

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 23 January 2018 commencing at 6:00 pm**

## **Present:**

The Worshipful the Mayor

Councillor H A E Turbyfield

## **and Councillors:**

R E Allen, P W Awford, K J Berry, R A Bird, G F Blackwell, G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, D M M Davies, J E Day, M Dean, R D East, J H Evetts, D T Foyle, R Furolo, R E Garnham, P A Godwin, M A Gore, J Greening, R M Hatton, S E Hillier-Richardson, A Hollaway, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, H C McLain, A S Reece, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, R J E Vines, D J Waters, M J Williams and P N Workman

## **CL.60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

60.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A J Evans, B C J Hesketh, T A Spencer (Deputy Mayor) and P E Stokes.

## **CL.61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

61.1 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.

61.2 There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

## **CL.62 MINUTES**

62.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

## **CL.63 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

63.1 The evacuation procedure, as set out on the Agenda, was advised to those present.

63.2 The Mayor introduced the Chair of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel along with the other Panel members who were in attendance – they were all present for Item 7 on the Agenda, Member Allowances Scheme 2018/19.

## **CL.64 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

## **CL.65 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

65.1 The following questions had been received from Councillor Graham Bocking to the

Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Elaine MacTiernan, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question:

Now that the Innsworth and Twigworth planning application appeals have been successful, primarily due to their inclusion in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and s106 has already been discussed and CIL is due to be at a reduced rate as they are JCS sites, how does this Council plan to fund and deliver the infrastructure highlighted as required in the JCS?

Answer:

As CIL was not yet in place, the contributions from the site to infrastructure would come from s106 arrangements that had been determined as part of the appeal decision and negotiated through the subsequent detailed reserved matters applications.

The Council would continue to work with infrastructure providers and funders, such as the GFirst LEP, Gloucestershire County Council and Highways England, to progress the development of infrastructure projects as necessary.

Question:

As this housing is to be built on appeal and it is possible that we will receive no new homes bonus on either site. Will the Council be putting a contingency plan in place to enable a smooth updating of its Medium Term Financial Strategy to compensate for this?

Answer:

The government had previously discussed proposals to potentially remove the eligibility for Councils to receive New Homes Bonus payments from schemes which had been granted planning permission at appeal; however, as yet, those proposals had not been implemented. Therefore the Council would receive New Homes Bonus payments from those sites.

Question:

As these plans were opposed as unsound on flooding grounds by the Council, what contingency plans have we put in place, and what funding have we put aside, to deal with the predicted flooding in the area?

Answer:

The Council's flood risk objections at the public inquiry were made on the basis that the outline applications had not demonstrated how the proposals would have an acceptable impact in terms of flood risk. The Council did not object to the principle of development on the sites which were, of course, included in the Joint Core Strategy. The Secretary of State accepted the advice of the Appeal Inspector who took a different view to the Council and considered that those were matters which could be dealt with by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions. Officers would work closely with the developers and the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that the sites would be developed in line with the aspirations contained in Policy SA1 of the Joint Core Strategy.

#### Innsworth and Twigworth Site specific detail question

Background and reasons to ask the questions:

There are two main problems with the Innsworth and Twigworth sites – traffic and flooding.

On the flooding issue, in the approved Minutes of Tewkesbury Borough Council on the 31/01/2017 section 95.13:

“Planning Policy Manager advised that the Innsworth and Twigworth sites were very much interlinked and the flood risk needed to be looked at as a whole through a detailed masterplan.”

In the JCS final Report 26 Oct 2017, sections 194-196, the Inspector says the lack of a masterplan is not a reason to not proceed with the JCS.

Question:

What is the current status of the masterplan for flood mitigation?

Answer:

There was no specific masterplan for flood mitigation. A masterplan, and details of flood risk management, were submitted by the developer as part of the planning applications for both the Innsworth and Twigworth sites.

