

23 September 2019

Committee	Council
Date	Tuesday, 1 October 2019
Time of Meeting	6:00 pm
Venue	Tewkesbury Borough Council Offices, Severn Room

ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND

Agenda

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Pursuant to the adoption by the Council on 26 June 2012 of the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct, effective from 1 July 2012, as set out in Minute No. CL.34, Members are invited to declare any interest they may have in the business set out on the Agenda to which the approved Code applies.

- 3. MINUTES**

1 - 13

To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2019.



4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. When the continuous alarm sounds you must evacuate the building by the nearest available fire exit. Members and visitors should proceed to the visitors' car park at the front of the building and await further instructions (during office hours staff should proceed to their usual assembly point; outside of office hours proceed to the visitors' car park). Please do not re-enter the building unless instructed to do so.

In the event of a fire any person with a disability should be assisted in leaving the building.

2. To receive any announcements from the Chair of the Meeting and/or the Chief Executive.

5. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- a) To receive any questions, deputations or petitions submitted under Council Rule of Procedure.12.

(The deadline for public participation submissions for this meeting is 25 September 2019).

- b) To receive any petitions submitted under the Council's Petitions Scheme.

6. MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

To receive any questions submitted under Rule of Procedure 13. Any items received will be circulated on 1 October 2019.

(Any questions must be submitted in writing to Democratic Services by, not later than, 10.00am on the working day immediately preceding the date of the meeting).

7. NOTICE OF MOTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

14 - 24

To consider and determine the amended Notice of Motion proposed by Councillor Cody and seconded by Councillor Softley.

8. CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

In accordance with Rule of Procedure 2.1 the Borough Solicitor has exercised her delegated authority to approve the following changes to Committee Membership:

Councillor K J Cromwell has resigned from the Audit and Governance Committee and been replaced by Councillor D W Gray.

Councillor M L Jordan has resigned from the Licensing Committee and been replaced by Councillor R J Stanley.

9. TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

In accordance with the Terms of Reference of the Tewkesbury Borough Community Safety Partnership, the Council is asked to nominate one Member to join the Lead Member for Community on the Partnership.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION: ACCIDENT AND EMERGENCY SERVICE AT CHELTENHAM GENERAL HOSPITAL

Councillor Gore will propose and Councillor Hollaway will second that:

On 23 January 2018 a motion of this Council stated clear opposition to any proposed closure or downgrading of Accident & Emergency (A&E) facilities at Cheltenham General Hospital and called for any proposals relating to the future service to be the subject of wide consultation, to include the Council and its residents.

This Council now notes the launch of the discussion booklet 'Fit for the Future', but:

- 1) is concerned at the lack of transparency in the 'Fit for the Future' proposals by OneGloucestershire for the reconfiguration of A&E provision and other affected services (oncology, general surgery, radiology and vascular treatment) in Gloucestershire;
- 2) opposes OneGloucestershire's proposals for further downgrading of A&E services at Cheltenham General Hospital to an Urgent Treatment Centre; and
- 3) supports the calls by Tewkesbury MP, Laurence Robertson, and others for a fully functioning, fully staffed A&E department operating 24/7 to be reinstated at Cheltenham General Hospital in line with this Council's previously agreed position.

This Council therefore instructs the Leader of the Council to:

- 1) write to OneGloucestershire calling on it to withdraw and revise its current proposals and commit to retaining long-term A&E services at both Cheltenham General Hospital and Gloucester Royal Hospital; and
- 2) write to the Health Secretary asking him to investigate the widespread concerns over the OneGloucestershire's 'Fit for the Future' proposals and the lack of public clarity about the local NHS Trust's intentions for the future of NHS provision in Gloucestershire.

11. SEPARATE BUSINESS

The Chairman will move the adoption of the following resolution:

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

12. SEPARATE MINUTES

25 - 26

To approve the separate Minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2019.

13. SEPARATE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Council is asked to consider and determine separate recommendations of a policy nature arising from the Executive Committee as follows:-

(a) Future Countywide Waste Partnership - Joint Waste Committee and Joint Waste Team 27 - 35

(Exempt – Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to any individual)

At its meeting on 4 September 2019 the Executive Committee considered the future of the Countywide Waste Partnership – Joint Waste Committee and Joint Waste Team and made a recommendation to Council accordingly.

14. COMMERCIAL PROPERTY INVESTMENT STRATEGY

36 - 58

(Exempt – Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

To note the acquisitions made and the performance of the commercial property portfolio; to agree funding to be added to the capital programme to finance further purchases in line with the Commercial Property Investment Strategy; and to delegate authority to the Head of Finance and Asset Management to amend the Council's Treasury Strategy and Prudential Indicators to reflect the borrowing requirements of the Commercial Investment Strategy.

Recording of Meetings

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, please be aware that the proceedings of this meeting may be recorded and this may include recording of persons seated in the public gallery or speaking at the meeting. Please notify the Democratic Services Officer if you have any objections to this practice and the Mayor will take reasonable steps to ensure that any request not to be recorded is complied with.

Any recording must take place in such a way as to ensure that the view of Councillors, Officers, the public and press is not obstructed. The use of flash photography and/or additional lighting will not be allowed unless this has been discussed and agreed in advance of the meeting.

