

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 20 February 2018 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, 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, V D Smith, P E Stokes, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, D J Waters, M J Williams and P N Workman

## CL.75 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

75.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B C J Hesketh and R J E Vines.

## CL.76 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

76.1 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.

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

## CL.77 MINUTES

77.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2018, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor, subject to the following amendments:

- Minute No. 68.2 – bullet point 3 – ‘...which had reduced the applications from ~~2,000~~ **2,200** to ~~260~~ **2,000**’.
- Minute No. 68.2 – bullet point 12 – ‘...approach to improving health and was funded by the ~~County Council~~ **Clinical Commissioning Group**’.

## CL.78 ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

78.2 The Deputy Mayor expressed his thanks to the Council which, in his absence at the previous meeting, had nominated him as Mayor for 2018/19. He indicated that the nomination meant a lot to him and his wife and they looked forward to their Mayoral year.

**CL.79 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**CL.80 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

80.1 There were no Member questions on this occasion.

**CL.81 LEAD MEMBER PRESENTATION**

81.1 The Mayor invited the Lead Member for Organisational Development, Councillor Gill Blackwell, to make her presentation to the Council.

81.2 The presentation covered the following main points:

- Portfolio Remit – Business Transformation; Performance Management; Human Resources (HR) and Organisational Development; Overview and Scrutiny; and Health and Safety. Business transformation and performance management were about delivery whereas the rest of the portfolio areas were about supporting delivery. Overview and Scrutiny ensured there was challenge, accountability and transparency in how the Council did things; HR and organisational development ensured the Council had the right people, in the right place, at the right time to achieve its aims in a changing and complex world; and health and safety ensured everything the Council did was undertaken in a safe manner with an additional focus on staff wellbeing. The responsibility for this rested with both Members and Officers and, through the remit of the portfolio, the Lead Member gained assurance where necessary that the right frameworks, processes and monitoring arrangements were in place.
- Business Transformation – the programme, introduced in 2014, was overseen by the Transform Working Group. It looked at innovative and creative solutions and offered a strategic approach which was supported by five themes; partnerships, assets, technology, people and culture and commercialism. The programme had made significant savings of approximately £3 million to date. The Working Group saw Members and senior Officers working together to bridge the budget deficit which meant looking at things differently and creatively while, at the same time, delivering a balanced budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy. The business transformation programme was currently in its fourth year and it was fully expected that its success would continue – some of those successes included the commercial property investment strategy, the new garden waste system and the public service centre refurbishment. The range of projects on the programme cut across all Lead Member portfolios and, as the Lead Member for transformation, she was more than satisfied that the Council had the tools and ambition to build on its previous success and ensure that whatever it did was 'better for customers, better for business'.

- Performance Management – this monitored the Council Plan, service plans and staff appraisals. There was a robust regime for monitoring the Council's priorities. Similar to transformation, performance was cross-cutting as it affected each portfolio and each service. It was important that Members could act as a critical friend when it was identified that something was not performing as it should. There were a lot of actions within the Council Plan some of which were more complex than others but, overall, performance was something to be proud of and delivered value for money services. In terms of service performance, each service produced a high level service plan which was presented at Executive Committee and the actions within them formed part of the Lead Member briefings. Three services were currently under review, or about to commence the review process; Revenues and Benefits, Planning and Environmental Health. The Management Team had now enforced completion of staff appraisals which it was anticipated would ensure staff had the right tools to do their jobs and understand their roles in conjunction with the priorities of the Council.
- Overview and Scrutiny – Officers and Members were committed to ensuring maximum value of the Committee was achieved. The Committee had a varied work programme which covered key strategy monitoring such as Economic Development and Tourism and Housing and Homelessness; key action plans such as enviro-crimes and planning enforcement; and the performance of Ubico, and the Council generally, through the monitoring of the Council Plan. In addition, the Committee was just embarking on a scrutiny review of the recent water outages experienced in the Borough; this would fulfil the criteria within the Committee's Terms of Reference for it to be a Committee for the community.
- HR and Organisational Development – the Council was operating in challenging times and trying to do more for less so it was essential the workforce had the skills and competencies necessary to implement those new ways of working whether it be digitally or commercially. The Council had a committed and motivated workforce and working practices - such as flexible working, all staff working on one floor and having pride in their work - and their public service ethos helped towards this. Organisationally, across the board there was a good working relationship between Officers and Members which created a culture of 'getting things done'. There were numerous supporting mechanisms in place for staff development, whether that be the appraisal scheme, corporate training budget, flexible working, team meetings or the empowerment to think creatively. The HR team was currently working on a Workforce Development Strategy which would encapsulate this along with an action plan for further improvements. A new HR system would soon be implemented which would make life easier for the HR team as well as managers.
- Health and Safety – quarterly meetings of the Keep Safe, Stay Healthy Working Group were held and these were attended by the Lead Member. This was a corporate group which was represented by all services and received reports which covered all activities relating to the Council's health and safety environment; this included ensuring adequate monitoring arrangements for key contracts such as Ubico and the leisure centre as well as internal processes such as completion of risk assessments, workstation assessments and policy related issues. The group also focussed on staff wellbeing and, in 2017, the Council had sought accreditation through the Workforce Wellbeing Charter which was an opportunity for employers to demonstrate their commitment to the health and wellbeing of their workforce. In terms of health and safety, the Council had been accredited as 'excellent' and similarly was accredited as 'excellent' for its absence

