

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 19 September 2017 commencing at 6:00 pm

## Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor  
Deputy Mayor

Councillor H A E Turbyfield  
Councillor T A Spencer

## and Councillors:

R E Allen, P W Awford, K J Berry, R A Bird, R Bishop, G F Blackwell, G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, D M M Davies, J E Day, M Dean, R D East, A J Evans, D T Foyle, R Furolo, R E Garnham, P A Godwin, J Greening, R M Hatton, B C J Hesketh, S E Hillier-Richardson, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, H C McLain, A S Reece, V D Smith, Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, R J E Vines, D J Waters and P N Workman

## CL.40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

40.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M A Gore, A Hollaway and M J Williams.

## CL.41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

41.1 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.

41.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
G J Bocking	Item 7 – Petition – Land at Lincoln Green Lane, Tewkesbury.	Councillor works for a competitor.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the Chamber for the consideration of the item.
K J Cromwell	Item 7 – Petition – Land at Lincoln	Close family members of the	Would speak and vote.

Green Lane,  
Tewkesbury.

Councillor live on the  
Tewkesbury Park  
Estate and were  
members of the  
Residents'  
Association.

M G Sztymiak

Item 7 – Petition –  
Land at Lincoln  
Green Lane,  
Tewkesbury.

Councillor's daughter  
works for Aldi but not  
at the Tewkesbury  
store.

Would speak  
and vote.

41.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

#### **CL.42 MINUTES**

42.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

#### **CL.43 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

43.1 The evacuation procedure was advised to those present.

43.2 The Mayor welcomed Mrs Christine Laird to the meeting and advised that she would be presenting the petition at Item 7 on the Agenda.

43.3 The Mayor indicated that he had used his discretion to accept an item of urgent business. The item was entitled 'Local Development Scheme – Delegation' and the urgency related to the need to enable the Local Development Scheme to be updated to avoid any timetabling delay in respect of both the Joint Core Strategy and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan which needed to be in place before the next Council meeting and kept up-to-date at a frequency that did not match the scheduled meetings of the Council. The report would be considered at Agenda Item 11.

#### **CL.44 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

#### **CL.45 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

45.1 There were no Member questions on this occasion.

**CL.46 PETITION - LAND AT LINCOLN GREEN LANE, TEWKESBURY**

- 46.1 Members were advised that a petition had been received by the Council which asked it to reverse the decision of the Executive Committee to sell a parcel of land on the corner of Lincoln Green Lane to Aldi Stores Ltd. The petition had received 767 signatures which was in excess of the 100 signatures required to trigger a Council debate and was the reason the current report was before Members. The report of the Head of Finance and Asset Management, circulated at Pages No. 10-26, asked that the Council determine whether it supported the action requested in the petition to reverse the decision of Executive Committee to sell the land at the corner of Lincoln Green Lane, Tewkesbury to Aldi Stores Ltd; or whether to note the petition and proceed with the sale of the land.
- 46.2 The Mayor invited Christine Laird, speaking on behalf of the petition organiser, to make her presentation to the Council. Mrs Laird advised that, locally, people were extremely angry with the way in which the land sale had been pursued and they strongly disputed the accuracy of the information provided to Members believing the main driver for the sale to be money rather than public interest. For the last 40 years, residents on the Tewkesbury Park Estate had been repeatedly told that the land which formed the entrance to their estate could not be sold and that it had been specifically designed to create a rural entrance to an otherwise urban estate which reflected the rural nature of the town. Various requests to purchase the space had been turned down for that reason. Residents therefore believed the decision to sell to Aldi to be perverse as it defied all the urban planning arguments that the Council had previously relied upon. Mrs Laird advised that this was not just a piece of land with some trees on it but rather it was the entrance to where the petitioners lived; they used it, valued it and had always thought of it as being theirs. To suggest that the loss of the land could be compensated for missed the point as it would permanently change the appearance of the area and affect the residents' quality of life in the long term. Since the Aldi store had been built, air and noise pollution locally had got worse; so far the mature trees on the green space mitigated that because they were an effective sound and noise pollution barrier but removing so many trees would significantly increase noise and air pollution as well as changing the water table. It was suggested that the petitioners were directly and adversely affected by the sale and they believed they should have been consulted before it was announced. The Council claimed it was committed to meaningful community engagement but most people affected by the land sale had found out from an advert in their local newspaper which was not, in her view, meaningful consultation. The petitioners felt they had been treated as an irrelevance and they believed the Council's decision-making process to be unsound. Confusion was rife as to which organisation had first mooted the sale - residents were told it was Aldi but new information suggested it was the Council - and incorrect information appeared to have been given to the Executive Committee with the site plan being wrong in so far as the number of existing car park spaces shown was incorrect. In addition, the plan inferred only six trees would be removed to make way for the extension of the car park when in fact 14 would need to be removed; even with replanting, half the trees on the site would be lost and pollution levels would therefore worsen. Claims that the green space was not originally part of Tewkesbury Battlefield site were also incorrect according to information received from Historic England in July. It was felt that, if the sale proceeded, a full archaeological survey would have to be undertaken before any redevelopment was contemplated – this had a direct bearing on the sale and its financial implications but was not even mentioned in the report. No first-hand evidence of unmet demand for car parking had been compiled but lack of car parking was being used as the principle justification for the sale; Mrs Laird suggested that a decision taken in the absence of supporting evidence would be unwise. Residents had recently

