

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 24 November 2009 commencing at 6:00 pm

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Deputy Mayor

Councillor M J Williams
Councillor Miss E A Hancox

and Councillors:

P W Awford, Mrs K J Berry, P J Brazil, B C Calway, C Clucas, M Collins, D M M Davies, Mrs J E Day, R I Hart, Mrs S E Hillier-Richardson, B A Jones, A L Keyte, K R Leech, J D H McCloy, Mrs F M Ogden, Mrs J Perez, J Richardson, P R N Richmond, Ms A E Ricks, M H Rowcliffe-Quarry, G K Shurmer, R J G Smith, Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, P R Taylor, A C Tugwell, R J E Vines, D J Waters, B Whelan and Mrs C Wright

CL.70 PRAYERS

70.1 The meeting opened with prayers from the Mayor's Chaplain

CL.71 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

71.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R E Allen, J H Evetts, N J Greaves, A L Mackinnon and J R Mason

CL.72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

72.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct adopted by the Council on 24 September 2007, and Members were reminded that they had signed an undertaking in their Declaration of Acceptance of Office to observe the Code in carrying out their duties.

72.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Policy(ies)	Nature of Interest	Declared action in respect of disclosure
P W Awford	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor. Has a non-pecuniary interest in the National Flood Forum	Would speak and vote.

M Collins	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would speak and vote
G K Shurmer	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would speak and vote.
M G Sztymiak	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would speak and vote.
M G Sztymiak	Item 14a – Notice of Motion – Changing the name of the Council	Is a Tewkesbury Town Councillor.	Would speak and vote.
R J E Vines	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would speak and vote.
B Whelan	Item 6 – Member Questions or Petitions Properly Submitted in Accordance with Council Procedure Rules	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would speak and vote.
B Whelan	Item 12 – Council Representation on Severn Vale Housing Society	Is a Council representative on the Board of Severn Vale Housing Society	Would speak and vote

72.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

CL.73 MINUTES

- 73.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2009, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.74 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 74.1 The evacuation procedure as noted on the Agenda was advised to those present.
- 74.2 The Mayor reminded Members that his Charity Race Day was due to be held on 11 December. Tickets were still available but were selling fast. The Mayor's Charity Ball was due to be held on 12 February and invitations would be sent out in the next few weeks.
- 74.3 The Mayor welcomed Mrs Elaine MacTiernan and Mr Dave Witts of the Severn & Avon Valley Combined Flood Group who would be asking questions under Items from Members of the Public. In addition, he advised Members that there was a minor change to the Agenda in that, as Councillor Mason had apologised for this evening's meeting, the Motion at Agenda Item 14 would be seconded by Councillor Day.
- 74.4 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Vines, indicated that, following the recent devastating events in the area, the Council would be making a collection to donate to the flood fund in Cumbria. A letter of sympathy had already been sent from the Mayor on behalf of the Council, and the Leader encouraged Members to donate as much as they could. Members of staff would be holding a dress down day that week and the donations from this would also go into the collection. Residents of the Borough could contribute directly to the fund and the Leader had asked for the relevant details to be placed on the Council's own website for information. The Deputy Leader of the Council echoed these sentiments and indicated that the television coverage had brought back many memories for people living in the Borough and he hoped that Councillors, staff and residents alike would wish to help those affected as much as they could. The hope was expressed that the media would get behind the flood fund as it had in Gloucestershire in 2007 and that the fund would be administered, as it had in Gloucestershire, quickly and with minimal administration expense.

CL.75 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 75.1 The Mayor welcomed Mr Witts and Mrs MacTiernan to the meeting and invited them to ask their questions of the Lead Member for the Built Environment. The questions and answers were as follows:

Question 1

We understand that the Joint Core Strategy is Central Government's way of implementing the RSS before the main report is approved, in actual fact it is the local version of the RSS and a way of getting around the 3500 objections. **When did the TBC full Council approve their participation in the Joint Core Strategy?** Please provide the Minutes of the meeting.

Answer 1

The Joint Core Strategy is at an early stage. The Issues and Key Questions Document currently out to consultation contains no specific proposals for development. It is not intended that the Joint Core Strategy be adopted in advance of the finalisation of the RSS.

Tewkesbury Borough Council resolved at Full Council on 29th July 2008 to participate in the production of a Joint Core Strategy. A copy of the Minutes will be provided. The Minutes can be found on the Council website, paragraph 42.7 onwards refers.

