

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive Committee held at the Council Offices,  
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Wednesday, 23 November 2016 commencing  
at 2:00 pm**

## **Present:**

Chair  
Vice Chair

Councillor R J E Vines  
Councillor D J Waters

## **and Councillors:**

R E Allen, Mrs K J Berry, R A Bird, D M M Davies, M Dean, Mrs E J MacTiernan and J R Mason

### **EX.53 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

53.1 The evacuation procedure, as set out on the Agenda, was taken as read.

### **EX.54 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

54.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.

54.2 The following declarations were made:

| <b>Councillor</b>  | <b>Application No./Item</b>                    | <b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>   | <b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b> |
|--------------------|--|---|---|
| Mrs E J MacTiernan | Item 13 – Recruitment of Environmental Warden. | Is a Member of Northway Parish Council, which had considered this issue, but had not taken part in the discussions. | Would speak and vote.                           |
| J R Mason          | Item 13 – Recruitment of Environmental Warden. | Is Chair of Winchcombe Town Council, which had considered this issue, but had not been present for the discussions. | Would speak and vote.                           |

54.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

**EX.55 MINUTES**

- 55.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2016, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**EX.56 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- 56.1 There were no items from members of the public on this occasion.

**EX.57 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN**

- 57.1 Attention was drawn to the Committee's Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No.11-14. Members were asked to consider the Plan.

- 57.2 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the Committee's Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

**EX.58 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2017/18-2021/22**

- 58.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 15-40, set out the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2017/18-2021/22. Members were asked to consider the Strategy and recommend it to the Council for adoption.

- 58.2 The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the Strategy was a five year rolling forecast for the Council which was set against a backdrop of uncertainty. The government had, however, recently confirmed a four year funding deal for the authority which would help with its future financial planning and meant the figures contained within the Medium Term Financial Strategy for core government support were correct for the next three years which was helpful. In terms of some of the key points within the Strategy, he explained that the future funding for New Homes Bonus was still unknown at this stage but it was hoped that any reduction in years payable would be offset by an increased growth in house building. In terms of business rates, the Council had experienced losses in the last two years and, unfortunately, this was expected to continue; with this in mind the income target had been removed from the base budget for future years. It may be put back in at some point if the outlook improved. In addition, there had been no further announcements on scheme design or on the timetable in respect of 100% business rates retention. The growth elements of the Scheme were highlighted at Paragraph 7 of the report and included the cost of employees, in particular pension contributions which the actuary had recently confirmed would increase from an ongoing rate of 14.7% to 17.5%. Notwithstanding this, the annual contribution to the deficit would only increase by £50,000 instead of the £200,000 which had initially been forecast. Overall, the Council faced a £3.3 million shortfall in its budget over the next five years.

- 58.3 In respect of the Council Tax Strategy, confirmation had been received from the government that the current excessive Council Tax limits would remain in place for next year. This meant the Council could, if it so wished, increase its Council Tax by £5 or 2% whichever was higher. The Strategy was currently modelled on the £5 increase on a Band D property for the life of the Strategy which still left the Council in a position of being in the bottom quartile for Council Tax charges. In terms of the Business Transformation Strategy, the Head of Finance and Asset Management advised that it was essential that all elements were delivered to make £1.4 million savings; this meant pushing ahead with the Commercial Strategy, digitalisation, commercial viability etc. In terms of the Medium Term Financial Strategy reserve, it was felt this was vital to help guard the Council against the deficit which was faced;

the suggestion was that the reserve would be accumulated from New Homes Bonus, in-year savings etc.

58.4 During the discussion which ensued, a Member expressed some concern about the Council Tax Strategy and suggested some amendments to the wording to change the emphasis bearing in mind the uncertain future. Drawing attention to Paragraph 10.3, he felt it was important not to commit the Council to a £5 increase for every year of the Strategy and he proposed that, in order to ensure flexibility to be creative with financial management in the future, the Paragraph be amended to state that ‘...given the size of the deficit faced by the Council it is recommended that this strategy is continued **for 2017/18 recognising the likely need for further increases in future years**’. In addition, at Paragraph 10.5, he proposed that it be amended to read ‘...The proposed Council Tax for the next financial year of £109.36 is likely to be approximately £40 below the bottom quartile threshold and £60 below the national average for a District Council. ~~Projections of future increases to council tax will ensure the council remains within the bottom quartile for council tax charges and meet its priority to maintain a low council tax~~. He further proposed that Paragraph 1.1 be amended to read ‘...the level of savings and increased income that are likely to be needed. ~~to keep Council Tax affordable~~...’. The proposals were duly seconded.