arranged their own car parking survey which had shown that, even at its busiest, 14 spaces were usually available for shoppers. Mrs Laird advised that she had established, from a personal site inspection, that problems with parking occurred when Aldi received deliveries from its warehouse; vehicles struggled to enter the loading bay which inhibited the free flow of traffic into, and around, the car park and caused queues. Aldi was responsible for causing that problem and it seemed unfair to adversely affect residents as a result. Mrs Laird contended that decisions reliant on a public interest justification must be scrupulous in process and totally transparent and she felt this had not happened in this case.

- 46.3 The Mayor thanked Mrs Laird for the information provided and invited the Head of Finance and Asset Management to introduce the report. Members were advised that the details of the Council's Petition Scheme and the petition were set out from Pages No. 10-26 of the report. The petition statement was attached at Appendix B to the report for Members' information and, in summary, it objected to the Executive Committee's decision to sell the land due to the loss of public benefit; the increase in air and noise pollution; a lack of demand for additional car parking; the impact on the Tewkesbury Battlefield; and the impact on the water table. The Head of Finance and Asset Management drew attention to Paragraph 4.0 of the report which sought to address those issues along with some other points for Members to consider including the fact that the Council had previously been approached regarding the potential for a partial private sale to a local resident for the intended purpose of extending private garden space; those approaches were considered but rejected due to the intended private use. Where Officers felt the offer from Aldi differed was that the intended use still benefited the wider community through the parking provision. With particular reference to the petitioners' contention that the site was within the historic Battlefield site, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that a review of the Historic England website had shown that the current designated Battlefield Site (updated in March 2017) excluded the area of land in question along with the developed area of the Tewkesbury Park Estate, the Aldi store itself and a number of residential properties along Gloucester Road. In terms of car parking, the scheme design detailed an increase of 15 spaces, or 23%, which took the total provision to 79 spaces. In accordance with industry standards, a car park was at full capacity at 80% as 20% was required for circulation. In addition it was noted that, since the Executive Committee meeting, a Community Right to Bid had been received for the parcel of land.
- 46.4 The Mayor invited questions and confirmed that he would then allow 15 minutes for debate as required by the Petition Scheme. A Member referred to Paragraph 3.9 of the report and questioned where and when it would be decided whether any of the trees in question would be subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). In response, the Head of Development Services advised that TPOs were being considered; if they were made, an application to remove the trees would be required but that would be a separate decision outside of the Council meeting based on technical evidence. The decision on TPOs was delegated to Officers in consultation with local Members then, if appealed by the landowner, was considered by the Council's Tree Panel. Another Member questioned what the Community Right to Bid meant in practice. He understood that there would be six weeks to decide to bid but he questioned when that six week period would commence. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that, as the asset was now listed as one of value, if the Council agreed at the current meeting to sell it, the bid group would have six weeks from the decision to say whether it wanted to bid and it would then have six months to raise the funds to create a bid. This was a bidding process so it was not possible for Officers to say how much the bid from the community would need to be for. A Member expressed concern about some of the information in the report, particularly in terms of the statements that a "number of trees would be lost" and a "number would be replanted" he questioned