In the appeal decision letters, the Secretary of State imposed conditions requiring further Site Wide Masterplan Documents for the two sites to be submitted to the Council either prior to, or alongside, the first application for approval of reserved matters on each site. In addition, the Secretary of State had imposed conditions stating that no development should commence until a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the entire site had been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Council. Officers would work closely with the developer and the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that the site was brought forward in an acceptable way in line with Policy SA1 of the JCS.

Question:

Who is writing the masterplan?

Answer:

The developer was responsible for producing the Site Wide Masterplan Document and detailed surface water drainage strategy required by the conditions imposed by the Secretary of State.

Question:

When will it be available for public scrutiny?

Answer:

The developer had three years in which to submit the first applications for reserved matters on each development. The Site Wide Masterplan Document had to be submitted either before, or alongside, those first reserved matters applications. The availability of those details would depend on when the developer decided to submit them to the Council.

Question:

What is the proposed total area of the raised platform?

Answer:

This would be determined during the reserved matters applications process.

Question:

What is the total capacity of all the SUDS?

Answer:

This would be determined during the reserved matters applications process and

through the surface water drainage strategy required by conditions 21 and 26 respectively of the Twigworth and Innsworth appeal decisions.

Question:

Can the Council give any indication on the proposed scale of house owners' 'flood mitigation/management' fee charges? And should the properties not sell, as the responsible authority, will the Council guarantee the flood mitigation management/maintenance is kept up to date?

Answer:

The scale of fee charges would be a matter between the developer/housebuilder and purchasers.

Conditions 21 and 26 respectively of the Twigworth and Innsworth appeal decisions required the developer to submit a detailed surface water drainage strategy which must provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. It would also include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

65.2 The following questions had been received from Councillor Mike Sztymiak to the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Ron Furolo, but were taken as read without discussion.

The government has given a commitment to the introduction of all electric cars by 2040. They have also incentivised the purchase and take up of electric vehicles and encouraged the introduction of public charging points. In Tewkesbury and other parts of the Borough it will not be possible for owners to use their private dwellings to charge these vehicles because they have to be parked on-street and this would mean trailing cables across pavements and roads. These people will be dependent on public charging points.

Question:

What has Tewkesbury done to facilitate the introduction of public charging points?

Answer:

The Borough Council had yet to facilitate the introduction of public charging points on its own assets.

The Tewkesbury Borough Plan would include guidance on the provision of charging points.

Question:

Does Tewkesbury Borough have any plans to introduce them on premises they own e.g. Gloucester Road Offices/Leisure Centre, car parks, etc.?

Answer:

The Asset Management Team's service plan for 2018/19 would contain a specific action to review vehicle charging points and conclude the viability of installation at a number of Council-owned assets. This was likely to be programmed for the second half of the year given other requirements for the team to progress.

Question:

What use has Tewkesbury Borough Council made of government grants available to local Councils to help provide public charging points?

Answer:

The Borough Council has yet to make use of government grants for the installation of vehicle charging points on its own assets. The review mentioned above would include consideration of government grants and other subsidised or free schemes.

- 65.3 The following question had been received from Councillor Mike Sztymiak to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Elaine MacTiernan, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question:

What planning policies encourage the installation of public charging points?

Answer:

There were no existing planning policies within the local plan for Tewkesbury that specifically related to public charging points. The JCS did have more general policies regarding sustainable transport and design; however, the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan would include more detailed guidance on the issue.

- 65.4 The following questions had been received from Councillor Mike Sztymiak to the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Julie Greening, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question:

How many foodbanks are operating in Tewkesbury Borough?

Answer:

Three official Foodbanks – Tewkesbury, Bishop's Cleeve and Winchcombe.

Question:

How many people are they supplying?

Answer:

See below.

Question:

Can I have this figure broken down into the number of families, adults and children that benefit from food banks?