Head of Democratic Services

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 30 July 2019 commencing at 6:00 pm

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Deputy Mayor

Councillor G F Blackwell
Councillor A S Reece

and Councillors:

R A Bird, G J Bocking, C L J Carter, C M Cody, K J Cromwell, M Dean, R D East, J H Evetts, P A Godwin, M A Gore, D W Gray, D J Harwood, A Hollaway, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, H C McLain, P D McLain, H S Munro, J W Murphy, P W Ockelton, C Reid, J K Smith, P E Smith, R J G Smith, V D Smith, C Softley, R J Stanley, S A T Stevens, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, S Thomson, R J E Vines and M J Williams

CL.22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

22.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L A Gerrard and P N Workman.

CL.23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

23.1 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.

23.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
R A Bird	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
K J Cromwell	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.

M A Gore	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Councillor owns a share in land that may benefit from a proposed policy within the Plan.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.
A Hollaway	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Close family members own land adjacent to proposed development but neither the Councillor, nor any family members, own any land which is proposed for development.	Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
P W Ockelton	Item 12a – Spring Gardens/Oldbury Road Regeneration.	Is a member of a local, national and international charity that has land holdings that could be affected by the development process.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.
V D Smith	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
P D Surman	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Is a close friend of a landowner who has land allocated within the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.
R J E Vines	Item 7 – Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan.	Councillor jointly owns land which is allocated within the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan. Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of the item.

23.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

CL.24 MINUTES

- 24.1 The Minutes of the meetings held on 21 and 28 May 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as correct records and signed by the Mayor.

CL.25 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 25.1 The evacuation procedure was advised to those present.

CL.26 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

CL.27 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

- 27.1 There were no Member questions on this occasion.

CL.28 PRE-SUBMISSION TEWKESBURY BOROUGH PLAN

- 28.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 18-24, attached the report of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group and the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan for approval. Members were asked to consider the Working Group report, and Officer advice; determine whether or not site SHU4 should be included within the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan; to approve the version for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination; and to delegate authority to the Head of Development Services, in consultation with the Lead Member for Built Environment, to make any necessary minor amendments prior to the publication of the Plan and its submission for independent examination.
- 28.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the Tewkesbury Borough Plan was the Borough's second tier plan which sat beneath the adopted Joint Core Strategy. It was being prepared to compliment the Joint Core Strategy and to provide more detailed and locally specific policies to guide development and propose non-strategic allocations for housing and employment growth. The Borough Plan provided an appropriate planning policy framework to ensure Council policy on development was effectively implemented alongside ensuring that reasonable aspirations could be achieved whilst giving protection to its communities and built and natural environment against harmful development. The Plan contained a range of policies in relation to housing; economy and tourism; the Green Belt; town centres and retail; the creation of quality places; the natural environment; communities; health and recreation; and transport and accessibility. It contained a suite of policies along with a number of plans to identify allocations of land for particular uses. The Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan had been progressed following extensive work by Members and Officers and was the version the Council intended to submit to the Secretary of State for independent examination following a minimum consultation period of six weeks.
- 28.3 The Member Working Group report, attached to the Officer report at Appendix 1, sought Council approval for the publication of the Pre-Submission version of the Borough Plan. As detailed within the Officer report, there was Officer support for the recommendations of the Working Group report with the exception of the proposed inclusion of site SHU4: land south of Badgeworth Lane, Shurdington and the consequent changes to the Green Belt boundary. This was because the site was located within the Green Belt and the National Planning Policy Framework stated

that exceptional circumstances were required to justify the removal of sites from the Green Belt through the plan-making process, furthermore, there was a requirement for the local planning authority to demonstrate that it had fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need. It was the opinion of the Working Group that SHU4 should be allocated, along with the other sites in Shurdington, to provide an appropriate level of growth at a sustainable location that was otherwise highly constrained by Green Belt; the Working Group considered this to constitute exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt. However, as set out at Section 2 of the Officer report, Officers did not consider that exceptional circumstances were present to justify the allocation of the site because the identified needs for development in service villages, as set out at Joint Core Strategy policy SP2, could be met and were exceeded without the allocation of SHU4. Policy SP2 stated that 'the service villages will accommodate in the order of 880 new homes' so, without SHU4, when added to existing commitments, the other allocations in the Plan would cumulatively provide 1,043 homes in service villages. It was for that reason Officers considered that the SHU4 allocation could not be justified as being required to meet the identified need for development as set out by the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, Environmental Health Officers had advised against the allocation of SHU4 due to potential noise and dust associated with the existing aggregate business which was located adjacent to the site as well as the strong objections from the Parish Councils, local residents and other interest groups.