Question 2

It has been indicated that the RSS will be binned if there is a change of Government next year. **Why is this Council taking part and wasting money on the Joint Core Strategy?**

Answer 2

The Council has a statutory duty under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act of 2004 to produce a Local Development Framework for their area; to a timetable agreed by central government and set out in the Councils' Local Development Scheme published on their web site. The production of the Core Strategy document is the initial stage of such a framework. To be certified as a sound document the Core Strategy will have to be in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy or whatever strategic guidance may replace it should there be a change of Government.

The Council considers that it is appropriate to have planned development set out in a structured sequence of plans rather than ad hoc development led by planning applications.

Question 3

In the Joint Core Strategy document further land at Bishops Cleeve is earmarked for development there was a large opposition to the Homelands Development by the residents of Bishops Cleeve. **Why is further development being put forward?**

Answer 3

The Issues and Key Questions Document contains no specific proposals for further development in Bishops Cleeve. In order to give context to the document the main proposals of the Regional Spatial Strategy, Secretary of State's Proposed Changes are reiterated and include an area of search for an urban extension to the north of Bishops Cleeve. The Issues and Key Questions document makes it clear that the proposals contained in the Regional Spatial Strategy have not been adopted and the three Joint Core Strategy Councils remain opposed to many of these proposals.

Question 4

We notice that a Program Manager has been appointed for the Joint Core Strategy. **Where and when was this job advertised?**

Answer 4

The Programme Manager post was a consultant appointment made by Cheltenham Borough Council, in agreement with all 3 Joint Core Strategy Councils.

Question 5

How much is the Program Manager for the Joint Core Strategy costing and what proportion is TBC paying?

Answer 5

The Programme Manager post is funded by external funding of £20,000 provided specifically for this purpose by the Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnership. No costs for this appointment fall on any of the Joint Core Strategy Councils, including Tewkesbury Borough Council.

Question 6

The Joint Core Strategy ROADSHOWS ARE SUPPOSED TO BE THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION there is very reduced advertising on the consultation process. **How much is being spent on advertising this consultation process and what media is being used for this process?**

Answer 6

£30,000 has been allocated in the 2009/2010 Joint Core Strategy Budget to the November consultation exercise. Direct advertising costs including website development are likely to amount to around £6000 and include half page advertisements in local newspapers.

The local press and radio stations also provided a degree of free publicity via press releases and launch events. At the launch event on November 18th the Gloucester Echo newspaper group, BBC Radio Gloucester, Heart FM and Star FM were present. The resultant coverage was widespread and well received.

Additional publicity has been given to the process in news media produced by all three authorities and an extensive process of individually notifying local consultees, Town and Parish Councils, community groups and key stakeholders is also being undertaken

75.2 The following supplementary questions were asked and Mr Witts and Mrs MacTiernan were advised that they would receive a written response to the questions within 5 working days:

Question 1:

When were the two Councillors, Davies and Richmond, appointed as Members of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Member Steering Group and why? Please provide the Minutes of the meeting.

Question 2:

At a joint meeting between Severn & Avon, Tewkesbury Borough Council, the Environment Agency, County Councillors and Peter Bide of Communities and Local Government in 2007, Councillor Davies proudly boasted that his Ward of Highnam did not flood, we notice that in the Joint Core Strategy document no land is being earmarked for development in Highnam. Why is that?

Question 3:

In the Minutes of the JCS Members Steering Group meeting on 13.10.09, Ian Jones (Forward Planning Officer) explained that the questions for consultation, and I quote "were designed to guide the public's responses". We also understand that Ian Jones is resisting consultation in some areas such as Parish Councils with the excuse that Officers do not have the time, also at a Bloor Persimmon exhibition last Thursday they stated that they have been working in close co-operation with TBC Planning Department for the approval of 4500 houses at Uckington. Why is the public consultation on Forward Planning taking this undemocratic path?

Question 4:

(Refers to the post of Programme Manager) How many applicants, who chose the successful applicant and on what date was the appointment made? Please supply a copy of the confirmation of the appointment to the successful applicant.

Question 5:

No supplementary question was asked

Question 6:

In the Minutes of the JCS meeting on 13.10.09, Ian Jones stated that the three Authorities were not engaged in "consensus" planning whereby the wishes of the majority of the public would automatically prevail. Andrew North said that it was important to think about consulting and engaging with all Councillors as they are the important stakeholders. However, it appears that the JCS Steering Committee are acting to reduce public response, concerns and objections despite the public face they put on in their press release. Why are they taking this stance and does this meet with the approval of this full Council?