management arrangements – overall it was scored highly across all categories and was awarded charter status. Even with this in mind, improvements were also made where necessary e.g. a new occupational road risk policy had been introduced.

81.3 The Mayor thanked the Lead Member for her informative presentation and invited Member questions. In response, a Member queried what the current trend was in terms of sickness absence levels amongst staff. The Chief Executive advised that the rates did go up and down quite a lot. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the figures on a quarterly basis and challenged Officers on them. One of the main issues for the Council was its size and the way that long-term sickness absence affected the figures; there were currently a number of staff off on long-term sickness absence so the figures were slightly increased. The Council had good HR procedures in place to ensure it supported staff and managed absences effectively but, as part of its review of performance information, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would shortly be undertaking a review of the sickness absence policy to see if it could be improved. With regard to the reference within the presentation that the Council had purchased a new HR system, a Member questioned how this would help staff. In response, he was advised that the system was not yet live but, when it was, it would streamline the HR processes and enable staff to self-serve in a more effective way which would be helpful to the HR team as well as making the systems more efficient.

81.4 Accordingly, it was

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

## **CL.82 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

### **2018/19 Budget**

- 82.1 At its meeting on 31 January 2018, the Executive Committee had considered a report which set out the proposed budget for 2018/19. The Executive Committee had recommended approval of a net budget of £8,732,790; a Band D Council Tax of £114.36, an increase of £5.00 per annum; the use of New Homes Bonus, as proposed in Paragraph 3.5; the Capital Programme, as proposed in Appendix A to the report; the Capital Prudential Indicators, as proposed in Appendix B to the report; the annual Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement, as contained in Appendix B to the report; the 2018/19 Treasury Management Strategy, as proposed in Appendix C to the report; the 2018/19 Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy, as proposed in Appendix D to the report; and that the Council's involvement in a 100% Retained Business Rates Pilot in Gloucestershire for 2018/19, as detailed in Appendix E to the report, be noted.
- 82.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 16-54.
- 82.3 The recommendation from the Executive Committee was proposed by the Chair of the Committee and seconded by the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management.
- 82.4 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned how much money was in the Council's planning reserve and whether that included the costs gained from appeals; why Ubico's costs had increased; and how much One Legal's case management system would cost the Council in total. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that he was unsure what was currently left in the reserve but would update the Member following the meeting – any costs that were gained from appeals went straight back into the reserve. In terms of Ubico, the pay offer had had a significant impact on the costs of employees but, in

addition, when the Council had looked at the budgets for Ubico, Officers had identified that it needed a longer season for garden waste and that it should have a budget in place for agency staff – it was those increased costs which had affected the budget and were the reason further money was required. It was not anticipated that costs would increase further over the year. In respect of One Legal, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that the total cost for the case management system was £240,000 but this was payable between Tewkesbury Borough, Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils so the payment was £80,000 each. As Tewkesbury Borough was the host Council for One Legal, it incurred all of the expenditure and reclaimed it from the other parties which was the reason the whole £240,000 was in the budget.

82.5 Referring to the proposed Council Tax levels, a Member questioned whether it would raise £169,295. She also queried whether the revenue reserve was currently £4.427 million. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed the amount to be raised through Council Tax and that the revenue reserve balance identified in the report was correct as at the time of writing; the exact balance would have changed slightly now but he would advise the Member of the amount following the meeting. The Member expressed the view that, with approximately £4 million in reserves, the Council should not be asking residents to pay more for their Council Tax in a time when finances were already a struggle and wages were not keeping up with inflation. She noted that the County Council was increasing its share of the Council Tax, to make greater contributions to social care, as was the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, and she felt the Borough Council should not add to that.