- 28.4 The recommendation from the Working Group that the Plan be approved as attached at Appendix A and including SHU4, was proposed and seconded. An amendment was proposed that SHU4 be removed from the Plan prior to submission and left in the Green Belt with the rest of the Plan being approved as proposed.
- 28.5 The Mayor invited questions on the amendment. A Member questioned where the Council stood in terms of the MAFF site which had previously been included in the Borough Plan for housing. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that the MAFF site was included under the Tewkesbury Town Regeneration Policies (RET9) on Page No. 124. The policy also referred to Healings Mill and Spring Gardens and indicated that the MAFF site was suitable for higher density residential uses, including housing and a care home, but that possible alternative uses, including public car parking, may be considered where they contributed positively towards the wider town centre regeneration strategy. Referring to the inclusion of Healings Mill for housing, the Member noted that 50-60% of the site had been under flood water in 2007 and he questioned whether Officers were aware of that. In response, the Planning Policy Manager indicated that the redevelopment of the site would have to come forward with flood mitigation measures and would have to pass the flood risk exception test as identified in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Member noted that the results of the consultation on the preferred options Borough Plan had not yet been considered by Members. He was conscious that the opinions expressed, and Officer responses, should be taken into account and that could only be done when it was known what they were. He questioned what Officers views were on that. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the responses received were on the Council's website and had been considered by the Working Group when putting the Pre-Submission version together. A detailed process had been followed with changes being made to the Plan as appropriate; all comments had been considered even if they had not resulted in changes.
- 28.6 A Member noted that residents of Bishop's Cleeve had seen a lot of development in recent years and infrastructure in the area was an issue. She requested assurances as to the infrastructure planned for Bishop's Cleeve and why the allotments in the area had been allocated for housing in this new version of the Borough Plan rather than reserved for community use. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the site had not been available in the last version of the Plan but it

was within the settlement boundary, as such, investigations had been made to see if it was suitable for inclusion and it had been found to be an infill site which would provide additional housing. As the Pre-Submission Borough Plan would be subject to consultation there would be an opportunity for people to provide their comments should they have any. Referring to the use of the term 'major development' in the Plan, a Member questioned what this meant. In response, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that this was a development management definition which referred to developments of ten and over – this could be clarified within the text through the delegation for minor amendments. The Member also questioned what the exceptional circumstances were for the other two sites in Shurdington being included when Officers were of the view that SHU4 should not. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the Green Belt was subject to strict tests and the difference in Shurdington was that, as the village was surrounded by Green Belt, any growth required some release. The Green Belt had been assessed so Officers could understand the contribution it made, and the harm that may result if it was released; the other two sites were assessed to cause low/moderate harm whereas SHU4 would cause moderate/high harm. It was understood that Shurdington was a sustainable area for development, as such some Green Belt would need to be removed, but Officers also had to consider the harm caused by its removal.

- 28.7 A Member indicated that he had seen the feedback from the consultation on the Preferred Options version of the Plan and had noted the comments made in respect of the lack of exceptional circumstances regarding the removal of Green Belt at Shurdington - he questioned whether there was any other feedback from the community. In response, the Planning Policy Manager indicated that the main topics raised were in respect of the Green Belt and that had been highlighted by the community, local interest groups and some developers. Other issues raised were the potential noise and dust pollution, traffic and the proximity to the existing school. A Member suggested that the employment land next to SHU4 would not cause an issue as the bunding could be extended and the noisy equipment was only in operation for eight weeks of the year so it would cause no major harm to the area. In addition, he indicated that there was a need for specific sites for travellers to be identified and he felt the Plan needed to go back to the Working Group for further consideration as it was fragmented and he could not support a piecemeal approach. Another Member questioned whether the amount of housing in Brockworth had been considered in respect of Shurdington Road as this would impact the whole area given that Shurdington Road was already nearing capacity. In response, the Head of Development Services confirmed that the housing allocations in the Plan had been assessed and had taken account of existing permissions. During the consultation, Officers had spoken to many different agencies and the sites allocated had been included in consultation with County Highways. Referring to Page No. 56, site COO1, a Member questioned whether the allocation of 50 dwellings was correct and was advised that this was the figure the site had been assessed as being suitable for. There had recently been an application submitted for 40 dwellings in the area which had caused some confusion. Referring to sites in Brockworth – land adjacent to Golf Club Lane and at Nerva Meadows – a Member questioned why the site on the periphery of Coopers Edge was not being allocated for shops/facilities for the local people in Coopers Edge. In response, the Planning Policy Manager advised that both sites had already received a resolution to permit proposals for residential development and their allocation within the Borough Plan was in line with those permissions. The Officer indicated that, whilst he did not disagree with the view that facilities would be helpful, this did not change the fact that residential development had already been permitted and there had been no proposals submitted for shops etc. on the site.