75.3 The Mayor thanked Mr Witts and Mrs MacTiernan for their questions.

75.4 The Borough Solicitor indicated that a representative from SWARD had intended to attend the meeting to ask questions of the Council but unfortunately she was now unable to attend. It had been agreed those questions would be answered in writing after the meeting. Members asked that the answers to all of the questions asked at the meeting and the response made to SWARD be copied to all Members of the Council.

CL.76 MEMBER QUESTIONS OR PETITIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

76.1 The following question was received from Councillor Sue Hillier-Richardson to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Robert Vines:

Question:

I understand that land at Wingmoor Farm, which is owned by Tewkesbury Borough Council, has been included as part of a site for the GCC Waste Core Strategy. Please could the relevant Lead Members provide me with the following information?

How and when was it decided, at the Council, that TBC would be offering this land at Wingmoor Farm, which it owns, as a site for inclusion in the GCC Waste Core Strategy?

Answer:

There has been no decision by the Council to offer any land at Wingmoor Farm as part of a site for the GCC Waste Core Strategy. Informal discussions with the County Council about the Council's land ownership in the vicinity of Wingmoor Farm have been on going. Part of the land is subject to a leasehold interest which would need to be resolved through negotiation prior to the whole site being available. The Executive Committee will be considering the Council's response to the consultation on the GCC Waste Core Strategy at its meeting on 2nd December 2009.

76.2 Councillor Hillier-Richardson asked the following supplementary question to which the Leader of the Council advised that she would receive a response in writing:

The report to the Executive Committee on the County Council's Waste Core Strategy says the Council should support the sites in its area, who has made this decision?

CL.77 LEAD MEMBER PRESENTATION

77.1 The Council received a presentation from the Lead Member for Finance & Asset Management, Councillor A L Keyte.

77.2 The presentation covered the following key points:

- The Business – Property & Asset Management, Revenues & Benefits and Financial Strategy (incl. finance, value for money & efficiency, procurement and investments)
- Property & Asset Management –
 - The Service – manages and maintains the Council's property portfolio which includes land & property within the Borough that delivers a service or is for commercial or investment purposes and land adopted under Section 106 Agreements.
 - Corporate Asset Management Group – the Group meets regularly, discusses acquisitions and proposals, property maintenance issues, getting the best use and value from assets and updating the Asset Management Plan. The representation on the Group includes the Lead and Shadow Member, Legal Services, Property Services and the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources
 - Asset Management Plan – Is a three year plan which helps to deliver the objectives set out in the Council Plan and includes a number of Strategic Council documents such as the Asset Register, the Disposal Programme, the Repair & Maintenance Programme, Capital Programme and Acquisition Programme.
- Revenues and Benefits
 - The Service – Council Tax and Business Rate accounts collection and management, Council Tax and housing benefit claims, promotion of welfare benefits and countering fraudulent benefit claims
 - Housing and Council Tax Benefits – Total caseload October 2009 – 5,275 (+19%). Processing time – average 25.14 days. Department for Work and Pensions are funding an additional assessor post for 2 years and benefits staff had been working overtime but were nearly up to date
 - Council Tax and Business Rates – Council Tax was collected from 35,000 properties, Business rates were collected from 10,000 businesses and collection rates at October 2009 were 67.28% for Council Tax and 67.33% for Business Rates. The revaluation of Business Rates had been undertaken and would come into effect in 2010/11. This was a major concern to business and a transitional relief scheme was in place to gradually phase it in
- Financial Strategy
 - Medium Term Financial Strategy – The Council was developing a 5 year Strategy (2010/15). In future the Strategy would include all financial aspects.
 - 2010/11 Strategy – This had been expanded to 5 years and included the Reserves Policy, Capital Strategy and value for money and efficiencies.

