

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 22 October 2019 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor K J Cromwell
Councillor J W Murphy

and Councillors:

C L J Carter, P A Godwin, H S Munro, R J G Smith, P D Surman, M J Williams, P N Workman
and M L Jordan (Substitute for P W Ockelton)

OS.46 ANNOUNCEMENTS

46.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.

OS.47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

47.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G J Bocking, H C McLain, P D McLain, P W Ockelton and J K Smith. Councillor M L Jordan would be acting as a substitute for the meeting.

OS.48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

48.1 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.

48.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

OS.49 MINUTES

49.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

OS.50 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

50.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 20-24. Members were asked to determine whether there were any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could give to the work contained within the plan.

50.2 The Head of Corporate Services advised that the Council Plan 2016-20 refresh was due to be taken to the Executive Committee meeting on 8 April 2020 but this would now be brought forward to the meeting on 8 January 2020 in order for the Council Plan to be approved prior to the peer review challenge which was taking place during the first week in March 2020. In addition, the Deputy Chief Executive

confirmed that the special Executive Committee meeting due to be held on 4 November 2019, to consider approval of the West Cheltenham Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document for consultation, had been cancelled; it was now intended that this would be considered at the normal meeting on 27 November 2019 which would be in line with Cheltenham Borough Council.

50.3 It was

RESOLVED That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.51 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20

51.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20, circulated at Pages No. 25-34, which Members were asked to consider.

51.2 With regard to the pending items section of the Work Programme, set out at Page No. 33 of the report, the Head of Corporate Services advised that the Communications Strategy would now be taken to the meeting on 3 December 2019 and the presentation on the Growth Hub and Gloucestershire First Local Enterprise Partnership (GFirst LEP) would be taken to the meeting on 14 January 2020. It was further noted that the Flood Risk Management Group Report - which was received on an annual basis by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in order for Members to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee as to whether there was a continuing role for the Group and was currently scheduled for the meeting on 10 March 2020 - would be removed from the Work Programme as this had been superseded by the Council decision to expand the remit of the existing Flood Risk Management Group to deal with climate change matters. It was noted that the Group was due to report to Council by its meeting on 21 April 2020 with a detailed action plan for delivery.

51.3 With regard to the Parking Strategy Review items which were due to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meetings on 14 January and 10 March 2020, the Deputy Chief Executive advised that it was more appropriate for the Head of Finance and Asset Management to be the Lead Officer, rather than the Head of Development Services, and the Work Programme would be updated accordingly.

51.4 It was

RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Plan 2019/20 be **NOTED**, subject to the following amendments:

- Communications Strategy to be moved from Pending Items to the meeting on 3 December 2019;
- Presentation from the Growth Hub and GFirst LEP to be moved from Pending Items to the meeting on 14 January 2020;
- Flood Risk Management Group Report to be removed from the Work Programme on 10 March 2020; and
- Parking Strategy Review items on 14 January 2020 and 10 March 2020 to be amended to show the Head of Finance and Asset Management as the Lead Officer rather than the Head of Development Services.