- 28.8 Referring to the transport connections, a Member expressed the view that, whilst the ideas of better cycling provision and increased bus and train routes were laudable, there needed to be more detail around how they connected to each other. In response, the Planning Policy Manager advised that there were policies in the transport section of the Plan and it was expected that all development would provide connectivity for cycles/pedestrians and that this should be an integral part of the design of the development. Connectivity outside of the site was more difficult to control and the Council would have to work with the County Council, as the Highways Authority, and the emerging Transport Plan on that. It was not the role of the Borough Plan to detail the connections and the projects to be delivered as that fell to the Local Transport Plan which sat alongside the Borough Plan and the Joint Core Strategy. Officers were currently working with Officers at the County Council on the Local Transport Plan as there would be a refresh of the existing Plan up to 2023 after which there would be a wider review. The existing Plan would take on board the proposals and policies in the Borough Plan and the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of the Housing Needs Survey, the need in the Borough Plan came directly from the Joint Core Strategy as that set out the Council's housing requirement. The Housing Needs Survey was important when considering the need for rural provision and for the Neighbourhood Development Plans – this was dealt with by the housing team. In respect of gypsies and travellers, there were three sites allocated and for travelling showpeople there was one site to help meet the needs in the Joint Core Strategy. A Member questioned whether Bishop's Cleeve had already met local housing needs identified in its housing needs survey. In response, the Planning Policy Manager advised that he was unable to comment on specific locations but he would speak to the housing team to get that information.
- 28.9 The Borough Solicitor reminded Members that the current debate was on the amendment that site SHU4 be omitted from the Plan. A Member indicated that he had been on the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group for the past two years. The Plan had been through various iterations but was now at the final stage following a lot of hard work by Members and Officers. The issues had been thoroughly debated and a whole variety of questions had been concluded. He felt it would not be right to amend the Plan at this stage in accordance with individual interests which could run the risk of the Council not having a Plan at all and therefore being unable to prevent unregulated, speculative development. When the Council had approved the Preferred Options version of the Plan, those facts had been at the forefront of Members' minds and, since then, little had changed except the Council had less ability to demonstrate a housing supply. Shurdington had three sites available and the other two sites on their own did not meet the identified housing need of 141 which he felt met the test of exceptional circumstances for the allocation of SHU4 and its removal from the Green Belt. Another Member expressed concerns about the whole Plan; he felt it left Tewkesbury susceptible to flooding as it meant the area was surrounded by more and more housing. He was firmly of the view that there should be no building in flood zone 3 and that the Working Group should reconsider the Plan recognising the flooding concerns.
- 28.10 In summing up the amendment, the proposer drew attention to Page No. 22 – Paragraph 2.7 – which explained the situation regarding Shurdington and showed that there were no exceptional circumstances for the inclusion of site SHU4 or for taking it out of the Green Belt.

28.11 A recorded vote was requested and, upon receiving the appropriate level of support, voting was recorded as follows:

For	Against	Abstain	Absent
G J Bocking	R A Bird	D J Harwood	L A Gerrard
C L J Carter	G F Blackwell		M A Gore
C M Cody	K J Cromwell		P D Surman
M Dean	R D East		R J E Vines
J H Evetts	A Hollaway		P N Workman
P A Godwin	J R Mason		
D W Gray	A S Reece		
M L Jordan	J K Smith		
E J MacTiernan	V D Smith		
H C McLain			
P D McLain			
H S Munro			
J W Murphy			
P W Ockelton			
C Reid			
P E Smith			
R J G Smith			
C Softley			
R J Stanley			
S A T Stevens			
M G Sztymiak			
S Thomson			
M J Williams			

28.12 With 23 votes in favour, nine against and one abstention, this became the substantive motion. During the discussion which ensued, a Member indicated that he was conscious of the issues that caused most debate and the need to apply policies fairly and consistently while subjective terms such as 'major' and 'very small scale' made this difficult; he felt this particularly applied to RES4 – Page No. 69 – which sought to encourage new housing in rural settlements which was not covered

by other policies and where it discussed ‘very small scale’ he proposed what he considered to be a small and helpful addition to bullet point b) to read ‘it does not have an adverse cumulative impact on the settlement having regard to other developments permitted during the plan period **as a general rule no more than 5% growth or 10 dwellings, whichever is lesser, will be allowed;**’; this proposal was seconded. A Member of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group advised that the Group had debated the policy wordings at length and had agreed that it was better to be flexible to allow the policies to provide for all kinds of possibilities that could not be anticipated at this stage. It had been felt that a specific limit would be inequitable in a lot of cases therefore the addition of percentages did not make any sense. A number of Members agreed with the amendment as they felt it would enable affordable housing in areas where there would otherwise not be any due to the land prices which, in turn, would mean the villages had a community feel which they currently did not have. In offering some clarification, the Head of Development Services explained that the proposer of the amendment was stating that, allowing uncontrolled development, would disincentivise the rural exception sites for affordable housing. The general principle of the approach to provide limited growth in villages was supported by Officers and they had grappled with how to meet that objective whilst still protecting the built and natural environment. The proposal would not be unacceptable in planning terms but the Council would have to consider the implications of doing that as part of its growth. In response to a query about exception sites, the Planning Policy Manager explained that Policy RES6 allowed for development of affordable housing within/on the edge of settlements and that was the case regardless of the wording of RES4. Sites in accordance with RES6 could include some market housing for cross-subsidy but provided the opportunity to deliver affordable housing in areas that would not otherwise be allocated/permitted. A Member noted a typographical error at Page No.73 – RES6, bullet point c) a space was required between the words ‘site’ and ‘has’.