82.6 Having considered the comments made, and, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, voting on the proposal was recorded as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>
R E Allen	Mrs S E Hillier- Richardson		B C J Hesketh
P W Awford	M G Sztymiak		R J E Vines
K J Berry	P N Workman		
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			

J H Evetts

D T Foyle

R Furolo

R E Garnham

P A Godwin

M A Gore

J Greening

R M Hatton

A Hollaway

E J MacTiernan

J R Mason

H C McLain

A S Reece

V D Smith

T A Spencer

P E Stokes

P D Surman

H A E Turbyfield

D J Waters

M J Williams

82.7 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That a net budget of £8,732,790 be **APPROVED**.
2. That a Band D Council Tax of £114.36, an increase of £5.00 per annum, be **APPROVED**.
3. That the use of New Homes Bonus, as proposed in Paragraph 3.5 of the report, be **APPROVED**.
4. That the Capital Programme, as proposed in Appendix A to the report, be **APPROVED**.
5. That the Capital Prudential Indicators, as proposed in Appendix B to the report, be **APPROVED**.
6. That the annual Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement, as contained in Appendix B to the report, be **APPROVED**.

7. That the 2018/19 Treasury Management Strategy, as proposed in Appendix C to the report, be **APPROVED**.
8. That the 2018/19 Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy, as proposed in Appendix D to the report, be **APPROVED**.
9. That the Council's involvement in a 100% Retained Business Rates Pilot in Gloucestershire for 2018/19, as detailed in Appendix E to the report, be **NOTED**.

### **Council Tax - Empty Homes Premium**

- 82.8 At its meeting on 31 January 2018, the Executive Committee considered a report which set out the introduction of a proposed Council Tax - Empty Homes Premium. The Executive Committee had recommended to Council that a premium of 50% be implemented from 1 April 2018 in respect of properties that had been unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than two years; and that the detailed governance arrangements be implemented in consultation with the Lead Member.
- 82.9 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 55-58.
- 82.10 The recommendation from the Executive Committee was proposed by the Chair of the Committee and seconded by the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management.
- 82.11 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned whether someone would have to pay the premium if they were purchasing a property that had been empty for two years and which would need to remain empty for a further period before they could move in. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive confirmed there would be some discretion open to the Council and that type of example was something that could be decided in consultation with the Lead Member as recommended by the Executive Committee. There followed a discussion about what was meant by the phrase 'substantially unfurnished'. Members felt this was a rather 'woolly' term and, in response, the Deputy Chief Executive indicated that this was something upon which Officers would have to use their discretion as there was no definition for what was meant by a property being substantially unfurnished. However, the Council used fully trained assessors who would take into account all of the facts and evidence before making a decision as to whether or not the premium should be applied. In view of the fact that this appeared to be a subjective issue, a Member questioned whether there was a right of appeal. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive indicated that, as with any new policy, it would be subject to procedures and he would undertake to check what the appeals procedure might be. It was intended that a mailshot would be sent to any properties which would be affected by the premium to ensure the owners/landlords etc. were aware of the change.
- 82.12 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED** That, from 1 April 2018, a Council Tax Empty Homes Premium of 50% be implemented in respect of properties that have been unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than two years; and that the detailed governance arrangements be implemented in consultation with the Lead Member.