what the net loss/gain would be. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that there was a feasibility study ongoing so there were no specific figures available at this stage. If the scheme proceeded, it would go through the planning process so the details would be required at that time. Another Member expressed concern that the recommendation to sell conflicted with the Community Right to Bid and she felt the decision on the sale should be deferred for six months until the outcome was known. She was also of the view that the community was at a disadvantage in not knowing how much money it would need to raise. In response, she was advised that, if the Council decided to continue with the sale of the land, the Community Right to Bid process would be triggered automatically. The scheme was designed so the community raised what it could and then submitted that as a bid; it was up to the landowner to decide whether it would accept the bid. A Member was concerned whether the parking extension would require Aldi to submit an application for planning consent; whether the Council had robust enough policies around landscaping and design to ensure it did not just end up with a car park at the entrance to the estate; and whether an uplift clause would be inserted in the sale so that, if Aldi decided to move and the whole site was changed to residential, the Council would not lose out. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that Aldi would have to submit a planning application so landscaping designs would be required at that time and an uplift clause would be inserted so the Council would not lose out in the long term.

- 46.5 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that the Council note the petition and proceed with the sale of the land.
- 46.6 During the discussion which ensued, one of the local Ward Members commended the Residents' Association for its efforts in compiling the petition. She, along with the other Ward Member, had been approached with a number of objections prior to the consideration of the item by the Executive Committee and she had put those forward; however, it should be borne in mind that she represented all residents and she had also received some comments of support for the sale. In this case her own view was not to support the sale to Aldi for the reasons set out by the public speaker. In addition, she was concerned that, if Aldi moved out of Tewkesbury, the site would be left derelict, or sold to a different organisation, and would become an eyesore. She was of the view that all supermarkets had problems with parking at peak times and the addition of 15 spaces in this case would merely be a 'sticking plaster'.
- 46.7 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that the Council support the action requested in the petition to reverse the decision of the Executive Committee to sell the land at the corner of Lincoln Green Lane, Tewkesbury to Aldi Stores. In supporting the proposal, a Member expressed the view that money was not everything and the environment was equally important. When the Estate had been developed, the open space areas had been passed to the Council to be maintained as green space to be kept available for use by the residents. He felt the site was a good link to the town and that it would be a shame to lose what was undoubtedly an attractive area. Another Member reiterated that view and thanked Mrs Laird for her speech. He felt the Council had a responsibility to the people it served and, in this case, those people wanted to keep their area of public open space. The number of trees lost was not documented so Members could not specifically identify what would be lost or gained and air quality really was an issue that needed to be addressed. He had rarely queued to use the Aldi car park and had not noticed a capacity issue. It was felt by a few Members that there were no good reasons to support the sale of the land which was of value to the streetscene as well as being a benefit in terms of air quality. The money gained from the sale would provide a one-off boost to the Council's capital pot but the loss of the space would be mourned forever. In response, the Chair of the Executive Committee explained that the Committee had made its decision in good faith on the details

before it. The Council had financial difficulties and there was no doubting that the money gained from the sale could be put to good use. He felt the problems with parking at the store were well known and it was extremely dangerous when that spilled out onto Gloucester Road.

- 46.8 With the time for debate at an end, the Mayor invited the Borough Solicitor to remind Members what they were voting upon. A recorded vote was requested and, upon receiving the appropriate level of support, voting on the proposal to note the petition and proceed with the sale of the land was recorded as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>
K J Berry	R E Allen		G J Bocking
R A Bird	P W Awford		J H Evetts
R Bishop	K J Cromwell		M A Gore
G F Blackwell	A J Evans		A Hollaway
D M M Davies	D T Foyle		M J Williams
J E Day	P A Godwin		
M Dean	J Greening		
R D East	B C J Hesketh		
R Furolo	S E Hillier- Richardson		
R E Garnham	H C McLain		
R M Hatton	V D Smith		
E J MacTiernan	M G Sztymiak		
J R Mason	P N Workman		
A S Reece			
T A Spencer			
P E Stokes			
P D Surman			
H A E Turbyfield			
R J E Vines			
D J Waters			

- 46.9 With 20 votes in favour and 13 against, it was  
**RESOLVED** That the petition be noted and that the sale of the land proceed.