- 28.13 In summing up the amendment, the proposer hoped that Members could see the sense in the amendment as proposed as he felt the provision of affordable housing in the Borough was extremely important. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried and became the substantive motion.
- 28.14 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that the whole Plan be sent back to the Working Group to look at the land supply issues, the service villages and the safeguarded land more closely. In response, the Head of Development Services indicated that Officers and the Working Group Members considered the Plan to be sound for submission to the Inspector for examination following the consultation. There were always conversations and debates to be had in relation to the planning processes but it was important that the Council had a Plan in place and it was felt that the current Plan before Members could be robustly defended at examination. The Borough Solicitor clarified that this was a new proposal and could be voted upon after the amended substantive motion which was the recommendation on the paper without the inclusion of SHU4 and with the amendment to RES4.
- 28.15 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that WIN1 be removed from the Plan as there was no need for the site when the number allocated could be met through infill. The Planning Policy Manager advised that Winchcombe was constrained by the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which meant the growth expected had not occurred; through the Borough Plan, sustainable options for growth had been sought in the area of which this was one. The implications of not bringing sites forward would be that the local housing needs would not be satisfied. A Member felt it was not sensible to take sites out of the Plan on an ad-hoc basis and he felt the Working Group should be supported in the work it had undertaken. Another Member agreed with that view and felt the Council could not go on changing the Plan and that it should be agreed without delay. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment to remove WIN1 was lost.

- 28.16 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that the area of Healings Mill in the policy be amended so that the car park – which was in flood zone 3 – was not built upon. It was felt this would otherwise cause anxiety to residents in the area who feared the displaced water would affect them. In response, the Head of Development Services indicated that Healings Mill was important as it was recognised as a regeneration site; this did not mean the whole site would be developed, in fact that was very unlikely to be the case. It was felt that, overall, any development would offer significant improvements from a planning point of view as the site would be much more permeable and it was not anticipated the car park would be developed. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.
- 28.17 A Member proposed that, in light of the lack of housing land supply and deletions made against the Working Group's advice, Highnam be re-included as a service village to fulfil the shortfall and that development to the south-east and north-west of the village be considered. This amendment received no seconder.
- 28.18 It was proposed and seconded, that the allotment site at Bishop's Cleeve be removed from the Plan as it had been included after the last consultation which meant residents had not had the opportunity to comment on its allocation. The Planning Policy Manager acknowledged that Bishop's Cleeve had seen a lot of growth but indicated that the site in question was infilling between areas. In addition, it was within the settlement boundary and therefore the principle of development would already be acceptable and the site likely to come forward – Officer advice would be that it should be included and count towards the Borough's housing supply. A Member suggested the Council needed to consider the social impact on communities and the fact that it was infilling missed the point that residents were upset at the continual development in the area without the infrastructure to support it. The Head of Development Services indicated that it was important to understand that the Plan had taken two years to get a point where it was considered sound. Officers could fight for the Plan at examination, but a framework was needed to do that. The Council must not be at the mercy of developers and, without a Plan, Officers had very little opportunity to defend the Borough. The Plan could, and would, be reviewed in due course, as was the case currently with the Joint Core Strategy, but approval of the Borough Plan must be expedited so the Council did not continue to be in a vulnerable position. The strong advice of Officers was to take the Plan forward and submit it to the Secretary of State without delay. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment to remove the allotment site at Bishop's Cleeve was lost.
- 28.19 The substantive motion, to exclude site SHU4 and amend RES4, was put to the vote. A recorded vote was requested and, upon receiving the appropriate level of support, voting was recorded as follows:

For	Against	Abstain	Absent
R A Bird	C M Cody		L A Gerrard
G F Blackwell	D J Harwood		M A Gore
G J Bocking	H S Munro		P D Surman
C L J Carter	R J Stanley		R J E Vines
K J Cromwell	M G Sztymiak		P N Workman
M Dean			
R D East			

J H Evetts
P A Godwin
D W Gray
A Hollaway
M L Jordan
E J MacTiernan
J R Mason
H C McLain
P D McLain
J W Murphy
P W Ockelton
A S Reece
C Reid
J K Smith
P E Smith
R J G Smith
V D Smith
C Softley
S A T Stevens
S Thomson
M J Williams

28.20 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED

1. That the Pre-Submission version of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan be **APPROVED** under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as the version to be submitted, following consultation, to the Secretary of State for independent examination subject to:
 - a) the exclusion of site SHU4; and
 - b) additional wording at RES4 to read: ‘b) it does not have an adverse cumulative impact on the settlement having regard to other developments permitted during the plan period ***as a general rule no more than 5% growth or 10 dwellings, whichever is lesser, will be allowed;***’

2. That authority be delegated to Head of Development Services, in consultation with the Lead Member for Built Environment, to make necessary minor amendments prior to:
 - i) publication of the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan; and
 - ii) submission of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan for independent examination.

CL.29 AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19

29.1 The Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee for 2018/19 indicated that the report before Members, circulated at Pages No. 257-271, demonstrated that the role of the Committee was not only to look at finance which she felt was a common misconception. With that in mind, in order to raise the profile of the Committee, the name had been changed to include governance and the membership had been expanded from seven to nine. The Audit and Governance Committee received a variety of reports from different sources to give assurance that systems, procedures and policies were operating as they should be. Sources of assurance included the work of the Council's internal audit team, reports from the Council's external auditors, Gloucestershire Counter Fraud Unit and individual reports from Officers on governance related issues such as health and safety. During the year, the Committee had received a new risk register and she looked forward to Members getting 'under the skin' of those risks to gain assurance that they were being effectively managed. She explained that she was no longer the Chair of the Committee, but took the opportunity to update on a key outcome from the last meeting at which the Committee had been pleased to hear the external auditors had signed off the statement of accounts without any significant issues arising and were very complimentary of the work of the Council's finance team. The auditors had also been satisfied that the Council had proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources as well as referring to the implementation of a savings programme being approved within the Medium Term Financial Strategy in line with a previous audit recommendation.