- Future Years: Completing the Picture – Income and Charging Policy and Investments
- 2010/11-2015/15 – Balanced Five Year Strategy – The hard work was not over. The Council still needed to deliver the savings plan, achieve procurement savings, achieve savings in Shared Services. However most of all the Council needed economic recovery which would lead to increased income from Planning, Land Charges and Building Control. A reasonable grant settlement for 2011/12-2013/14 would also help.
- The Key Resource – The staff team was now led by George Hill

77.3 Members thanked the Lead Member for his informative presentation and it was

RESOLVED That the presentation received from the Lead Member for Finance & Asset Management be **NOTED**

CL.78 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Go-7 Shared Services

78.1 Attention was drawn to the report detailing the Go-7 Shared Services proposal, circulated with the papers for the current meeting at Pages No. 13-59. The Executive Committee had considered the report and recommended to Council:

- (a) that it commits to the GO-7 Shared Service project as set out in the Business Case and as summarised in Paragraph 1.1
- (b) that it approves the financial plan and revenue and capital requirements of the GO-7 business case and agrees to commit the necessary funding for the project, as summarised in Table 1 in the Financial Implications section of the report
- (c) that it participates in the procurement of the shared Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system
- (d) that authority be delegated to the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance & Asset Management, to purchase the ERP system so long as the costs are in line with the attached Business Case and on terms and conditions approved by the Borough Solicitor including a Collaboration / Partnership Agreement between the Councils if necessary
- (e) that the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources be authorised, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor, to waive the Contract Procedure Rules in respect of contracts relating to the Go-7 project in circumstances where such waivers would facilitate the implementation of the Go-7 project

78.2 A Member indicated that he was disappointed that this issue had been brought forward in this format but that, reluctantly, he would have to agree with the recommendation. He questioned whether the need to replace the financial system had been included within the budget and, if not, why not. The Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources explained that the replacement of the system had been under discussion for quite a long time and many options had been considered. Other Districts also needed to replace their systems and it therefore seemed sensible to share a system, this was the reason for the report in its present format. The Council did have a plan in place as a contingency but the Go-7 Project would provide a far more robust option.

78.3 The Lead Member advised that the thrust and outline of the project was set out at Page No. 23 and this included the reasons for the project. He felt that it was an imaginative solution that would offer better resilience and it was hoped that the joint working could be extended as the project moved forward. In addition he explained that the figures set out in the report were felt to be fairly pessimistic and therefore it was anticipated that the cost of the project would be lower than projected and that the savings would be higher. In response to a question about the County Council's involvement, the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources advised that the County Council had replaced their system fairly recently but regardless it would not use the same kind of system as the District Councils as it was a much larger Authority with more complex needs.

78.4 Having considered the report and information provided it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

- (a) that the Council commits to the GO-7 Shared Service project as set out in the Business Case and as summarised in Paragraph 1.1
- (b) that the Council approves the financial plan and revenue and capital requirements of the GO-7 business case and agrees to commit the necessary funding for the project, as summarised in Table 1 in the Financial Implications section of the report
- (c) that the Council participates in the procurement of the shared Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system
- (d) that authority be delegated to the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance & Asset Management, to purchase the ERP system so long as the costs are in line with the attached Business Case and on terms and conditions approved by the Borough Solicitor including a Collaboration / Partnership Agreement between the Councils if necessary
- (e) that the Corporate Head of Financial Services & Resources be authorised, in consultation with the Borough Solicitor, to waive the Contract Procedure Rules in respect of contracts relating to the Go-7 project in circumstances where such waivers would facilitate the implementation of the Go-7 project

Gambling Act 2005 - Statement of Principles

78.5 Attention was drawn to the Gambling Act 2005 – Statement of Principles, circulated with the papers for the current meeting at Pages No. 60-116. The Executive Committee had considered the report and recommended to Council that the draft revised Statement of Principles, attached to the report at Appendix C, be approved for publication.

78.6 In considering the report a Member indicated that she had concerns about children, young people and vulnerable adults and she felt that a number of amendments would add clarity and strengthen the Principles. Referring to Page No. 99, she indicated that under the second bullet point of interested parties she would like to add an asterisk after the wording "business interests" which would then be defined to include partnerships, charities, faith groups, medical practices etc. She explained that the Gambling Commission's Guidance to Licensing Authorities specifically

stated that the wording “business interests” was expected to have a wide interpretation and it gave those organisations as examples. Referring to Page No. 110, she asked that under Permit: 3 or more machines, the final sentence should be amended to read “applicants will be expected to provide information leaflets” in place of “may wish to consider the provision of”. She was of the view that this was more positive in terms of the Council’s expectations. In addition she proposed that in future any consultation on the principles should include faith groups, those working with children, young people and vulnerable adults which could include LSP Children & Young People Partnerships, Gloucestershire Association for Voluntary and Community Action (GAVCA), Housing Association, Youth Service, relevant charities etc.