### **Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document Adoption**

- 82.13 At its meeting on 31 January 2018, the Executive Committee considered the Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document following consultation. The Executive Committee had recommended to Council that it be adopted.
- 82.14 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 59-136.
- 82.15 The recommendation from the Executive Committee was proposed by the Chair of the Committee and seconded by the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management.
- 82.16 During the discussion which ensued, a number of Members thanked Officers for the work that had gone into the document. They felt it was long awaited and that, if adopted, it would be extremely helpful going forward. Whilst he was of the view that it was a good document, a Member questioned whether surface water drainage could be considered and monitored carefully throughout the construction phase as well as prior to the commencement of a scheme. In response, the Lead Member, and Chair of the Flood Risk Management Group, indicated that she felt this would be a sensible addition. In offering clarification, the Borough Solicitor advised that this could be included in addition to the document as an aspiration/reminder but it could not be an additional requirement within the document unless it was sent back out for consultation. Members generally agreed that the document should be adopted as soon as possible and therefore flagging the issue up as an aspiration was the correct way forward. One Member expressed the view that it was a fantastic document and he would like to see the other five Districts in Gloucestershire adopting something similar. He indicated that a lot of the background work had been undertaken by people who had been flooded previously and he suggested that all Members read the document in detail as it provided good guidance on development in and around the flood plain.
- 82.17 A Member queried what happened after a development had been passed to a management company and whether the Council had any powers to monitor or enforce once the transfer had taken place. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive referred to Page No. 115, Paragraph 6.15.1, and explained that the Supplementary Planning Document would be part of the planning process; the powers in relation to planning and environmental health provided a suite of measures that could be taken into account when management issues regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) arose. In response to a query regarding road surface levels, the Deputy Chief Executive indicated that it would be possible to flag up as an aspiration that, when integrating the street network with SUDS, the level of the road in connection with the housing should be taken into account.
- 82.18 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED**
1. That the Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED**.
  2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Development Services to make any necessary minor amendments to the Supplementary Planning Document, as considered appropriate, prior to it being published.



3. That it be flagged up as an aspiration/reminder that surface water drainage should be considered and monitored carefully throughout the construction phase, as well as prior to the commencement of a scheme; and that, when integrating the street network with SUDS, the level of the road in connection with the housing should be taken into account.

### **CL.83 HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND, ASHCHURCH**

- 83.1 The report of the Deputy Chief Executive, circulated at Pages No. 137-145, set out information about funding which had been awarded to the Council from the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). Members were asked to note the award of the funding to support the delivery of a bridge over the railway at Ashchurch to facilitate housing delivery; to note that Officers would continue to work to develop a delivery project in relation to the bridge and related development, in discussion with the relevant stakeholders including Network Rail, Gloucestershire County Council, landowners and developers; and to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to make all necessary decisions with regard to the government funding and to receive further status reports as the project progressed.
- 83.2 Members were advised that the HIF had been launched by the government in July 2017 to support housing delivery through the funding of vital physical infrastructure e.g. roads and bridges, with the opportunity to unlock 100,000 homes nationally. The fund was split into two key areas: forward funding – for larger schemes up to £250 million; and marginal funding – schemes up to £10 million. To support the delivery of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) housing numbers, Tewkesbury Borough Council had entered a number of bids including a marginal funding bid to help deliver a bridge over the railway line at Ashchurch to support the development of the wider Ashchurch area. A further bid under the forward funding section, for the M5 J9 improvements and A46 off-line, had also been submitted but the results of that had not yet been announced. The award of the bid was for £8,132,465 and was based on unlocking development potential in the area for the delivery of 826 homes. This had been a highly competitive process and it was to be commended that the bid which Officers had put together had won the funding.
- 83.3 As part of the evidence gathering for the development strategy, transport planning modelling had taken place and this had reviewed various options of how housing growth could be delivered within the area. This work had tested the concept of a new bridge over the railway and the outputs indicated that, without such a new access point, development capacity would be severely restricted. At this stage it was not known where the bridge would go; the bid had not required specifics in terms of details or location so there was now a lot of work to do to deliver by 2021. Initial discussions had taken place with Network Rail which was supportive of the project, not least because it had a preference to close or alter the existing Northway level crossing due to safety concerns. Further conversations would need to be undertaken with Network Rail and other partners such as the Local Enterprise Partnership, Highways England, County Highways etc. in order to progress the project. In summary, the Deputy Chief Executive indicated that there were many unknowns at this stage and a detailed project brief would be required but the main purpose of the report currently before the Council was to make Members aware that the funding had been received. The Executive Committee would receive a report setting out how the project would work and to approve the setting up of a Working Group to take it forward. Any decisions required would be submitted to the Council except those delegated to the Executive Committee. In addition, the J9 Area Member Reference Panel would receive regular progress

updates and a detailed communications plan would be put together so that all parties involved were kept fully apprised of the project.