Answer:

Tewkesbury

Figures for December 2017:

- Number of vouchers: 46
- Number of adults: 69
- Number of children: 45
- Total number: 114
- Number of meals: 1,026

Bishop's Cleeve

April 2015- March 2016

- 44 vouchers redeemed

- 181 people fed
- 85 adults
- 96 children

(6months only)

April 2016 - March 2017

- 101 vouchers redeemed
- 408 people fed
- 179 adults
- 229 children

April 2017 - 18 January 2018

- 91 vouchers redeemed
- 357 fed
- 157 adults
- 200 children

Winchcombe

April 2013 - March 2014

- 110 vouchers redeemed
- 437 people fed
- 173 adults
- 264 children

April 2014 - March 2015

- 104 vouchers redeemed
- 399 people fed
- 171 adults
- 228 children.

April 2015 - March 2016

- 100 vouchers redeemed
- 343 fed
- 145 adults
- 198 children

April 2016 - March 2017

- 53 vouchers redeemed
- 132 people fed

- 80 adults
- 52 children

April 2017 - 18 January 2018

- 33 vouchers redeemed
- 90 fed
- 47 adults
- 43 children

65.5 The Mayor invited supplementary questions and, in response, the following were asked:

Councillor Bocking – one of the main things highlighted in the production of a new Secondary School was S106 monies totalling approximately £5 million. Given that a new school could cost between £30-60 million, and that funding was not in the County Council's funding projections for the next five years, what other sources would the Borough Council look at to secure the required funding for a secondary school. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that the site had been won on appeal so the S106 agreement had been presented to the Council rather than negotiated by it. The Borough Council would now work with the County Council to provide a range of infrastructure including the school.

Councillor Bocking – in view of the government's consultation on New Homes Bonus funding, what contingency plans were the Council putting into place should New Homes Bonus not come through in 2019/20. In response, the Head of Development Services advised that, at this stage, the government had made no changes to the funding. In addition, as she understood it, any developments built following appeals that had already happened would still receive New Homes Bonus funding as they had been granted prior to any change.

Councillor Bocking – will the Council guarantee that any issues raised by its flooding expert in the Inquiry would be addressed. In response, the Head of Development Services advised that Officers at Tewkesbury Borough Council would work closely with the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure the site was developed appropriately and with as much flood mitigation as possible.

Councillor Bocking – who would monitor the Site Wide Master Plan document. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that the developer would be responsible for the Master Plan and, as the responsible local authority, the Borough Council would work with them and experts to ensure it was approved. The monitoring of it would be considered as part of the production of the Plan.

Councillor Sztymiak – how will Members be involved in the review of the provision of vehicle charging points. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that it was currently not known when the review would be undertaken but he would ensure Members were consulted at the appropriate time.

Councillor Sztymiak – Why was there no historical information available for Tewkesbury foodbank. The Head of Development Services indicated that she would respond in writing following the meeting as she needed to check if there was any more data available from the food bank.

## **CL.66 MEMBER ALLOWANCE SCHEME 2018/19**

66.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 14-28, attached the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel following its consideration of the Council's Member Allowances Scheme. The report set out

two proposed minor amendments made by the Panel which the Council was asked to consider when agreeing its Scheme of Allowances for 2018/19.

66.2 The Mayor invited the Chair of the Panel to address the Council. The Chair thanked Members for inviting him to the meeting and advised that the current Panel had been in place since 2014 and he had been Chair for much of that time. Since the Panel had been in operation it had spoken to around 30 Councillors and that information gathering had been invaluable in helping it to understand the hard work and level of commitment shown by Members to their local communities. The Panel had analysed a large amount of comparison data and had noted that, whilst Tewkesbury Borough Councillors had some of the highest Basic Allowances in the country, its Special Responsibility Allowances had previously been on the low side in comparison to others which was why increases had been recommended. Having reviewed current data, the Panel had taken the view that it would not be fair to cut the Basic Allowance but that the current level should be retained for 2018/19 and reviewed again for 2019/20. It had also felt that the Special Responsibility Allowances were now at a more comparable level and therefore should remain unchanged for the forthcoming year but reviewed again in 2019/20. There were two minor amendments to the wording of the Scheme which were proposed and could be found at Page No. 27 within the Panel's report. Those amendments were suggested to offer clarification and to ensure the Scheme was explicit in its definitions.