78.7 The Lead Member was of the view that these amendments were helpful and he fully endorsed them. He also indicated that there were a number of Policies and Laws in place to protect children from gambling and not purely this document. One Member indicated there seemed to be a lot of repetition throughout the document and he was reminded that both the old and revised Policies were attached and much of the wording between the two was the same.

78.8 Having considered the report it was

RESOLVED

That the draft revised Statement of Principles, attached to the report at Appendix C, be **APPROVED** for publication subject to the following amendments:

- Page 99 – Under the second bullet point of interested parties, add an asterisk after the wording “business interests” which would then be defined to include partnerships, charities, faith groups, medical practices etc.
- Page 110 – Under Permit: 3 or more machines the final sentence to be amended to read “applicants will be expected to provide information leaflets” in place of “may wish to consider the provision of”.
- that in future any consultation on the principles should include faith groups, those working with children, young people and vulnerable adults which could include LSP Children & Young People Partnerships, Gloucestershire Association for Voluntary and Community Action (GAVCA), Housing Association, Youth Service, relevant charities etc.

CL.79 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SHARED LEGAL SERVICES JOINT MONITORING AND LIAISON GROUP

79.1 The Borough Solicitor drew attention to the Constitution and Terms of Reference of the Shared Legal Services Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group, circulated with the papers for the meeting at Pages No. 117-118. She explained that the Legal Shared Service was due to launch on Monday 30 November and that all Members would receive contact information shortly. Legal Services would then be provided to Cheltenham Borough Council by contract from Tewkesbury Borough Council. The Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group would be put into place as part of the governance arrangements with the constitution and Terms of Reference as set out in the papers. Two Members were sought to represent the Council on the Group.

79.2 A Member indicated that he would have liked to see Tewkesbury Borough Council holding the chair of the Legal Services Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group rather than the Building Control Group and he questioned whether there should be political balance on the Group. In response the Borough Solicitor indicated that the Constitution of the Group had now been agreed and would require amendment if it

was to be politically balanced. Political balance on a Group such as this was not a requirement of the legislation. The Chair of the Group was intended to go with the Council which had the services provided to it i.e. Tewkesbury Borough provided the legal service to Cheltenham Borough and as such the Chair would go to Cheltenham Borough Council. The reverse arrangements were in place for the Shared Building Control Service.

79.3 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED That the Lead and Shadow Members for Corporate Governance be the Council's representatives on the Shared Legal Services Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group

CL.80 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SHARED BUILDING CONTROL JOINT MONITORING AND LIAISON GROUP

80.1 The Borough Solicitor drew attention to the Constitution and Terms of Reference of the Shared Building Control Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group, circulated with the papers for the meeting at Pages No. 119-120. She explained that the Building Control Shared Service was already in place and the Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group would be put into place as part of the governance arrangements with the constitution and Terms of Reference as set out in the papers. Two Members were sought to represent the Council on the Group.

80.2 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED That the Lead and Shadow Members for the Built Environment be the Council's representatives on the Shared Building Control Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group

CL.81 TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

81.1 The report of the Chief Executive, circulated at Pages No. 121-124, set out the work that had been undertaken by the Council's Smarter, Faster, Fitter Board and the reasons why it was considered that it should now be disbanded.

81.2 Members were advised that the Smarter, Faster, Fitter Programme had been introduced in 2007 to support the business improvement aspect of the Council's 2006/07 Improvement Programme. The Programme provided an opportunity for the Council to pull together, under a single Programme, its many business improvement projects and activities. This allowed the Council to strategically manage business improvement, and to introduce the principles of project management. Until September 2009, a Business Improvement Manager had been shared with Cotswold District Council and she had driven the work of the Board forward. A key aspect of the work was to introduce Systems Thinking into key service areas. As a result the Housing Benefit Service had been redesigned, which reshaped the way Benefits were processed making it better for the claimant and more efficient for the Council. In turn, this reduced the time taken to process claims and increased the capacity within the Team. The Planning application processing redesign had been proven on a small scale and was now being rolled out, in a staged implementation plan, to the rest of the service. Early indications showed that this would improve the speed with which applications were processed and the capacity within the Team. The Chairman of the Board was of the view that the Systems Thinking work had been one of the great successes of the Board and that it had been a very valuable programme but that it was now time to move on.