29.2 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the Audit and Governance Committee Annual Report 2018/19 be **APPROVED**.

CL.30 HONORARY ALDERMAN

30.1 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED That an Extraordinary meeting of the Council be convened, on a date to be agreed, in order to confer the honour of Honorary Alderman upon former Councillors Allen, Awford, Berry, Davies, Day, Hillier-Richardson, Stokes and Waters.

CL.31 NOTICE OF MOTION - DECLARING A CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY

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

agreed that the Motion would be deferred.

- 31.2 A Member suggested that the motion be discussed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He explained that climate change was at the forefront of everyone's minds so it was appropriate to discuss it properly at Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider where the Council was and where it wanted to be. The Council was committed to a sustainable existence with garden communities being the epitome of sustainable living which he felt demonstrated that commitment. During the discussion which ensued, a number of Members suggested that, if the motion was deferred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, a special meeting should be called as a matter of urgency given the topic of motion and its importance. There was disappointment expressed by some that the decision was being put off to another meeting when it could easily have been considered at the current meeting. Tewkesbury Borough Council was already the last district in the County to have signed up to the motion and now it was still not confirming the importance of tackling climate change; it was felt that residents wanted to see action rather than more words. The Borough Solicitor confirmed that a special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could be called to consider the motion and that the Council would need to agree whether the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could decide upon the matter or whether it should make a recommendation back to Council.
- 31.3 A Member suggested that the motion should have input from the relevant Lead Members and deferring it to a Committee would offer that opportunity. The Council had a long tradition of working cooperatively and he would like that to continue. The proposer of the motion was disappointed that the Council had decided not to consider the motion at the current meeting. She was of the view that the country was in the middle of a climate change emergency and she was unsure why Members could not see that putting the decision off was not appropriate. Tewkesbury Borough was the only Council in the county not to have considered this motion which aimed to try and ensure a decent future for all; Stroud District Council was already carbon neutral and she felt Tewkesbury Borough should be following that lead. With 168 Councils already taking action it was no longer time to think but instead time to act and she was ashamed that Tewkesbury Borough was not being part of that movement. Other Members agreed with this view and felt the Council ought to be taking action as a matter of urgency rather than putting the matter off to an unspecified time.
- 31.4 A Member questioned whether the proposer of the motion could attend the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which considered it and, in response, the Borough Solicitor confirmed that, in accordance with the Council's rules, she could attend and speak but would not be able to vote. It was proposed and seconded that the motion be deferred to Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration at the earliest opportunity - preferably within two weeks - and that a recommendation be made back to Council.
- 31.5 Upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That, at the earliest opportunity, the motion be **REFERRED TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** for consideration and recommendation back to Council.

CL.32 SEPARATE BUSINESS

- 32.1 The Mayor 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.33 SEPARATE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Spring Gardens/Oldbury Road Regeneration

*(Exempt – Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972
– Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person
(including the authority holding that information))*

- 33.1 The Council considered the formal report from MACE Group Ltd and agreed the options to move forward for due diligence within the next phase of the scheme.

The meeting closed at 9:05 pm

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Council
Date of Meeting:	1 October 2019
Subject:	Notice of Motion On Climate Change
Report of:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	One

Executive Summary:

The Council's Constitution requires that, before a Notice of Motion is debated at a Council meeting, the Council must decide whether to discuss and determine it at that meeting or refer it without debate to a Committee for consideration. If the latter course of action is decided, then the Council must direct the Committee either to determine the Motion or consider it and make a recommendation back to Council.

At the meeting of the Council on 30 July 2019, a Notice of Motion on Climate Change was referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration and recommendation back to Council.

This report advises Council of the outcome of Overview and Scrutiny Committee's deliberations.

Recommendation:

To consider and determine the amended Notice of Motion proposed by Councillor Cody and seconded by Councillor Softley, as set out below:

That the Council:

- **Declare a "Climate Emergency".**
- **Commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council offices carbon neutral by 2030.**
- **Expand the remit of the existing Flood Risk Management Group to deal with climate change matters with the following delegations to the Borough Solicitor in consultation with the Group:-**
 - i) **preparation of revised Terms of Reference to include an audit of the Council's current position, an action plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, funding and promotion of good practice throughout the borough including buildings that provide a public service, such as the Tewkesbury Leisure Centre; and**
 - ii) **membership of the Group, taking account of its wider role.**
- **Call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.**

- **Commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.**
- **Report to Council by its meeting on 21 April 2020 at the latest with a detailed action plan for delivery.**

Reasons for Recommendation:

To comply with the Council's direction to consider the wording of the Climate Change Motion and make a recommendation back to Council.

Resource Implications:

The recommendation involves the expansion of the remit of an existing Working Group in order to avoid setting up a new Group requiring additional staff resources to support that Group. Any cost implications as a result of the action plan will be the subject of a further report.