66.3 The Leader of the Council thanked the Panel members for their hard work in reaching the conclusions which had been placed before the Council and, accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel for the 2018/19 Scheme of Allowances be **AGREED** as follows:

- That the Scheme of Allowances for 2018/19 be unchanged from the 2017/18 Scheme except for the following two minor amendments:
  - Special Responsibility Allowances section to be amended so that, in Schedule 1 after Leader and Deputy Leader, a line be inserted to read '***(inclusive of Lead Member role)***'; and
  - Paragraph 2.1 of the Dependents' Care Scheme be amended to read "The maximum rate payable by way of reimbursement has been fixed at ~~£7.20~~ **£7.50** per hour, ~~in line with the living wage,~~ with no overall daily maximum. This will be reviewed on an annual basis. ~~This will remain unchanged for the period of the Scheme.~~

2. That Officers continue to make provision for increases in the Member Allowances budget within the Medium Term Financial Strategy in order that there should be flexibility to increase allowances if appropriate during the next annual review of the Scheme.

**CL.67 APPOINTMENT OF CIVIC HEADS FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR**

**Mayor**

67.1 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor Terry Spencer, be appointed Mayor for the



ensuing Municipal Year.

### **Deputy Mayor**

67.2 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

**RESOLVED** That Councillor Ruth Hatton be appointed as Deputy Mayor for the ensuing Municipal Year.

### **CL.68 LEAD MEMBER PRESENTATION**

68.1 The Mayor invited the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing, Councillor Julie Greening, to make her presentation to the Council.

68.2 The Council covered the following main points:

- Overview – Operational Housing and Homelessness; Future Developments in the Service; Warm and Well; and Community Development.
- Rehoused Households through Choice Based Lettings (CBL) – There had been 361 social housing allocations through CBL over the past 12 months. The lettings were predominantly into one and two bedroom properties and 88% of lettings were to Tewkesbury residents in emergency, urgent or significant housing need. In terms of the bandings, emergency: family to non-family; this was awarded to those under-occupying to free up family homes. Emergency: immediate medical/welfare needs; this was awarded for a health condition which required immediate rehousing on medical grounds – most likely to be when an applicant had a major incident, was in hospital or other emergency provision and was unable to return home. Gold: downsize – family to smaller family; this was offered to enable the best use of social housing stock and to assist households affected by the ‘bedroom tax’. Gold: full statutory homeless duty accepted; this was for households who had applied for homeless assistance and the authority had investigated their circumstances and agreed a full homeless duty to rehouse permanently. Gold: Major overcrowding; this banding occurred when a household was lacking two bedrooms in their current accommodation - one bedroom was required for an adult couple, a person aged 16 years or over, two children up to 16 years old of the same sex and two children aged up to ten years old of different sexes – so, potentially, this could apply to either a couple with three small children in one bedroom or three adults (not including a couple) in one bedroom. Gold: move on/ multi-agency/ succession; this was awarded when a move-on from supported accommodation was agreed by the local authority - there were two conditions, the supported accommodation provider had confirmed the resident was ready for independent living and the local authority had been involved in the move-on planning. Gold: left in occupation and succession; occurred when a tenant died but members of the family were still living within the home - most social housing tenancies had one right to succession which meant that the remaining adult within the property had the right to be granted the tenancy; however, if the property was too big or too small for the remaining family member(s), irrespective of whether they had a right to succession, they could be required to move to a more suitable property (normally from a family home to a flat as it was generally a middle aged child left in the property) - in those circumstances the remaining resident was awarded gold banding to prioritise their move and free up the property for a suitable household. Gold: prohibition notice – disrepair/overcrowding; occurred where an Environmental Health Officer had inspected the property and served a Prohibition Order on it prohibiting its use as a residential home - this may be because of disrepair or because it was not considered safe for someone to remain there if, for example, a