OS.52 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- 52.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 35-49, which provided an update on progress made against the Development Services Review Action Plan. Members were asked to consider the report and to note that the remaining actions would all be completed by March 2020 and, should that not be the case, a further report would be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 52.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the Development Services Review was approved by Council on 25 April 2018 and was supported by an action plan to help improve the service. The action plan had contained 76 actions at the time of approval but considerable progress had been made and, of those, all but 13 had been completed; the report provided an update on the outstanding actions. Members were reminded that this was not a service plan and the action plan did not represent all of the work that was undertaken by the department. It was noted that the majority of actions were for the Development Management team and they had been prioritised; this had involved joint working across the Council with IT and Customer Services to improve the service for customers. She was fully aware of the importance of the relationship between Officers and customers and she regretted that there had been times when the service had fallen short of expectations but she provided assurance that this would be addressed where issues were identified. With regard to planning policy, the Tewkesbury Borough Plan had reached the Pre-Submission stage; whilst this had impacted on other projects, clearly it was a very important piece of work. In terms of economic development and tourism, the Growth Hub had now been operational for a year and many compliments had been received about the positive impact on businesses. In respect of community development, a Member workshop had been held to clarify and define the role of the Place Approach and that had been well received. The next stage was to ensure it was embedded across the three areas within the borough. The relationship between place and health was recognised as a key priority for the team moving forward.
- 52.3 A Member drew attention to Page No. 42, Action B.12 – Review whether to propose Local Development Orders for areas where no permitted development rights - which stated that the action had been suspended for a year in order to enable a cost/benefit analysis to be undertaken but then went on to say that this was now unlikely to be taken forward due to the loss of income predicted and he sought clarification as to the situation. The Head of Development Services explained that, whilst the majority of areas benefited from permitted development rights, those rights had been removed in some newer areas; permitted development rights allowed properties to be extended without planning permission - within certain limits - if permitted development rights had been removed, a planning application would be required. In April 2018, when the action plan had been adopted, there was no fee for submitting a planning application if permitted development rights had been removed; however, those applications were quite costly to process so an action had been included to consider introducing Local Development Orders which would reinstate permitted development rights. Since that time, the regulations had changed and a fee was now required for these applications therefore it may no longer make economic sense to bring in a Local Development Order; this was still being considered but it was unlikely that it would be taken forward.
- 52.4 The Member also drew attention to Page No. 44, Action C.2 – Produce Supplementary Planning Document to support introduction of the Joint Core Strategy and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which sets out the relationship between CIL and Section 106 (and Section 278 of the Highways Act) and approach to non-plan compliant schemes – and questioned why the target date had changed from June 2019 to a ‘commencement date’ of January 2020. The Head of

Development Services explained that the CIL had just been adopted by the Council and it was now intended to produce a Supplementary Planning Document to clarify this for the public. It took at least 12 months for a Supplementary Planning Document to be adopted due to the various consultation stages, and there had also been delays due to recent changes to the CIL regulations which had meant that a lot of work had to be aborted – she wanted to be clear that this would certainly commence in the New Year which was why the target date stated in the action plan was ‘January 2020 commencement date’. In response to a query as to whether there was a process determining how CIL could be spent, the Head of Development Services clarified there was no formally agreed process but that was included on the forward plan for November 2019; the process needed agreement from all three Joint Core Strategy authorities and the County Council which did take time. Ultimately, she hoped to have an agreed governance strategy by the end of the calendar year. The CIL regulation changes meant that it was now possible to spend the money in ways that had not been allowed 12 months earlier. She reassured Members that, although CIL had been charged since January 2019, there was a significant lead-in period and an instalment policy which meant that money was not yet being collected from liable developments. Notwithstanding this, she stressed that it was an absolute priority to put the governance arrangements in place and she confirmed that this would require an Executive Committee decision. A Member sought assurance that it was clear and understandable to developers when CIL had to be paid and the Head of Development Services confirmed that the CIL cost was established based on floor space, use etc. and there was a legal document setting out the payment dates and the amounts due. The information was stored on a new software system and was completely transparent. She clarified that there was a 5% administration fee and Parish Councils were entitled to 15% or 25% depending on whether a Neighbourhood Development Plan was in place – in most cases that proportion would go directly to the Parish Council; this left 70% or 80% in the strategic pot and a decision was required as to the recipient which would be set out in the governance. Whilst this was obvious in many cases, it could be unclear where certain infrastructure was required for developments to come forward. She indicated that projections could be produced for Members, if required, to give them an indication of the CIL that Parishes could expect to receive and the potential ways this might need to be spent.