- 83.4 In proposing the recommendation on the paper, a Member expressed the view that the Council had been lucky to win the bid which gave it a fantastic opportunity that it might not otherwise have had. It was understood that the details were currently fairly sparse in what would happen moving forward but the most important thing would be the full involvement of Members throughout the process and he felt the proposal before the Council was the most appropriate and effective way to continue. He also felt that delegation to the Executive Committee, with updates to the J9 Area Member Reference Panel, would ensure Members were fully informed. In seconding the proposal, a Member felt it was great to see the government investing in the Borough in this way and he thanked Officers for the hard work that had gone into the bid at very short notice. He felt it was a great achievement and asked Members to get behind the project so that Officers could move on and start to deliver.
- 83.5 During the discussion which ensued, a Member expressed the view that, whilst it was great to see the Council winning a bid for such an amount of money, he questioned what would happen to the surrounding roads. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that the project for which the HIF money had been won was not a substitute for the larger issues on the A46. Another Member questioned whether the Council would still be robust with developers and landowners to ensure they continued to contribute towards Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy as they still had obligations which they must adhere to. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that the Council would continue to be robust in that respect. In response to a further query regarding consultation, the Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that there would be a number of strands coming out of the project and a large part of that would be the communications strategy which residents would be integral to.
- 83.6 Referring to the fact that the funding was to ensure vital physical infrastructure was in place to unlock the development at Ashchurch, a Member expressed particular concern about the link road between Twigworth and Innsworth and questioned whether development in that area would need to be put on hold until the vital physical infrastructure was in place. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that the funding bid being discussed at the current meeting was purely for Ashchurch; the funding bids for Twigworth and Innsworth were completely separate. In addition, Members were advised that, at the same time as the bid for HIF monies had been made, a second bid had been submitted for the Innsworth/Twigworth link road but this had not been successful; the Council had been advised that further information on that funding process may be provided in the Chancellor's Autumn Statement. The Deputy Chief Executive undertook to discuss the Member's particular concerns in that regard following the meeting.
- 83.7 Concern was expressed that the details of the funding seemed to imply the Council would need to have built the bridge by 2021 and it was considered this was extremely soon given the work which needed to be done to get to that point. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive indicated that 2021 was the date given by the government but he needed to have a conversation with the Homes and Communities Agency to understand exactly what was expected at that point. At this stage he was assuming the project would need to be delivered by 2021; it was a complex issue and there may be room for manoeuvre but at this stage he was unsure.

83.8 A Member indicated that, ever since he had seen the first press release about the funding he had thought it was good that the Council was able to attract that kind of money from the government; however, now that he understood the funding was linked to a bridge over the railway line he was unsure how that would unlock housing. He was of the view that, wherever a bridge was built in that area, it would cause traffic chaos in Northway. He felt there was no way it would work unless the funding was instead used for a link to the A46 to try and solve some of the issues which were already experienced on that road. Accordingly, he proposed, and it was seconded, that the Council note the funding award of £8,132,465 to support a link to the A46 for facilitating housing delivery; that Officers continue to work to develop a delivery project in relation to the link to the A46 and related development, in discussion with the relevant stakeholders including Network Rail, Gloucestershire County Council, landowners and developers; and to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to make all necessary decisions with regard to the government funding of £8,132,465 and to receive further status reports as the project progresses. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the HIF funding was specifically to provide an infrastructure connection to unlock the site for development and therefore its purpose was not up for discussion/amendment. He also reminded Members that the funding was not meant to provide infrastructure which would be a substitute for an A46 offline solution – no one would suggest this was a perfect solution to the traffic issues in the area on its own but it would go some way in helping enable the development which was planned. The Chief Executive indicated that, in effect, the proposal would refuse the funding that the Council had been offered. The seconder of the motion expressed his disappointment that the Council would not be able to change the way the funding was spent as it seemed ludicrous to build a bridge that would serve only to cause more traffic chaos. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive reiterated that indicative modelling had been undertaken as part of the bid and that had suggested there was capacity to free up some of the development sites in the area with a bridge; this was the reason the funding had been awarded. Officers were fully aware of the traffic issues on the A46 but this particular bid was not seeking to address that. A Member expressed concern that the Council seemed to be on the verge of giving the funding back and he felt that would be a huge mistake; he was of the view that the funding was there and should be used. In addition, another Member indicated that the A46 Partnership was looking for an off-line solution to the problems with the A46 so this was not something to be addressed with the HIF money currently under discussion. He also pointed out that the bridge could not be built by the Borough Council alone and that it would need all of its partners to work with it. He felt the conversations needed to be had with stakeholders before Officers would know whether it was possible to build the bridge and its cost; if it was found to be unfeasible then Officers would have to look at the issue again but the work needed to be done in the first instance to understand if there were issues and what they were.