property had been let to a tenant above a fish and chip shop with no independent access and no fire escape. Gold: Urgent medical/welfare need; was awarded when there was an urgent medical need to move, for example, a person living in a top floor flat with uncontrolled epilepsy who may collapse on the stairs. Silver: homeless or threatened with homelessness; this was awarded to residents who were threatened with homelessness, for example a notice to quit, or to households who were homeless and were currently the subject of a homeless investigation or were homeless and the local authority did not have a statutory duty to them, for example if they were not vulnerable. Silver: overcrowded; this was awarded when a household lacked one bedroom in their current home. Silver: significant medical/welfare need; this was awarded when an applicant had a significant medical welfare/condition which would be alleviated by a move to more suitable accommodation - the most common reasons for this were severe depression and asthmatic conditions where the current property exacerbated the condition. Bronze: low housing need; this included adult children wanting to leave their parental home but had not been asked to leave as well as households who were struggling to meet their current rent but were on incomes which indicated they could afford the property.

- Current Housing Register for Social Housing by Housing Need – As of 28 December there were 1,886 applications for social housing within Tewkesbury Borough. During the autumn, Housing Services had contacted all the applicants who had not been active on the register and cancelled them which had reduced the applications from 2,000 to 200. The current figures were all actively seeking accommodation and over 51% of those households had a one bedroom need for accommodation. 1,218 (64%) of those were banded as 'Bronze' – low housing need and 51% had a one bedroom need. 668 (36%) had an emergency, urgent or significant housing need.
- Housing Options and Homelessness – This was the greatest area of change within the service. There continued to be a rise in the numbers of residents facing housing difficulty – possibly due to ongoing welfare reforms and the freeze on levels of benefit to private rented tenants. The focus on financial assistance and in-depth advice through housing options had continued to be successful in preventing homelessness. During 2016/17, the service had prevented homelessness in 187 households, which was twice the number than in 2014/15, and it was likely that this year it would assist approximately 200 households. Unfortunately, the number of households the service was unable to prevent becoming homeless was also likely to rise for a second year.
- Highlights of the Year – The 'Gold Standard' peer review, undertaken in June 2017, had scored 72%. Tewkesbury Borough was the only authority within Gloucestershire which had passed the peer review and it had now submitted its first 'challenge' associated with the bronze award – it was hoped it would receive this early in the New Year. The entrenched rough sleeper project had now been launched and was known as ACTion Glos. The project was funded by a Gloucestershire bid for social impact bond

funding and would assist the most difficult to house people in the county. The contract was additional to the Countywide Assertive Outreach Service funded by the District Councils, County Council and the Police Crime Commissioner which was also provided by P3. The Assertive Outreach Service made initial contact with the rough sleepers following streetlink identification and enabled them to access supported accommodation. In the event that the rough sleeper had multiple issues which were too high for the supported service to work with, they were referred to ACTion Glos. The project sought self-contained accommodation and properties that were suitable for pet owners, and then worked on the support issues. The Assertive Outreach Service also helped in administering the Countywide Severe Weather Protocol in periods of cold weather and linked those accessing short-term shelter to ongoing support. The Places of Safety Dispersed Refuge continued to house victims of violence in safe houses across the County and now had 12 properties supported by Gloucestershire Domestic Advisory Service (GDAS) available for victims of violence.

