government announcement expected on 16 June.
- Not all of the questions for each scenario may ultimately require a response or a formal view to be expressed.

In questioning and discussion, the following points were noted:

- There was concern about the capacity of officers and political leaders to respond within the timeframe.
- There had been broad consensus at the leaders' meeting across most of the questions, with potential differences on the preparing vs shadow authority model and the naming of any new authority.
- The proposed structure for the Implementation Executive / Joint Committee was six representatives from the County Council and one from each of the district councils in Gloucestershire. Application of political balance would be a matter for the County Council to determine from amongst representatives.
- The Implementation Executive / Joint Committee would operate from the point the SCO came into effect until the elections for the new unitary council/s.
- In the event of a single unitary authority, the most straightforward name would be "Gloucestershire Unitary." For a two-unitary model, the proposed names were "East Gloucestershire" and "West Gloucestershire".
- The warding arrangements for any new unitary/unitaries had been set out in the proposals submitted to MHCLG on 28 November 2025, and there was no current indication of councillor-level issues being raised in relation to those arrangements. The draft SCO would be laid before Parliament, with councils given the opportunity to fact-check its contents prior to laying, expected in winter 2026 ahead of implementation.
- Initial arrangements would provide two councillors per County Council division, with an intention that during the first term of the new council a boundary review would be undertaken. There would be a move towards single-member divisions at the second election of the new authority, scheduled for 2032.

Recommendations:

1. **Membership of the Implementation Executive / Joint Committee**  
Each district council will appoint its own representative, with the County Council determining the political balance of its six representatives.
2. **Naming of New Authorities;** That Cabinet note indicative support for:
  - "Gloucestershire Council" if a single unitary was created.
  - "East Gloucestershire" and "West Gloucestershire" if a two-unitary model was adopted.
  - No view was expressed on the Greater Gloucester and Gloucestershire option.
3. **Timetable for Response:**  
Given the constrained timetable, Cabinet should prepare a proportionate and focused response to the consultation, concentrating on the most significant issues.

4. **Preparing authority vs shadow authority:** The Committee noted the options without expressing a preference, acknowledging the model may depend on whether a single or two unitary councils are created.

### **OS.340      Waste and Environment - Service Design Options**

The purpose of the report was to describe the rationale, impacts and risks associated with: (1) demobilising the Council-provided “bring bank” service; (2) introducing kerbside collections of plastic bags and wrapping in line with Simpler Recycling requirements, including the proposed approach to resident presentation of material; and (3) moving to the combined collection of paper and card to simplify collections and improve operational resilience.

The report was introduced by Councillor Andrea Pellegram, Cabinet Member for Environment and Regulatory Services, and Peta Johnson, Head of Waste and Environment, who highlighted the following points:

- Changes to the waste service were proposed to support upcoming vehicle procurement, address legacy arrangements, and prepare for future service harmonisation under Local Government Reorganisation. Changes included removing “bring banks”, not providing bags for the collection of plastic film and wrapping, and introducing smaller residual waste bins for new homes or where replacement bins needed to be provided.

Arising from member questions, the following points were noted:

- Clothing and textile banks operated by charities and third-party organisations would remain in place.
- The estimated financial impact of the proposed changes was an overall annual benefit of around £10,000.
- No immediate change to resident containers; mixed paper and card would continue in existing black box and blue bag, with a longer-term aim to simplify and standardise containers as stock was used up and improved designs were introduced.
- Mixing paper and card resulted in some loss of material quality, as it led to downcycling rather than higher-grade paper recycling; however, this was considered in the context of declining paper volumes over time.
- There was no immediate expectation for residents to purchase bags specifically to recycle ‘soft’ plastics.
- The “bring bank” locations included 24 sites, with 20 currently showing provision, but this was subject to change as a full site survey being carried out (due to be completed by 5 June 2026).

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

01/June2026

### Recommendations:

#### 1. "Bring bank" service

That Cabinet request an increase in monitoring / collections at former "bring bank" sites in order to:

- prevent or reduce fly-tipping
- manage any waste left at the sites following decommissioning

#### 2. Collection of plastic bags and wrapping

- That Cabinet ensured a communications package was provided to residents explaining that they would be expected to use their own bags for plastic film and wrapping recycling. It was recommended that guidance would be provided to avoid confusion and contamination of recycling streams.

The recommendations to Cabinet were proposed by Councillor David Cunningham and seconded by Councillor Ian Watson. This was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

### **OS.341 Overview & Scrutiny Committee Annual Report 2025/26**

The purpose of the report was to receive the annual report for the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The report was introduced by Councillor Gina Blomefield, Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Chair thanked Democratic Services for their support in producing the report, noting the value added through scrutiny work, including 18 recommendations made to Cabinet over the past year, most of which were accepted or partially accepted. She thanked the Vice Chair and committee members for their contributions and flexibility in managing the workload with additional meetings. She expressed a view that Overview and Scrutiny would play an important role during Local Government Reorganisation. Councillor Michael Vann praised the work of the Chair and his comments were echoed by other members of the committee

### **OS.342 Updates from Gloucestershire County Council Scrutiny Committees**

Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Angus Jenkinson  
The report was presented to Members in his absence.

### **OS.343 Work Plan and Forward Plan**

Changes to report dates were highlighted.

**OS.344**      **Matters exempt from publication**

The Committee considered the exclusion of the press and public for the remaining item of business on the basis that it contained exempt information within the meaning of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. Upon being proposed and seconded the Committee voted to approve a resolution to exclude the press and public.

Recommendation:

Agreed to exclude the press and public for the remaining items of business in accordance with Regulation 11 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of Agenda Item 12 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 as per of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972

**OS.345**      **Exempt Annex for Agenda item 15: Asset Management - Out of District Investment Properties**

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

The report was introduced by Councillor Mike Evely, Leader of the Council and David Stanley, who highlighted the following:

- Government policy had changed to discourage or prevent councils from investing in commercial properties outside their own area.
- The properties had been purchased when interest rates and market conditions made commercial property investment more attractive.
- In hindsight, a more diversified investment strategy would have been preferable, rather than limiting investment to the retail sector.

Arising from members' questions, the following points were noted:

- The approval sought of Cabinet was only to test the market and understand buyer interest and value. There was no obligation to proceed with a sale.
- Annual net book valuations had been assessed as at 31 March 2026, and market appraisals had been undertaken within the last 18 months. Agents would be used to soft test the market.
- The recommendation was to actively market all three out-of-district properties with a view to disposal, and any acceptable offers would return to Cabinet/Council for a final decision.
- If eventually sold, the proceeds would become capital receipts, which could be used to help finance the Council's capital programme rather than day-to-day revenue spending.

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

01/June2026

- The properties were outside the district, and some Members felt there was little strategic benefit in retaining assets outside the Council's area simply to generate income.
- Local Government Reorganisation - If the properties were not sold before the new authority was established, decisions would transfer to the successor authority and might require additional consultation.

### Recommendations:

To support the recommendations in the report to Cabinet.

The Meeting commenced at 4.00 pm and closed at 6.11 pm