- 52.5 With regard to Page No. 48, Action H.1 – Discuss tourism role with Members and partners – a Member noted that the first paragraph in the progress to date column talked about uncertainty over funding but this seemed to be contradicted by the last sentence which stated that a plan would be presented to Members setting out an enhanced tourism role. The Head of Development Services advised that there had been a vacant post within the Economic Development and Tourism team for some time and, whilst she was keen to fill the post, it was firstly necessary to make some decisions about how best to manage the service, for instance, the Local Industrial Strategy which had been prevalent in April 2018 talked about the role of the technology industry and it was important to capitalise on every opportunity to facilitate tourism, not only in terms of the Tourist Information Centres, but also through supporting businesses with their tourism role.
- 52.6 A Member raised concern that, as a new Councillor, it was unclear from the report what improvements had been made as a result of the action plan and she would have welcomed a summary to highlight what had changed for the better and areas for further improvement. The Head of Development Services felt this was a very good point and she advised that responses were currently awaited from a survey of applicants focused on their experience of the planning application process and the pre-application planning advice service. Another Member drew attention to Page No. 37, Paragraph 3.7 of the report which talked about a number of small scale proposals to improve service delivery, manage costs and improve capacity but there were no details as to what those were and what outcomes had been achieved. The

Head of Development Services explained that this report focused on the delivery of the action plan, nevertheless, there were a number of actions currently being considered which had not been possible in 2018, for instance, increased use of digital technology to improve case management and efficiency including trialling paperless householder applications; whilst these projects were progressing, some would require investment in terms of Officer time and/or capital.

- 52.7 A Member raised concern about two specific incidents, one whereby he had been unable to contact a particular Officer despite many calls to various other Council staff, and another which had been highlighted at a Parish Council meeting where an individual had been trying to obtain pre-application advice but their emails and calls had not been followed up. This was clearly not an acceptable way to deal with customers and it meant that it was difficult to see the improvements that were suggested in the report. The Head of Development Services understood these concerns and indicated that she was unaware of the problem at the Parish Council so she would be happy to discuss this further outside of the meeting. Another Member indicated that he understood this had actually been resolved efficiently following the Parish Council meeting once the relevant Officer was made aware of this issue. In terms of Officers not answering telephones, the Head of Development Services was disappointed to hear that this was an issue and reiterated her commitment to addressing the problem. She had heard comments about people not being able to get hold of Officers who worked part-time etc. but she stressed that if Officers were away from their desks – whether that was because they were on site, in meetings or because they did not work full-time – it was always possible to contact Technical Administration; the telephone number for that department was on the website and in the Shoretel directory but she undertook to circulate a list of key contact numbers to all Members following the meeting. It was worth noting that she had recently become aware of some technical issues with the telephones; whilst they allowed for three stacked calls, the two people behind the first caller did not realise they were in a queue as they just heard a ring tone which made it appear their calls were being ignored. This was not appropriate and she was working with the IT team to come up with a solution. The Chair felt that these types of concerns did not necessarily need to be resolved by the Head of Development Services as she clearly had a lot of other important work to do and he queried who else Members could contact. The Head of Development Services indicated that she was more than happy to take concerns from Members and she would always respond to calls and emails, although that may not be straight away. She was supported by the Technical Planning Manager and the Business Transformation Manager, as well as individual Case Officers, all of whom would be willing to assist Members. A Member noted that both of the Managers mentioned were shared with Gloucester City Council and questioned whether they responded to calls from Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers and Members whilst working there. The Head of Development Services clarified that the Officers split their time roughly 50/50 between the two authorities. Whilst they should answer their calls and emails for both authorities, there was a lack of integration between the systems which meant that they had two inboxes to manage; this had been flagged as a concern and Officers were attempting to resolve it.

- 52.8 It was noted that it was not proposed to bring back a further report on the delivery of the action plan unless the outstanding actions failed to be completed by March 2020; however, given the concerns that had been raised regarding customer service, a Member felt it was important for the Committee to receive an update on the outcome of the customer satisfaction survey. It was subsequently

RESOLVED

1. That the progress made against the actions contained within the Development Services Improvement Plan be **NOTED**.
2. That a further report be brought to the Committee in April/May 2020 to advise Members of the outcomes of the customer satisfaction survey and, if relevant, to give an explanation on any outstanding actions within the Plan.