- 81.3 Members agreed that it made sense to disband the Board and ensure all of the Council's efforts were channelled through one Improvement Plan. Accordingly it was
- RESOLVED** That that the Smarter, Faster, Fitter Programme Board be disbanded

CL.82 COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ON SEVERN VALE HOUSING SOCIETY

- 82.1 The Council was advised that Councillor Mrs P E Stokes had resigned her position on the Board of Severn Vale Housing Society and Members were therefore asked to agree a replacement for the remaining term of the Council.

- 82.3 Upon being proposed and seconded it was

RESOLVED That Councillor Mrs J Perez replace Councillor Mrs P E Stokes as the Council's representative on the Board of Severn Vale Housing Society

CL.83 CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

- 83.1 In accordance with Rule of Procedure No. 2.1, the Borough Solicitor had exercised her delegated authority to approve a change to the Membership of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Members were asked to note this change.

- 83.2 The Deputy Leader of the Council confirmed that as a consequence of the Committee Membership change, Councillor Perez had also taken over the role of Shadow Member for Safer, Stronger and Healthier Communities.

- 83.3 Accordingly it was

RESOLVED That it be noted that Councillor Perez had replaced Councillor Collins on Overview & Scrutiny Committee and as Shadow Portfolio Holder for Safer, Stronger and Healthier Communities

CL.84 NOTICE OF MOTION

Changing the Name of the Council

- 84.1 Attention was drawn to the Agenda for the current meeting which set out the following Notice of Motion, proposed by Councillor P R Taylor and seconded by Councillor Mrs J E Day:

'That this Council agree to set up a Working Group of no more than five Members, consisting of two Conservatives, two Liberal Democrats and one Independent, appointed by Group Leaders, to investigate the possibilities and costs of changing the name of the Council. The Working Group to report back to full Council by April 2010'

- 84.2 In proposing the Motion, Councillor Taylor explained that when the Council had originally been formed it had been a very different place to what it was now. He felt that Tewkesbury Borough and Tewkesbury Town Councils were inextricably linked and often people thought of them as being one and the same which should not be the case. He was of the view that by examining the name of the Council through a Working Group the Council would have the opportunity to rebrand and ensure that Tewkesbury Town Council was recognised in its own right for its contributions to its residents. He was of the view that, should the Council decide to change its name, it could be phased in at minimal cost to the Authority.

- 84.3 During the discussion which ensued, a number of Members expressed the view that this was an exercise that should not be carried out at a time when residents would be expecting the Council to concentrate on delivering its services cost effectively. Resources were scarce and it was felt that whilst cuts were being made in public spending, and the Council would be facing a challenge to provide good quality services with decreasing resources, this was not the right time to be looking at this issue.
- 84.4 Responding to a query about the role of Borough Mayor, the Borough Solicitor indicated that it would be possible to retain the Council's Borough status and the role of Borough Mayor even if it changed its name. Obviously the full legal implications of any name change would need to be considered carefully as part of the work of the Working Group, should the Council agree to take this route.
- 84.5 A number of Members expressed the view that they would support the Motion as it would serve to stop any confusion between the Town and Borough Council and the Working Group could fully consider all of the implications to allow Members to make an informed decision on this issue. It was felt that it would be good for the Council to establish an identity which would help take it forward. Before deciding that it was too expensive to change the name of the Council it was necessary to identify the costs and see whether this was the case or not.
- 84.6 A Councillor asked that the question be put and upon the casting vote of the Mayor it was

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

That this Council agree to set up a Working Group of no more than five Members, consisting of two Conservatives, two Liberal Democrats and one Independent, appointed by Group Leaders, to investigate the possibilities and costs of changing the name of the Council. The Working Group to report back to full Council by April 2010

CL.85 SEPARATE BUSINESS

- 85.1 The Chairman proposed and it was

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

CL.86 SEPARATE MINUTES

- 86.1 The Separate Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2009, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.87 SEPARATE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Shared HR Service

(Exempt –Paragraphs 3 and 4 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) and Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the Authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the Authority)

- 87.1 The Council was provided with a report that had been considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 4 November 2009. The report set out a proposal to share the Council's HR service with Cheltenham Borough Council and made a recommendation to the Council in favour of such an arrangement. The Council was in agreement with this proposal.

The meeting closed at 7:40 pm