**CL.47 LEAD MEMBER PRESENTATION**

47.1 The Mayor invited Councillor Bird, Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion, to make his presentation.

47.2 The presentation covered the following key points:

- Team Structure – Economic Development Officer; Tourism Officer; Economic Development and Tourism Assistant; Visitor Information Centre Manager; and Community and Economic Development Manager. The team sat within Development Services under the Head of Development Services. Businesses and individuals drove economic growth and the role of Tewkesbury Borough in that was as an influencer to bring people together to help aid prosperity.
- Tewkesbury Borough Economy – the economy was vibrant and successful with local, national and global trading which the Council’s small team had to support. There were 43,000 jobs; unemployment was at 1% (approximately 500 people); the value of goods and services produced was £2.23 billion per year; there were 3,915 enterprises (including 3,445 micro-businesses); there was a strong business survival rate; annual tourism-related spend in the Borough was £125 million; and there were 1.8 million day visits to the Borough.
- Tourism – this was a major part of the local economy with an annual spend of £125 million in tourism related business. Marketing and promotion of the area was largely through Cotswold Tourism which helped to promote Tewkesbury Borough to the wider world; the most obvious attraction was Tewkesbury Abbey which had 250,000 visitors annually. Help was provided to businesses through marketing campaigns etc. and to run events such as the Medieval Festival. In addition, activities were organised in local areas when necessary e.g. when the Cycle Tour of Great Britain came through the Borough. The team also helped with visitor experience promotion such as the signage project and the Tourist Information Centres.
- Business Support – the team advised and helped businesses with expansion and relocation information – there was a real pressure and need for sites. Town centre support was vital as the local community of traders and businesses was growing so the development of local trading areas was important. In terms of funding, the team helped businesses understand what funds were available and how to obtain them. Regeneration was important and the team linked its economic expertise with local businesses to regenerate areas that needed it.
- The Growth Hub – this was a new and exciting development which was taking place in the Borough. The new Growth Hub would be opening its doors at the Public Services Centre in June 2018 and the Council was extremely fortunate to be hosting a Hub of its size; it was the only District in the County to be doing so. The original Hub was located at Oxstalls in Gloucester and, whilst the Hub in Tewkesbury would be slightly smaller, it would act in the same way. The capital for the project had been funded by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) as a one-stop-shop for business support and it would offer integrated delivery and a place for businesses to network, get help and find resources etc.
- Business Delegations – the Council had been working with ‘Join in China’ for some time now and it had hosted events that linked businesses in the Borough with their Chinese counterparts. This had been a highly successful approach with two delegations from different areas in China visiting recently. The arrangement was enabling businesses in the Borough to reach new markets which was exciting news.

- Business Grants – the Council offered three small but significant grants which, historically, were as a result of the recession period and an attempt to help businesses market themselves more effectively so they could grow and thrive. The grants had, over time, increased slightly in value and widened their scope so that they now covered anything that would promote the growth of a business rather than being focussed on marketing.
- LEADER Fund – this was a rural development programme for England which offered grants to support rural business growth. It was a European Union (EU) initiative which was operating across Tewkesbury and the Forest of Dean and was paid through the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA); it was a fairly bureaucratic process but was one that offered capital fund grants of £5,000 to £50,000 to help pump-prime new and innovative activities. The funds were managed by the Local Action Group which was coordinated through a Programme Manager. If Members knew of any businesses that were looking for funding and would qualify they should contact the Programme Manager who would be able to advise – the scheme had been in place for some time now and there was a need to get the message out there to ensure businesses were making the most of the funding available.
- Economic Development and Tourism Strategy 2017-21 – this sought to deliver prosperity for the future and had recently been approved by the Council. Economic prosperity improved the lives of residents and economic development was one of the key priorities in the Council Plan which saw Tewkesbury Borough aspiring to be the primary growth engine of Gloucestershire's economy; identifying and delivering employment land; maximising the growth potential of the M5 junctions; and regenerating Tewkesbury Town.
- Strategy – Driving Business Growth – the Council needed to be simple, clear and focused. The aim was to be helpful, but not restrictive, and relevant to the needs of business.
- Advantages - The Borough was fortunate in many ways as it had unique advantages such as available employment land; it sat beside a key motorway artery and in the middle of a motorway network; it had a main line railway connection and an important airport; it was the sixth most popular tourism destination in the Cotswolds; it was an established centre for high quality manufacturing/world class tech aero engineering; and it had a diverse economy. Gloucestershire airport was the eighth busiest airport in the UK and was becoming a huge driving force for business growth.
- Relevant to Business Needs - the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy had been fundamentally based on the work from Bruton Knowles and Amion Consulting which had included an employment land review, an economic assessment and a business survey.
- Strategic Priorities – the consultants had set out five key strategic priorities to facilitate and help economic development: employment land planning; transport infrastructure improvement; business growth support; promotion of Tewkesbury Borough; and employability, education and training.