58.5 In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management advised that, whilst the wording in the paragraphs could be changed, he would question whether the Member would also want the tables and forecasts that were contained within the Strategy to be amended. If the Member wanted the information to be recast he would need to indicate what that would be and where he saw the balance coming from. He did feel, however, that it should be borne in mind the document was refreshed annually and, as such, there was always an opportunity to change it should circumstances change. As a matter of course the Medium Term Financial Strategy was a document that changed constantly and the version before the Committee was only a snapshot in time. The Member indicated that there was no need to change the tables or forecasts as they offered a suitable projection for the future he merely wanted to ensure flexibility within the wording of the Strategy, should it be required. Another Member expressed the view that the Strategy showed the Council was thinking ahead and she could see no problem with it as it was.

58.6 Having considered the report, and amendments as discussed, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18-2021/22 be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL** for **ADOPTION**, subject to the following amendments which would add flexibility to the Strategy:

- Paragraph 1.1 – amend sentence to read ‘...the level of savings and increased income that are likely to be needed. ~~to keep Council Tax affordable~~...’
- Paragraph 10.3 – amend sentence to read ‘...given the size of the deficit faced by the Council it is recommended that this strategy is continued **for 2017/18 recognising the likely need for further increases in future years**’.
- Table 8 – amend heading to read ‘Impact of ~~proposed~~ charges per Council tax band’.
- Paragraph 10.5 – delete last sentence ‘~~Projections of~~

~~*future increases to council tax will ensure the council remains within the bottom quartile for council tax charges and meet its priority to maintain a low council tax.*~~

**EX.59 FINANCIAL UPDATE - QUARTER TWO 2016/17 PERFORMANCE AND HALF YEAR TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT**

- 59.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 41-61, highlighted the quarter two surplus of £186,421 on the revenue budget and detailed the expenditure to date against both the capital programme and the approved reserves. Members were asked to scrutinise the information provided; approve the use of the reported surplus to fund the one-off costs of the management restructure and to use the balance available to support the Medium Term Financial Strategy reserve; and to note the half year treasury management report.
- 59.2 The Head of Finance and Asset Management advised that the purpose of the report was to let Members know of significant variations to budgets for the current financial year; highlight any key issues; and advise of any action to be taken if required. Income was up in planning, licensing and on recycling credits etc. and the current £186,000 surplus was promising. However, there were some half year overspends on staffing and on the Ubico contract. There was also some concern expressed about the quarter three position since September which had seen a marked slowdown in planning income and, in addition, a number of business rates appeals were now starting to come through with the level of success, and subsequent reduction in rates, being well in excess of historic levels; if the current trend continued the Council was likely to be in a safety net position again.
- 59.3 A Member questioned whether agencies and consultants were assigned to supplies and services and, in response, was advised that they were attributed to employees' expenditure.
- 59.4 Accordingly, it was

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the financial performance information for the second quarter of 2016/17 be **NOTED**.
  2. That the use of the reported surplus to fund one-off costs of the management restructure be **APPROVED** with the balance being used to support the Medium Term Financial Strategy reserve.
  3. That the half year treasury management report be **NOTED**.

**EX.60 REVIEW OF TREE SAFETY MANAGEMENT POLICY**

- 60.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 62-72, attached an updated corporate Tree Safety Management Policy which Members were asked to approve.
- 60.2 Members were advised that, in 2012, the Tree Safety Management Policy had been introduced to guarantee the authority met its obligation to ensure the risk of falling trees and branches was minimised and managed. The authority had over 5,000 trees on land that it owned and leased and it had a duty of care to ensure

those trees were managed to reduce the risk to properties and the public. Previously the Council had struggled to resource the inspections required by the old Policy and, when the tree management responsibilities had transferred to the Asset Management section in 2015, it had been agreed that investment would be made in a GPS and software system which would accurately plot the trees within the Council's ownership and allow Officers to accurately monitor the findings and ensure the risks were mitigated. Since 2016, the Asset Team had visited Council owned sites across the Borough to ensure all trees had been scored with a scoring matrix which enabled the Team to give clear instructions with regard to the inspections to be completed by the contractor. It also allowed the inspections to be spread over one through to five years, depending on the risk matrix score, which made it easier to resource.