OS.53 REVIEW OF PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PLAN

- 53.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 50-73, provided an update on performance arising from the adoption of the Planning Enforcement Plan. Members were asked to consider the information and to note that this would be included within the planning Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in future.
- 53.2 Members were advised that the Planning Enforcement Plan, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, had been adopted by the Executive Committee in July 2018. The Plan had been introduced following a review of the Planning Enforcement service and had been through various consultation prior to approval. The Plan set out the Council's principles and approaches to delivering the service and was intended to be used primarily by the public. The Head of Development Services advised that, when the Plan was adopted in 2018, the Enforcement team comprised a Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer and two Enforcement Officers; unfortunately, all three of the staff in those roles had now left the authority. After two or three attempts to recruit, appointments had been made to two junior posts – these Officers were doing very well but were both inexperienced and still learning the trade so they did require support. She had now tried to recruit to the Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer post unsuccessfully on four occasions. As an interim solution, arrangements had been made to cover this post for two days per week in order to assist with high priority cases. The focus for the last six to 12 months had been on implementing the new service with the new Officers and the Planning Enforcement Plan had been a useful tool during that process. She confirmed that consideration was being given as to how best address the vacant senior role. She went on to advise that statistics in relation to the service had been recorded on the Uniform system since 1 April 2019 and the first six months' data to 30 September 2019 was set out at Appendix 2 to the report.
- 53.3 In response to a query, the Head of Development Services advised that an Enforcement Officer did not necessarily have to be a qualified Planning Officer – neither of the staff in the two junior posts were qualified although both had experience in the industry. The senior role that had been advertised on several occasions was for a Planning and Enforcement Officer but candidates seemed to be very scarce and those that did exist tended to be based within County authorities which was why it was necessary to rethink the structure of the team; it was likely that the senior role would be a planning post with an element of enforcement but no decisions had been made as yet. A Member questioned how many live enforcement cases there were and was advised that Appendix 2 to the report stated that 73 breaches had been reported; however, that only related to new breaches between 1 April and 30 September and, as enforcement cases could take a long time to resolve, there were actually around 240 live enforcement cases. Another Member raised concern that the statistics provided did not give an indication as to whether performance was good or bad and she felt the figures needed to be put into context. The Head of Development Services explained that it was not always easy to compare due to the varied nature of cases and the different action taken to resolve them. Until the introduction of the Planning Enforcement Plan in July 2018 there had been no comparisons or timeframes so

there had been a definite improvement in that regard. She confirmed that the majority of cases were Category C - unless action was taken there was a risk of material harm to the environment or undue harm to residential amenity; investigation to commence within 10 days – or Category D – Breaches of planning control causing limited material disturbance to local residents or harm to the environment which do not come within any of the higher categories and where a delay would not prejudice the Council's ability to resolve the matters; investigation to take place as soon as resources allow with the aim being to commence within 15 days. It was noted that 72.2% of Category C cases and 76.9% of Category D cases had been commenced within the timescales set out within the Plan. Category A cases – Development causing, or likely to cause, irreparable harm or damage; investigation to take place as soon as possible or within 24 hours – and Category B cases – Unless prompt action is taken, there is a material risk of further harm being caused which could be reduced or prevented by early intervention; investigation to commence within five working days – were much less common with only three of each of these type of cases reported during the six month period.

53.4 A Member understood that the Planning Committee was supposed to receive regular reports on enforcement but he did not believe that was happening currently. He also pointed out that Members had previously been told they would be able to receive reports on enforcement cases within their Wards and he asked when that would happen as it was important for Councillors to be able to keep their constituents informed. The Head of Development Services apologised that the Planning Committee had not yet received these reports and provided assurance that this would commence from April 2020 to coincide with the new financial year. She confirmed that complainants were kept informed throughout the process and they would be notified of any changes automatically when the Uniform system was updated. Members had been given the opportunity to receive updates on enforcement cases, and she believed some had been set-up to receive them, so this could be rolled out further.