47.3

The Mayor thanked the Lead Member for his informative presentation and invited questions from Members. A Member indicated that he had been alarmed recently when he had read something which suggested the airport may be closed; he felt it was important for the Council to ensure the airport not only remained open but actually flourished. In response, the Lead Member indicated that, when the Council's Economic Development and Tourism Strategy was being developed, everyone on the Working Group had been very concerned that transport links were

shown to be one of the most important factors in business growth. Members had seen the value of the airport in those aspirations. One of the Working Group meetings had been held at the airport and it had been quite illuminating to understand what it was involved in both locally and nationally. There were a number of senior business executives who flew into, and out of, the airport which was also something to bear in mind. In terms of the LEADER funding, a Member questioned how this would work when the UK left the EU. In response the Lead Member advised that the LEADER funding would cease anyway as it was time limited but it was not known what would happen in the future in terms of other EU funding and 'Brexit'.

- 47.4 A Member indicated how proud he was to be part of such an outward looking Council and he was pleased that Tewkesbury Borough set the right environment to enable businesses to go onto greater things; however, he wondered whether there was anything else that could be done. The Lead Member was delighted with what the Council did now but was also optimistic for the future that more could be done. Some economic events had already been held and the most recent one had been particularly successful with a lot of positive feedback received. In addition, a lot of good had come from the Chinese delegations which had visited the Borough over the past year and some local engineering companies had seen real benefits in terms of connections made; the Lead Member felt that if a twinning arrangement could be implemented this could be a very good thing. Another Member questioned whether the authority had learnt from Dyson which had set up a production unit alongside an engineering university. He felt that type of model may be suitable for an area like Tewkesbury Borough. The Member also suggested that the Council could go out of its way to encourage businesses that were leading the way, particularly those in growing industries and those that would trade outside of the EU. In terms of technical skills, the Lead Member indicated that helping to improve employability using training and education was one of the five strategic priorities so it was a focus for the Strategy. In terms of a focus on growing industries, the Lead Member expressed the view that this was difficult to achieve due to the limited resources of the Economic Development Team. The Chief Executive confirmed that the Strategy was very detailed and Members who were interested should ensure they read it. Almost by default there was a focus on certain aspects as those industries were currently operating within the Borough. As markets changed following Brexit there would be a need to open new markets and businesses needed some help with that – this would be another benefit of the Growth Hub.
- 47.5 During the discussion which ensued, a Member noted that, whilst all the hi-tech businesses and jobs were great for the economy, it should also be remembered that there was a skill set deficit in tradespeople which needed to be addressed. In response, the Lead Member explained that education and training referred to all employment and the Council did what it could to facilitate good outcomes across all sectors. The Chief Executive agreed with Members that it was sad that Basepoint had closed as it had been a really useful training centre in the Borough; however, the County Council was currently developing a skills strategy for Gloucestershire and he hoped Members would be able to influence that to ensure it covered the educational need for all areas of employment.
- 47.6 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED** That the presentation by the Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion be **NOTED**.