- 60.3 Members agreed that this was a good policy which was succinct and seemed to meet the Council's requirements. One Member questioned whether there was collaboration between Council departments and other organisations and another Member queried the position with regard to trees on private land. In response, the Asset Manager explained that landowners had responsibility to mitigate the risks of trees on their own land. In terms of working with partners, Members were advised that the authority worked closely with Ubico as it carried out the inspections for the Council. Officers also worked with the planning team in terms of areas of conservation and tree preservation orders. Referring to the Policy, a Member noted that the Inspector must be suitably qualified and she questioned how this was policed. In response, the Asset Manager indicated that they needed to have a horticultural knowledge of trees and understand the risks etc. There were two suitably qualified staff within Ubico and Officers had seen their qualifications.

- 60.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the updated Tree Safety Management Policy be **APPROVED**.

#### **EX.61 LEISURE CENTRE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

- 61.1 The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 73-76, provided details of a new Leisure Centre Strategic Partnership Board to which Members were asked to agree the Council's representation.

- 61.2 The Committee was advised that, in June 2016, Places for People Leisure Management had commenced its contract for the provision of leisure centre services on the Council's behalf. Within that contract it had been agreed that a user group would be formed which would be known as the Leisure Centre Strategic Partnership Board and would comprise Councillors, members of the Swimming Bath Trust, representatives from Places for People and Officers of the Council. The purpose of the Board would be to monitor service performance; to consider proposals for continuous service improvement; and to ensure the partnership was consistent with cooperative working.

- 61.3 Referring to the report before the Committee, a Member indicated that it seemed to suggest that meetings would be both twice a year and quarterly and she questioned which was correct. In response, the Asset Manager confirmed that the meetings would be quarterly in line with the suggestion from Places for People that this would be the most effective way forward.

- 61.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** 1. That the Lead Members for Finance and Asset Management and Health and Wellbeing be the

Member representatives on the Leisure Centre Strategic Partnership Board.

2. That the Head of Finance and Asset Management be authorised to nominate two Officer representatives to the Leisure Centre Strategic Partnership Board.

## **EX.62 SAFEGUARDING POLICY**

- 62.1 The report of the Interim Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 77-102, attached a revised Safeguarding Policy which the Committee was asked to approve.
- 62.2 The Interim Head of Community Services explained that the Council's original Safeguarding Children's Policy had been approved in 2013 and scheduled for review this year. That review had now been undertaken and had looked at the wider safeguarding responsibilities which the Council had under the Care Act 2014; those were reflected in the Policy before the Committee which now included the welfare of vulnerable adults as well as children. The role of the Council and its Officers in this respect was to gather information and report any safeguarding issues to the appropriate agency; the Council did not make any judgements in respect of safeguarding itself. The Interim Head of Community Services explained that the Council was also engaged with the monitoring of duties of the Gloucestershire Safeguarding Children's Board and was currently undertaking a Section 11 audit to ensure it was discharging its functions correctly by having regard to the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people. The results of that process would be reported to the Audit Committee in December and Internal Audit would be carrying out an audit of safeguarding in quarter four.
- 62.3 A Member congratulated Officers on a comprehensive and concise report which she felt effectively drew attention to the detail of what to do if a Member or Officer had a safeguarding issue. She hoped that everyone would read the policy to ensure they knew what the guidance was and was pleased that the document set out contact details by post rather than Officers names so everyone knew who they should speak to. There was one area that needed amendment and the Member explained that the document should refer to children, young people and vulnerable adults throughout; there were currently a number of places where 'vulnerable adults' was omitted and this would need to be changed before it was published.
- 62.4 In terms of the need to ensure all Members, as well as staff, were kept informed it was suggested that a link to some online training could be forwarded to Councillors as well as them being invited to the staff briefings which took place on the subject. A Member felt that this would be a good idea as it needed to be recognised that safeguarding was everyone's job not just the responsibility of the County Council. In response to a query regarding how well the Council worked with partner agencies within the Public Services Centre on this issue, the Chief Executive advised that, within the building, the relationships with the police and other agencies were superb and, given the seriousness of the issue, there was a focus on this across all partnerships. The policy was communicated to all partners and had been reviewed with County Council colleagues so it was considered consistently across the County; although it should be borne in mind that there were different versions of it depending on the particular function that each organisation had within the process.
- 62.5 It was felt that it would be helpful to provide all Members with an email and hard copy of the Policy and, accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the revised Safeguarding Policy be **APPROVED**, subject to amendments being made where necessary to refer to ‘children, young people and vulnerable adults’ rather than just ‘children and young people’; and that future amendments to the Policy be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive.