83.9 Following advice from the Borough Solicitor, the proposer of the motion indicated that, as it was not possible to change what the funding was for, he would instead propose that recommendations 1 and 2 on the report be noted and that 3 be amended “that the Council go back to the government with a request that the funding be reviewed and that the grant be reassigned so that it could be used to support a link to the A46”. Upon being seconded, and voted upon, the proposal was lost. Accordingly, the recommendation on the papers, duly proposed and seconded, was put to the vote and it was

**RESOLVED** 1. That the funding award of £8,132,465 to support the delivery of a bridge over the railway at Ashchurch to facilitate housing delivery be **NOTED**.

2. That Officers continue to work to develop a delivery project in relation to the bridge and related development, in discussion with the relevant stakeholders including Network Rail, Gloucestershire County Council, landowners and developers.
3. That authority be delegated to the Executive Committee to make all necessary decisions with regard to the government funding of £8,132,465 and to receive further status reports as the project progressed.

**CL.84 COUNCIL TAX 2018/19**

84.1 Having agreed the Council's 2018/19 budget earlier in the meeting, attention was drawn to a report, circulated separately, which asked Members to approve and set a Council Tax requirement for 2018/19.

84.2 In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, voting was recorded as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>
R E Allen	M G Sztymiak		B C J Hesketh
P W Awford			Mrs S E Hillier- Richardson
K J Berry			R J E Vines
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			
J H Evetts			
D T Foyle			
R Furolo			
R E Garnham			

P A Godwin

M A Gore

J Greening

R M Hatton

A Hollaway

E J MacTiernan

J R Mason

H C McLain

A S Reece

V D Smith

T A Spencer

P E Stokes

P D Surman

H A E Turbyfield

D J Waters

M J Williams

P N Workman

84.3 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That it be **NOTED** that, on 1 December 2017, the Council calculated:
  - a) the Council Tax Base 2018/19 for the whole Council area as £33,858.60 (Item T in the formula in section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")) and,
  - b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as attached to the report at Appendix C.
2. That the Council Tax requirement calculated for the Council's own purposes for 2018/19 (excluding Parish precepts) is £3,872,070.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Act:
  - a. £40,979,732 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils;
  - b. £35,169,300 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;

- c. £5,810,432 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act);
  - d. £171.61 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T(1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts);
  - e. £1,938,362 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per Appendix C to the report);
  - f. £114.36 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T(1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates;
  - g. the amounts stated in Column 5 (Band D Parish/Town and Borough b)) of Appendix B to the report are given by adding to the amount at 3(f) above the amounts of special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area specified in Column 1 of Appendix B in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act. For completeness the table shows all areas; and
  - h. the amount set out in Appendix B to the report given by multiplying the amounts at 3(g) above by the number which, in proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular Valuation Band divided by the number which, in that proportion, is applicable to dwellings listed in Valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different Valuation Bands.
4. That it be **NOTED** that, for the year 2018/19, Gloucestershire County Council and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Borough Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Bands	Gloucestershire County Council £			Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire £
	ASC	General	Total	
A	45.39	776.08	821.47	150.99
B	52.95	905.44	958.39	176.16
C	60.52	1,034.78	1,095.30	201.32
D	68.08	1,164.13	1,232.21	226.49
E	83.21	1,422.82	1,506.03	276.82
F	98.34	1,681.52	1,779.86	327.15
G	113.47	1,940.21	2,053.68	377.48
H	136.16	2,328.26	2,464.42	452.98

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(h) and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts, set out in Appendix B to the report, as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2018/2019 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in Schedule 3.
6. The Council has determined that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2018/19 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. As the billing authority, the Council has not been notified by a major precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2018/19 is excessive and that the billing authority is not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
7. In respect of properties within Class A and Class B, as defined by the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (furnished chargeable dwellings that are not the sole or main residence of an individual), the discount provided by Section 11A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 shall be reduced to zero.
8. In respect of properties within Class C, as defined by the Council (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (a property that is unoccupied and substantially unfurnished), the discount provided by Section 11A of the said Act shall be 100% for a period of one month then 25% for the following five months.
9. In respect of properties within Class D, as defined by the Council (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (chargeable dwellings that are vacant and undergoing major repair work to render them habitable), the discount provided by Section 11A of the said Act shall be subject to a discount of 25% for a maximum period of 12 months.

**CL.85 SEPARATE BUSINESS**

85.1 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.86 SEPARATE MINUTES**

86.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2018, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

The meeting closed at 7:55 pm