- Future Housing Options and Homelessness – The most significant challenges for the service were likely to be the Homelessness Reduction Act and the launch of Universal Credit in the Borough. Tewkesbury Borough had hosted the training for the County on the new legislation and had undertaken extensive research on the potential impact of welfare reform at an individual level in association with its partners in the Financial Inclusion Partnership through policy in practice. It was working with its partners in the Homeseeker Plus partnership to tailor the joint database to meet new legislative responsibilities and would continue to adapt its processes in preparation for the additional duties associated with the Act. The refreshed action plan associated with the overall Housing Strategy encompassed those developments as well as being a focus on resolving the need for local homeless temporary accommodation. This would become increasingly important as it was likely that the new legislation would involve longer placements during applications.
- Warm and Well Scheme – The Scheme was delivered across Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire and was managed on behalf of the authorities by Severn Wye Energy. Each authority contributed £20,000 a year for the next three years to the delivery of the scheme. The aims were achieved through raising public awareness of energy efficiency and availability of technical and financial support; provision of detailed energy advice by telephone and engagement at events; carrying out home visits to vulnerable customers; carrying out energy surveys and bespoke advice reports; confirming eligibility for grant and discount schemes; facilitating access to Grant and Access Schemes; and providing signposting and fuel poverty identification training to frontline staff. Tewkesbury Borough had the second highest spend and the third highest in the number of properties improved so the scheme had been very beneficial to its residents.
- Community Development – Health Improvement Context – Life expectancy was 7.5 years lower for men and 5.4 years lower for women in most deprived areas; 17% of children in Year Six were classified as obese (better than the England average); estimated levels of adult excess weight and diabetes were significantly worse than the England average; early death for all causes (men and women) was lower than the national average; hospital stays for alcohol related harm, tuberculosis, Sexually Transmitted

Infections, life expectancy and cancer mortality rate – all significantly better than the England average. Increased evidence of rising rates of loneliness and social isolation. Tewkesbury Borough was the most active district within Gloucestershire, with 72.6% of adults taking part in 150+ minutes of activity per week.

- Our Aims – Supporting the community to be healthier and more active; encourage healthy active lifestyles; and health framework (as agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2016).
- What We Do – Sports development e.g. setting up new sports clubs, the Park Run on the Vineyards, walking groups; initiatives e.g. the Aston Project in Brockworth and the summer sports camp which targeted young people at risk of Anti-Social Behaviour; facility improvements e.g. supporting local sports clubs in plans to improve their facilities; funding advice and assistance – the Community Grants Officer had sourced just over £1 million for community groups etc.; event support e.g. the Tour of Britain, Tewkesbury half marathon; Section 106 – ensuring new developments had appropriate sports, play and open space facilities; and the workplace charter which supported Borough Council staff.
- Some Recent Achievements – Tewkesbury Leisure Centre; the introduction of social prescribing (now the community wellbeing service); draft sports, social and open spaces study which provided detail of infrastructure requirements and standards for the future – this was being done in partnership with Cheltenham Borough Council and was managed by Sport England supported by the large scale infrastructure fund; support to community groups in the funding process e.g. Apperley Play Area, Deerhurst Archers and Crickley Flyers; secured new facilities in new developments e.g. Cold Pool Lane; and organisation of events such as the Tour of Britain and Tewkesbury half marathon.
- Future Initiatives – ‘Strengthening Local Communities’ in Prior’s Park – this was a community approach to improving health and was funded by the County Council. It was being run as a pilot project because the area had been identified as having a high number of GP appointments and it was felt residents needed support in understanding how to improve their lifestyles. Gloucestershire Moves – this was a County initiative to raise physical activity levels across the County and get Gloucestershire moving; it addressed all aspects of daily life including travel, education, work, home and leisure and was designed to get the inactive active. Working with the Strategic Needs Analysis team to understand which communities needed the most help in the Borough and for what purpose. Working with the new Community Wellbeing Service supporting those with short or long term health situations or who were facing challenges. Opening new sport and health provision, e.g. playing pitches, play areas and sports facilities, in new developments like Perrybrook, Longford, Hucclecote, Invista, Bishop’s Cleeve and Gotherington.

68.3 The Mayor thanked the Lead Member for her informative presentation and invited questions. A Member felt one thing to consider, in terms of facilities for new communities, was that when a Section 106 Agreement was signed a sum of money was agreed but often, when the time came to implement the facilities, the funding agreed was not enough and there did not seem to be a way to hold the developer to account. The developer argued they could not provide the facility at the specification agreed for the amount of money agreed and there seemed to be nothing the Council could do; the Member suggested this was something for

everyone to think about. Referring to the Council's website, a Member suggested that there should be a weblink to the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Board on the wellbeing pages so that people could download walks etc. He felt this would be very useful and undertook to speak to the ICT Manager to ensure it was actioned.