Legal Implications:

None specifically arising from the consideration process of the Motion which is a matter of compliance with the Council's Constitution.

Risk Management Implications:

None specifically relating to the consideration process of dealing with a Notice of Motion but the subject of the Motion is very high profile on the national and international agenda.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The Motion sets out a series of actions with a report back to Council by the latest date of 21 April 2020. Progress to ensure this date is achieved will be monitored by the Working Group.

Environmental Implications:

Covered in the subject matter of the Motion.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 At the Council meeting on 30 July 2019, the following Notice of Motion was proposed and seconded:

Humans have already caused devastating climate change, the impacts of which are being felt around the world. Global temperatures have already increased by 1 degree Celsius from pre-industrial levels. Atmospheric CO₂ levels are above 400 parts per million (ppm). This far exceeds the 350ppm deemed to be a safe level for humanity;

In order to reduce the chance of runaway Global Warming and limit the effects of Climate Breakdown, it is imperative that we as species reduce our CO₂eq (carbon equivalent) emissions from their current 6.5 tonnes per year to less than 2 tonnes as soon as possible;

Individuals cannot be expected to make this reduction on their own. Society needs to change its laws, taxation, infrastructure, etc., to make low carbon living easier and the new norm;

Carbon emissions result from both production and consumption;

Tewkesbury Borough Council has already addressed the problem of single use plastics and has shown a strong commitment to recycling and sustainable transport but more needs to be done.

In Gloucestershire the consequences of no action include:

- Increased risk of flash flooding and the resulting damage to buildings, crops, farmland and infrastructure as a result of more extreme rainfall events.
- Health problems due to increased heat stress particularly for vulnerable adults and children.
- Increased costs associated with changes to crops and biodiversity.
- Higher energy costs.
- Crop failures associated with extreme heat, such as was experienced in 2018.

The County Council has already recognised more needs to be done and has created an additional cabinet role with responsibility for overseeing the authority's approach to prevention of, mitigation of, and adaptation of climate change.

The government believes that a shift to a very low carbon energy future represents the best course for the country's economic development while lowering the risk of fuel poverty and reducing air pollution.

In view of the above the Council is asked to:

- declare a "Climate Emergency".
- commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council carbon neutral by 2030, taking into account both production and consumption emissions.
- set up a Working Group consisting of seven Members of the Council (to be nominated at this evening's meeting) to prepare a long-term plan to achieve this, together with any initial budgetary requirements, to be reported back to the Executive Committee in October.
- call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.
- commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.

1.2 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Council determined that the Motion be deferred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration with a recommendation being referred back to Council.

2.0 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

2.1 A special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was convened to take place on 13 August to specifically consider the Notice of Motion on Climate Change that had been referred by Council.

2.2 The proposer and seconder of the Motion were present at the meeting and, although unable to vote, were given the opportunity to present their Motion to the Committee.

2.3 As part of the consideration process, the Chair suggested some amendments to the Motion as set out below aimed at providing clarity, a clear direction on the way forward and maximising and building upon existing arrangements:

The Council is asked to:

- Declare a “Climate Emergency”.
- Commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council **offices** carbon neutral by 2030 ~~taking into account both production and consumption emissions.~~
- ~~Set up a Working Group consisting of seven Members of the Council (to be nominated at this evening’s meeting) to prepare a long term plan to achieve this, together with any initial budgetary requirements, to be reported back to the Executive Committee in October.~~ **Expand the remit of the existing Flood Risk Management Group to deal with climate change matters with the following delegations to the Borough Solicitor in consultation with the Group:-**
 - i) preparation of revised Terms of Reference to include an audit of the Council’s current position, an action plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, funding and promotion of good practice throughout the borough including buildings that provide a public service, such as the Tewkesbury Leisure Centre; and***
 - ii) membership of the Group, taking account of its wider role.***
- Call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.
- Commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.

The proposer of the Motion indicated that she was prepared to accept these amendments and incorporate them within her Motion as she believed it was important to make a start and was keen to compromise in order to reach an agreement and move forward.

2.4 During the discussion which took place on the amended Motion, a Member expressed concern that 2030 was a long time to achieve carbon neutrality for one building but the Chair clarified that this was a target only and he was sure the Council would strive to achieve this as quickly as possible. In order to ensure that work was progressed as quickly as possible a further amendment was put forward, and accepted by the proposer of the Motion, to be included in her Motion as set out below:

- Report to Council by its meeting on 21 April 2020 at the latest with a detailed action plan for delivery.

2.5 The amended Motion, as set out in Paragraphs 2.3 and 4 above, now agreed by the proposer, received the unanimous support of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be recommended to Council for adoption.

2.6 A full copy of the approved Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are attached at Appendix 1 for information.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 Not applicable.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 Not applicable.

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

5.1 To form part of the audit to be undertaken should the Motion be approved.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

6.1 As above.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

7.1 As above.

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

8.1 As above.

9.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

9.1 As above.

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

10.1 Council on 30 July 2019.
Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Special) on 13 August 2019.

Background Papers: None.