### **EX.63 WORK EXPERIENCE AND WORK PLACEMENT POLICY**

- 63.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 103-126, attached a Work Experience and Work Placement Policy for approval and adoption.
- 63.2 Members were advised that the Policy had been developed by drawing together all of the existing procedural arrangements and then expanded to include specific reference to groups which may experience significant barriers to employment; this was in addition to the existing arrangements for access to work experience for school leavers and undergraduate students. There was also reference made to the potential for paid work in exceptional circumstances and subject to budget. All requests would be considered on merit and the Council reserved the right not to agree to any requests if it did not have enough capacity; this would ensure it offered good quality work experience placements.
- 63.3 Referring to Paragraph 4.9 of the Policy, a Member questioned whether the Council had direct links with the armed forces to let it know when personnel were leaving and whether they had expressed an interest in local government. In response, the Committee was advised that the Council did not have an active programme in place but it had a good link with the armed forces through its Community Development team so that was a way to gain information when necessary. In response to a suggestion that the Council could get more involved with taking younger children away to learn various different skills, the HR Advisor indicated that she would look into this.
- 63.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the new Work Experience and Work Placement Policy be **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** with effect from 1 December 2016.

### **EX.64 RECRUITMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL WARDEN**

- 64.1 The report of the Interim Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 127-155, considered the involvement of the Council in proposing and leading on the formation of a partnership between the Borough and Town and Parish Councils to recruit an Environmental Warden for a three year period to help reduce incidences of dog fouling and related environmental issues. Members were asked to approve the recruitment of an Environmental Warden over a three year period, subject to cost neutrality and a satisfactory partnership agreement.
- 64.2 Members were advised that, in essence, the Council was looking at forming a partnership with the Parish and Town Councils. The offer from Tewkesbury Borough would be the line management of the Officer(s) undertaking the role of the Environmental Warden over and above the duties currently carried out by the

Council. Feedback had been received from nearly all of the Borough's Parish and Town Councils with 11 having shown an interest; 29 who did not wish to participate; seven who were still considering the matter; and three from which no response had been received – those three were all Parish Meetings so it was likely that they would not want to participate. The next step would be to create a formal partnership with the Parishes that wanted to be involved so a meeting would be set up early in December; the Warden would then be recruited in the New Year to commence their duties in the new financial year.

64.3 During the discussion which ensued, Members asked a number of questions relating to the powers available to local Councils in respect of the Environmental Warden; what the Warden could do to tackle someone that they saw dropping litter, letting their dog foul etc.; how many fixed penalty notices the Council had issued to date, how much a fixed penalty was and how they were paid; what the duties of the Warden would be; whether a Parish Council that did not sign up to the Scheme initially could enter the agreement at a later date; whether different Parishes could sign up on the basis of precept and/ or population or whether all had to sign up on the same basis; who would pay for the Personal Protective Equipment (PPE); whether a part-time Warden would be sufficient to meet the needs of Parishes; who would pay insurance costs for the post; and how monitoring would be undertaken to ensure Parishes were receiving the services that they paid for.