53.5 The Deputy Chief Executive suggested that it would be beneficial to extend the customer satisfaction survey which was being undertaken as part of the Development Services Improvement Plan - discussed under the previous Agenda item - to include enforcement in order for Members to get a feel for public thinking in relation to that aspect of the planning service. It was

RESOLVED That performance arising from the adoption of the Planning Enforcement Plan be **NOTED** and this information be included with the planning Key Performance Indicators in future.

OS.54 HOUSING STRATEGY MONITORING REPORT

54.1 The report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 75-10, provided a summary of the key activities identified within the Housing Strategy 2017-21 which had been achieved between April and September 2019. Members were asked to consider the progress made to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Action Plan.

54.2 The Head of Community Services explained that it had been a year of change for the Housing team mainly due to the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act which was very much focused on prevention; fortunately, this was the approach that had generally been taken by Tewkesbury Borough Council. In terms of service improvement, he drew particular attention to Page No. 76, Paragraph 2.3.2 of the report which set out that Personal Housing Plans in the new database were currently being updated and a home visit service was being developed in order to increase understanding of a customer's situation in a less intimidating environment. Page No. 81, Paragraph 2.4.1 of the report stated that the Local Housing Needs Assessment was close to completion. This was carried out on a countywide basis,

with the last full assessment in 2009, and would form the basis of the new Housing Strategy when the current strategy came to an end in 2021. The action plan was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and he apologised that a number of the target dates had already passed and undertook to ensure these were corrected for the next update.

- 54.3 With regard to the rough sleeper count set out at Page No. 78 of the report, a Member questioned whether the one rough sleeper recorded in February 2019 was the same person that had been recorded in January 2019 and the Head of Community Services confirmed that was likely to be the case. He pointed out that it could take a long time to find solutions for rough sleepers, particularly if they lived chaotic lifestyles, and it was worth remembering that, although there were genuine cases, some chose to live on the street, or preferred to be seen as a rough sleeper, even when they had access to accommodation. The Interim Housing Manager confirmed that there were many reasons why people with accommodation could be found on the street, for instance, some were so entrenched in rough sleeping that they had adapted to that lifestyle and had their social networks on the streets. Officers worked with individuals to establish their reasons and were supported by organisations such as the P3 charity to ensure they received the right help. A Member expressed the view that the homelessness figures for Tewkesbury Borough were very positive and a credit to the Housing team. The Interim Housing Manager indicated that he had been with the authority since June, having worked in a number of local authority departments previously, and the Tewkesbury Borough Council Housing Team was the best he had worked with. The staff all pulled together and were extremely committed to helping people which resulted in some quality work. It was acknowledged that the type of people the team worked with were often very challenging and the job was often carried out under very difficult circumstances. The Chair echoed these sentiments and, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Housing team for their hard work.

- 54.4 It was

RESOLVED That the progress made to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Housing Strategy Action Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.55 WARM AND WELL SCHEME UPDATE

- 55.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 110-138, which gave an overview of the Warm and Well scheme. Members were asked to consider the achievements made to date.
- 55.2 The Head of Community Services explained that, along with the other local authorities in Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury Borough Council contributed £20,000 per year to pay for services provided by the Severn Wye Energy Agency in order to achieve its commitments around achieving affordable warmth and tackling fuel poverty. The main achievements for 2018/19 were set out at Pages No. 112-113 of the report with a detailed breakdown at Appendix 1. He drew particular attention to Paragraph 2.9 of the report which stated that the scheme had led to an overall annual carbon saving of 265 tonnes which was a significant reduction. He hoped that Members would agree that the Warm and Well Scheme was extremely good value for money in terms of the benefits it provided to vulnerable households and the environment. The Environmental Health Manager felt it was important to bear in mind that the scheme was primarily directed at vulnerable adults and there were some unscrupulous operators who mimicked the Warm and Well branding and marketing so he urged Members to contact the Council to confirm legitimacy if they were in any doubt whatsoever.