#### **CL.48 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

## Growth Hub

- 48.1 At its meeting on 30 August 2017, the Executive Committee had considered a report which provided further information on the Growth Hub and asked Members to provide delegated powers to the Deputy Chief Executive to approve and sign any agreements relevant to the expedient delivery of the Hub. The Executive Committee had recommended to Council that authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion, the Head of Finance and Asset Management and the Borough Solicitor, to implement the Growth Hub, including entering into appropriate arrangements.
- 48.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 27-31.
- 48.3 The recommendation was proposed by the Chair of the Executive Committee and subsequently seconded. In proposing the recommendation, the Chair explained that he had used the Growth Hub in Gloucester a while ago and he thoroughly recommended it as it was an extremely useful asset which would link the university with businesses and the Council.
- 48.4 A Member indicated that he was happy to support the Growth Hub but was concerned about the car parking situation at the Public Services Centre. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management advised that this issue was at the forefront of Officers' minds and the project team was currently working on capacity requirements to ensure there was sufficient space for Officers, Members and customers. The Management Team would be assessing that work and the outcomes would be taken to the Transform Working Group, and through the Committee cycle, as appropriate.
- 48.5 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED** That authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion, the Head of Finance and Asset Management and the Borough Solicitor, to implement the Growth Hub, including entering into appropriate agreements.

## CL.49 GOTHERINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 49.1 The report of the Planning Policy Officer, circulated at Pages No. 32-130, advised Members of the result of the referendum on the Gotherington Neighbourhood Development Plan and asked the Council to resolve that the Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Tewkesbury Borough as well as to delegate to the Head of Development Services, in agreement with the Parish Council acting as the Qualifying Body, the correction of any minor errors such as spelling, grammar, typographical or formatting errors that did not affect the substantive content of the plan.
- 49.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the Gotherington Neighbourhood Area had been designated by resolution of the Executive Committee on 4 September 2014. Following the submission of the Gotherington Neighbourhood Development Plan to Tewkesbury Borough Council it had been publicised and consulted upon between 12 September and 21 October 2016. The Council, with the agreement of the qualifying body, had appointed an Independent Examiner and that examination had concluded in April 2017. The examiner's report had recommended that, once modified, the Plan should proceed to a referendum and the area for the referendum should not extend beyond the Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan related. On 26 April 2017, the Executive Committee had agreed to take appropriate actions to progress the plan to a referendum on 20 July 2017. At the referendum,

the Plan had exceeded the required majority of 50% plus one vote cast with 93.10% of people voting doing so in favour of Tewkesbury Borough Council using the Neighbourhood Plan for Gotherington to help it determine planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area. Once 'made' the Plan would form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough and would be used to assist in determining planning applications in the designated area. Paragraph 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework stated that "where a planning application conflicts with a Neighbourhood Plan that has been brought into force, planning permission should not normally be granted".

49.3 During the brief discussion which ensued, a Member questioned how much planning weight the Plans actually carried. In response, the Head of Development Services reiterated that they were part of the statutory development plan and should be taken into account when considering planning applications.

49.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Gotherington Neighbourhood Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Tewkesbury Borough.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Development Services, in agreement with the Parish Council acting as the Qualifying Body, to correct any minor errors such as spelling, grammar and typographical or formatting errors that do not affect the content of the Plan.

**CL.50 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - DELEGATION**

50.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated separately at Pages No. 1-7, had been agreed as an urgent item in order to enable the local development scheme to be updated to avoid any timetabling delay in respect of both the Joint Core Strategy and Tewkesbury Borough Plan which needed to be in place before the next Council meeting and kept up-to-date at a frequency that did not match the scheduled meetings of the Council. Members were asked to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to update the local development scheme in respect of the timetabling of both the Joint Core Strategy and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan as may be required from time to time to reflect the progression of the Joint Core Strategy and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan.

50.2 The Head of Development Services explained that local planning authorities were required by law to prepare, publish and maintain a local development scheme which set out the timetable for preparing statutory development plan documents that formed the local plan. The Council's first local development scheme had been prepared in March 2005 and then revised in November 2009 and April 2013. It had been anticipated in the 2013 local development scheme, on information available at that time and looking for the shortest timescales possible, that the JCS would be submitted in August 2014 and adopted in December 2014. Whilst the JCS had been submitted for examination in November 2014 it had been in examination since that time with the hearings on the proposed main modifications having taken place in July 2017. On the basis that there would be no further hearings, and the Inspector would be moving to her final report, an updated local development scheme to incorporate the steps to date, and the anticipated date of adoption of the JCS, was required in order for statutory requirements in respect of the local development scheme to be met.

50.3 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

- That authority be delegated to the Executive Committee to update the local development scheme in respect of the

timetabling of both the Joint Core Strategy and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan as may be required from time to time to reflect the progression of the Joint Core Strategy and the Tewkesbury Borough Plan.

The meeting closed at 8:10 pm