64.4 In response to the queries raised, the Environmental Health Manager explained that local Councils had a general duty to carry out activities and spend money in this area; the Borough Council had a corporate enforcement policy in place which he would pass on to any Members that so wished. In terms of fixed penalty notices, none had been issued in the last 12 months but in the last two years, two notices had been issued; the fine was usually up to £100 and in both instances the money had been collected. The Council also regularly wrote to dog owners who were suspected of allowing their dogs to foul and this would continue with input from the Warden about what they had seen whilst out in the Borough. The payment of fines was usually done via an invoice; in terms of any action taken, the offence of the notice was the non-payment of the fine so that would be the basis on which the Council would take Court action. There was good detailed guidance from the government on this issue so the Warden would receive training prior to being asked to issue any fixed penalty notices. In terms of duties, the Warden would look at flytipping, littering etc. as well as dog fouling – they could also concentrate on particular issues in specific areas if that was what the Parish required. Whether Parishes could join the Scheme at some point within the three year period was something that the partnership would need to determine; a number of Parishes had suggested they would like to see how the scheme worked before signing up so this was something that would need to be considered at the outset. Within the initial information that had been sent to Parishes, the Environmental Health Manager had tried to give an idea of what the contribution might be depending on the number of Councils that signed up which was why he had provided examples of payments based on population/precept. Once the partnership had confirmed what would be within the job description of the Warden it would go through a pay evaluation process to get a salary scale; for the purposes of the information contained in the current report the national average had been used. Once the job description and salary scale was agreed it would then be possible to look at the number of hours that each Parish wanted to assess what the hours of the postholder would need to be. It needed to be clear what each Parish was putting in and what they expected to gain to ensure the system was fair to all. In terms of PPE, the Council already had a substantial amount which could be used, however, if any needed to be purchased the cost would be shared between the partners. The insurance costs would be paid by the employing authority which would be the Borough Council.

64.5 The Environmental Health Manager indicated that, to date, all Parishes that had



responded had received a general response to say thank you for their comments and that they would be kept updated with how the project was proceeding. The discussions so far had made it clear that Tewkesbury Borough Council carried out a lot of activity in the enforcement area and the Warden would provide an additional level of service. In terms of protection for the Council, a Member indicated that he was pleased that the recommendation was subject to the project being cost neutral and that it required a partnership agreement. The Chief Executive provided assurance that the project would only go ahead if it was cost neutral. The scheme had been put forward in response to approaches from Parish Councils in the past and it aimed to work with Parishes on those issues which affected them greatly. Members agreed that enviro-crimes were a modern blight on the Council's streets and it was important that Councils used all of the tools available to them to combat the problems; it was felt that this could be a good answer to those issues.

64.6 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the recruitment of an Environmental Warden be **APPROVED** subject to it being cost neutral over the proposed three year appointment and a satisfactory partnership agreement being entered into.
2. That responsibility be delegated to the Head of Community Services, in consultation with the Lead Member for Clean and Green, to negotiate a partnership agreement with those Parish and Town Councils wishing to participate with that agreement including Terms of Reference.

**EX.65 COMMUNITY GRANTS CRITERIA**

65.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 156-168, outlined a revised criteria for the community grants scheme and Members were asked to approve the revisions for implementation in April 2017.

65.2 Members were advised that the current criteria was linked to the priorities in the Council Plan 2012-16. There was now a new Plan in place with new priorities that did not align with the current criteria and this offered the Council an opportunity to review its community grants process. Attention was drawn to Paragraph 2.2 of the report which set out a proposal as to how grants would be awarded. Instead of the current criteria, the Grants Working Group would be considering the evidence of need for a project along with whether the grant would positively influence the community by bringing communities together and becoming more socially sustainable; encouraging communities to be healthier and more active; encouraging the learning of new skills that would be used for community benefit; demonstrating the financial sustainability of the group and project; encouraging volunteering in the community; and improving and maintaining the community's environment. The maximum amounts awarded would remain the same and all other criteria such as minimum lease periods, payment timescales and application periods were also recommended to remain the same. Members were advised that, in order to allow a transition between the new and existing schemes, it was proposed that applications made under the existing criteria were honoured until March 2017 and that the new Scheme be introduced from April 2017.

65.3 Members of the Committee, who were also Members of the Grants Working Group, indicated that the proposals had been made in consultation with the Working Group in light of its experiences to date.

65.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That the new community grants criteria be **APPROVED** for implementation from April 2017.