55.3 It was noted that the Severn Wye Energy Agency ran training sessions on fuel poverty and it was agreed that a session should be arranged for Members in the New Year. A Member queried whether the Warm and Well scheme was advertised in the Tewkesbury Borough News and the Head of Community Services confirmed that it had been in the past and undertook to speak to the Communications team about including something in the next edition. It was noted that the scheme was publicised at community events and information leaflets could be provided for such occasions. A Member asked for information on the scheme to be circulated to Town and Parish Councils and the Head of Community Services suggested that it may also be beneficial to include this on the agenda for the next Town and Parish Council Seminar. Another Member felt it would be beneficial to send out a Member Update with a summary of the service and how to contact the Severn Wye Energy Agency and the Head of Community Services undertook to ensure that was done by the end of the month.

55.4 It was

RESOLVED That the achievements made to date through the Warm and Well Scheme be **NOTED**.

OS.56 GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

56.1 The Chair indicated that he had chaired the last meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee - a joint meeting with the Gloucestershire Environment Scrutiny Committee - which the Council's representative had been unable to attend. The meeting had focused on Gloucestershire's Local Transport Plan Review and the presentation had been circulated to the Committee. He intended to briefly outline the issues that had been raised and to take any questions arising.

56.2 The presentation at the joint meeting had covered the following key points:

- Local Transport Plan Vision and Objectives – Support sustainable economic growth; conserve the environment; enable community connectivity; and improve community health and wellbeing.
- Objectives – Consider national, regional, county and local priorities and policies that have changed during the plan period; strengthen climate change agenda; reflect adopted local plans and their infrastructure requirements; look toward a new time horizon to 2041 to discuss future transport technologies and likely growth scenarios; and link to the newly introduced cycling and walking infrastructure plans.
- Shaping the Way to 2041 – Challenges: economic prosperity and the need for improved connectivity; inclusion; changes in attitude and consumer behaviour; innovation. Opportunities: better integration of all modes; SMART places and innovation; new vehicle technologies; shared mobility.
- Public and Community Transport – transport interchange hubs; three tiered bus stations; bus priority; total transport; Ultra Low Emission Vehicle (ULEV) bus lanes.
- Cycle Policy – Strengthen Gloucestershire's cycle network - £50m investment to connect Cotswolds to Tewkesbury and sub-routes once main routes in place; follow green infrastructure principles.

- Freight and Highways – Freight: Gloucestershire's freight network; advisory freight route map; journey routing information; low carbon and ULEV. Highways: document review; movement of certain policies into more appropriate document e.g. overarching strategy, public and community transport and walking policy document; £150m investment in the highway network.
- Rail – Rail connectivity long term aims – including Ashchurch for Tewkesbury – upgrade offer and connectivity.
- Scheme Prioritisation – Move away from short/long term time periods for scheme delivery to new categorisation developed by a scale of impact indicator to provide objective classifications. Strategic scheme priorities less than £20m; major scheme priorities £5m-£20m; local scheme priorities £200,000-£5m; countywide scheme priorities – non-place specific, revenue projects.

56.3 A Member questioned how they could comment on the proposals and put forward suggestions as he was under pressure from residents in Shurdington to get the proposal for a bypass reconsidered. The Chair advised that there would be public consultation and suggested that it might be possible to invite the County Council to give a short presentation to Members - he would also be happy to feedback on specific issues. The Deputy Chief Executive felt that it would be prudent to wait to see exactly what the consultation was on, and whether it would be appropriate to comment on particular issues such as Shurdington, in order not to raise expectations. A Member welcomed the planned improvements to cycle networks but felt there was more to be done within smaller areas, i.e. between housing estates, and the Chair indicated there would be a second tranche but it was hoped that new developments would not have the same problems as older ones.

56.4 Members generally felt that the plan was very positive and looked forward to seeing how it progressed. It was subsequently

RESOLVED That the update from the joint meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth and Environment Scrutiny Committees be
NOTED.

The meeting closed at 6:20 pm