68.4 Referring to the banding for housing, a Member noted that, if there were one or two people who lived in a house which they owned, and then they sold that house and went onto the housing waiting list, they would go down the list as they were intentionally homeless; however, he questioned what would happen if those people had sold the house because they needed something larger for their family but they could not afford to buy a larger house. In response, the Head of Community Services advised that they would fit within the banding structure somewhere – this was one of the reasons that delivery of affordable housing was key to the Borough; they would not be in priority need but the Council would provide as much support to them as possible. By way of an update, the Head of Community Services confirmed that the Council had hit its affordable housing target to deliver 150 properties.

68.5 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED** That the Lead Member Presentation be **NOTED**.

#### **CL.69 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

##### **Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2018/19**

69.1 At its meeting on 3 January 2018, the Executive Committee had considered a report which set out a Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2018/19. The Executive Committee had recommended to Council that the Scheme be adopted.

69.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 29-32.

69.3 The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee proposed and seconded the recommendation and it was

**RESOLVED** That the Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2018/19 be **ADOPTED**.

#### **CL.70 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2018/19**

70.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 33-36, set out the proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2018/19. Members were asked to adopt the Schedule as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

70.2 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED** That the Schedule of Meetings for 2018/19, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED**.

#### **CL.71 ROYAL GARDEN PARTY**

71.1 It was

**RESOLVED** That Councillor Mel Gore and guest accompany the Mayor and Mayoress as the Council's nominees at the Royal Garden Party in May/June 2018.

71.2 It was agreed that Councillor John Evetts be nominated as a reserve to attend in the event that Councillor Gore should be unable to make the date.

**CL.72 NOTICE OF MOTION - CHELTENHAM A&E**

72.1 The Mayor referred to the Notice of Motion set out on the Agenda and indicated that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, it was necessary for the Council firstly to decide whether it wished to debate and determine the Motion at the evening's meeting, or whether it wished to refer the Motion, without debate, to a Committee for consideration with authority either to make a decision on the matter or to bring a recommendation back to Council. Upon being put to the vote, it was agreed that the Motion would be determined at the current meeting.

72.2 In light of a Motion approved by Cheltenham Borough Council, Councillor Hollaway proposed and Councillor Gore seconded that:

“This Council, mindful of the distress, concern and inconvenience to residents, that would ensue should the Cheltenham Accident and Emergency (A&E) Department close, opposes any proposed closure or downgrading of A&E facilities at the hospital. The Council recognises the high esteem in which residents hold the A&E Department and the staff who work there.

The Council calls upon the Trust to confirm that any proposals in relation to the future of Cheltenham's A&E Department will be the subject of wide consultation to include the Council and its residents.

In addition, the Council calls on the Member of Parliament for Tewkesbury to support the retention of a full range of A&E services at Cheltenham Hospital”

72.3 Upon being put to the vote, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** That the following Motion be **AGREED**:

“This Council, mindful of the distress, concern and inconvenience to residents, that would ensue should the Cheltenham Accident and Emergency (A&E) Department close, opposes any proposed closure or downgrading of A&E facilities at the hospital. The Council recognises the high esteem in which residents hold the A&E Department and the staff who work there.

The Council calls upon the Trust to confirm that any proposals in relation to the future of Cheltenham's A&E Department will be the subject of wide consultation to include the Council and its residents.

In addition, the Council calls on the Member of Parliament for Tewkesbury to support the retention of a full range of A&E services at Cheltenham Hospital”

**CL.73 SEPARATE BUSINESS**

73.1 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.

**CL.74 COMMERCIAL PROPERTY INVESTMENT UPDATE**

*(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))*

74.1

The Council received an update on its commercial property investments and agreed that a further sum be added to the capital programme to finance further purchases in line with the Commercial Investment Strategy. The Council also agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Finance and Asset Management to amend the Council's Treasury Strategy and Prudential Indicators to reflect the borrowing requirements of the Commercial Investment Strategy.

The meeting closed at 7:40 pm