**EX.66 PROPOSED EXPANSION TO THE COUNCIL'S VEHICLE FLEET**

- 66.1 It was noted that, as a Director of Ubico, the Chief Executive had declared an interest in this item of business and had left the meeting for its consideration.
- 66.2 The report of the Interim Head of Community Services, circulated separately at Pages No. 1-10, asked Members to consider a request from Ubico to expand the Council's proposed vehicle fleet outside the approved budgetary framework; the capital costs of the vehicle could be met within the approved budget but the revenue implications for crewing, running, maintaining and replacing an additional vehicle would be outside of the approved budget and would have an impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Members were asked to consider the proposed options available, as set out within the report, and to recommend to Council that the revenue budget be increased on an ongoing basis to fund Ubico's provision of a part-time driver and part-time loader to service its request for an additional refuse vehicle.
- 66.3 The Interim Head of Community Services explained that, latterly during the vehicle fleet procurement process, Ubico had undertaken round reviews to ensure operational effectiveness and compliance with health and safety regulations etc. During that process, it had come to light that an additional vehicle was required in order that long reversing manoeuvres in narrow lanes could be avoided, as could the use of the street cleansing vehicle to carry out such rounds which put pressure on that vehicle and crew to undertake both duties. Ubico had been trying to avoid the extra expenses associated with the provision of an additional vehicle but, ultimately, it had been decided that the purchase of a new vehicle with a part-time driver and loader was the most cost effective way to address the issues faced; the business case for this was set out at Appendix 1 to the report.
- 66.4 The reason for the urgency of the decision was that Ubico was currently in the midst of its route scheduling work and this was time sensitive as residents needed to be made aware of changes to collection rounds as soon as possible. In terms of revenue generation, there would be some spare capacity on the vehicle so it was suggested that there may be potential to generate revenue income of approximately £15,000 by hiring the vehicle out to other contracts; this had been deducted from the revenue costs to offset the full amount required to fund the expansion of the service, however, there was a risk that this target income may not be achieved as it relied on unquantifiable business opportunities and uncertain service demand which could therefore result in increased costs.
- 66.5 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned why the vehicle fleet was not purchased between all members of Ubico. In response, the Committee was advised that the new vehicle would be used for both refuse and recycling collection, as well as garden waste, if the residents in question qualified for that service. There were approximately 600 properties that would be served by the new vehicle and it was not currently known whether any of the partner authorities within Ubico had the same need for that size vehicle. The other partner authorities were also looking at rounds etc. but they would not be able to commit, in a timely fashion, to whether or not they would have a use for the new vehicle. In terms of there being one collection service for all Ubico partners, this was an aspiration for the Joint Waste Committee but not something that was likely to be implemented in the very near future. Health and Safety Executive guidance was that if long reversing manoeuvres could be avoided they should be and, as the rounds were being considered anyway, it was reasonably practicable to address this through the procurement of a new vehicle. In addition, the Borough Solicitor indicated that

the Council needed to grasp the health and safety issue and, as Ubico had done the assessment, it was reasonable for the Council to consider it. The Ubico Contract Manager explained that Tewkesbury Borough was the only authority within Ubico that did not have a vehicle of this size in its fleet and, whilst the reason for this was historical, now seemed to be a good time to address it.

- 66.6 Members generally agreed that the health and safety imperatives outweighed any issues around the purchase of the vehicle but also recognised that the report was asking for revenue for the crew for the vehicle rather than for capital to purchase the vehicle. It was also felt that, to allow a full and frank discussion about the issues at Council, it would be better if the item was considered in confidential business. Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED:** That, having considered the options contained within the report and Ubico's associated business case, it be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL** that the ongoing increase to the revenue budget to fund Ubico's provision of a part-time driver and part-time loader to service their request for an additional refuse collection vehicle (Option 5 within the Ubico Business Case) be **APPROVED**.

**EX.67 SEPARATE BUSINESS**

- 67.1 The Chair proposed, and it was

**RESOLVED** That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**EX.68 SEPARATE MINUTES**

- 68.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2016, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**EX.69 REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM STAFFING STRUCTURE**

*(Exempt – Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to any individual)*

- 69.1 Members considered the proposed staffing structure for the Development Management Team and made a recommendation to Council thereon.

**EX.70 COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME**

*(Exempt –Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 –Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))*

- 70.1 The Committee approved the Commercial Investment Strategy and agreed to set up a Member Commercial Property Investment Board. It also made recommendations to Council which sought to create a commercial property investment fund and allow it to move forward with asset purchases.

**EX.71 ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FURROWFIELD PARK, NEWTOWN, TEWKESBURY**

*(Exempt –Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 –Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))*

- 71.1 Members considered the acquisition of public open space at Furrowfield Park, Newtown, Tewkesbury. It was agreed that negotiations should move forward and a number of delegations were approved in order that this could happen.

**EX.72 ABBEY CARAVAN SITE, TEWKESBURY**

*(Exempt –Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 –Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))*

- 72.1 The Committee considered the report and agreed that the current lease be surrendered and a new option agreement be entered into on terms highlighted within the report.

The meeting closed at 5:15 pm