Contact Officer: Head of Democratic Services Tel: 01684 272021
Email: lin.obrien@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: 1. Minutes of Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Special) on 13 August 2019.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 13 August 2019 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair	Councillor K J Cromwell
Vice Chair	Councillor J W Murphy

and Councillors:

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

also present:

Councillors G F Blackwell, C M Cody, M A Gore, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, C Reid, C Softley and S Thomson

OS.29 ANNOUNCEMENTS

29.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.

OS.30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

30.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C L J Carter, J K Smith and S A T Stevens. Councillors D W Gray and D J Harwood would be acting as substitutes for the meeting.

OS.31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

31.1 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.

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

OS.32 NOTICE OF MOTION - DECLARING A CLIMATE CHANGE EMERGENCY

32.1 The Chair advised that, at the meeting on 30 July 2019, the Council had referred the following motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in order to consider the wording and make a recommendation back to the Council meeting on 1 October 2019:

Humans have already caused devastating climate change, the impacts of which are being felt around the world. Global temperatures have already increased by 1 degree Celsius from pre-industrial levels. Atmospheric CO2 levels are above 400 parts per million (ppm). This far exceeds the 350ppm deemed to be a safe level for humanity;

In order to reduce the chance of runaway Global Warming and limit the effects of Climate Breakdown, it is imperative that we as species reduce our CO₂eq (carbon equivalent) emissions from their current 6.5 tonnes per year to less than 2 tonnes as soon as possible

Individuals cannot be expected to make this reduction on their own. Society needs to change its laws, taxation, infrastructure, etc., to make low carbon living easier and the new norm;

Carbon emissions result from both production and consumption;

Tewkesbury Borough Council has already addressed the problem of single use plastics and has shown a strong commitment to recycling and sustainable transport but more needs to be done.

In Gloucestershire the consequences of no action include:

- Increased risk of flash flooding and the resulting damage to buildings, crops, farmland and infrastructure as a result of more extreme rainfall events.
- Health problems due to increased heat stress particularly for vulnerable adults and children.
- Increased costs associated with changes to crops and biodiversity.
- Higher energy costs.
- Crop failures associated with extreme heat, such as was experienced in 2018.

The County Council has already recognised more needs to be done and has created an additional cabinet role with responsibility for overseeing the authority's approach to prevention of, mitigation of, and adaptation of climate change.

The government believes that a shift to a very low carbon energy future represents the best course for the country's economic development while lowering the risk of fuel poverty and reducing air pollution.

In view of the above the Council is asked to:

- Declare a "Climate Emergency".
- Commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council carbon neutral by 2030, taking into account both production and consumption emissions.
- Set up a Working Group consisting of seven Members of the Council (to be nominated at this evening's meeting) to prepare a long-term plan to achieve this, together with any initial budgetary requirements, to be reported back to the Executive Committee in October.
- Call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.
- Commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.

32.2

The Chair invited the proposer of the motion to address the Committee. The proposer of the motion indicated that she wished to begin with a definition of a climate emergency which referred to catastrophic changes to the world's climate caused by human activity and resulting in the loss of a safe climate, which threatened all life on earth. Science demonstrated that the earth had warmed, and was continuing to do so, resulting in serious consequences for the atmosphere, weather systems, human ability to produce food and for all people and species. She advised that the response related to tackling changing climate – taking action at a scale and speed that would restore a safe climate with the target being to provide maximum protection globally for all species and people. A safe climate would allow

existing and future generations, communities and ecosystems to survive and flourish. She went on to explain that current climate conditions were increasingly unsafe for a huge range of species, including millions of humans, and rapid transition to zero emissions across all sectors was required with technical solutions and appropriate political action.

- 32.3 She also wished to address carbon neutrality which related to zero carbon dioxide emissions via elimination or offsetting. She explained that carbon dioxide was released in processes associated with transport, energy production and agriculture / industry and, in order to achieve neutrality, this needed to be offset - for example, continuing to take the unnecessary flight but planting a forest in return - or eliminated - for instance, using renewable energy or greener modes of transport. Climate emergency declarations meant that carbon dioxide emissions would factor in all future decisions.
- 32.4 In order to combat the terrifying change of climate, everyone - both as individuals and as organisations, businesses, councils and governments - needed to make drastic changes but she pointed out that this did not have to be all about sacrifice, on the contrary, it could actually be a positive and wholesome realisation. The Borough of Tewkesbury was in many places exquisite, with Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, rivers, hills and woods and offered unique market towns, villages and communities framed by farming, leisure, tourism and technology – there was so much to nurture, enhance and protect; however, there was also poor public transport, severe traffic congestion, flooding, pollution, terrible cycling provision, environmentally inefficient houses and an awful lot more building on its way. She was certainly ambitious and up for the challenge and she was not alone – she had done this with her home and in business so why not the borough? She had been at the forefront of an international technology company achieving the business environmental standard ISO14001 and this had been done properly, without greenwash – the company had frequently been cited as showing best practice and various organisations, including the NHS, had used it as a model for much larger institutions. Taking into account diverse challenges, the remit had covered buildings, energy, transport, chemical reduction, materials reuse, recycling and waste - landfill had reduced by 94% and she was pleased to say that many of the initiatives actually saved money too. This had been achieved by changing business as usual and thinking outside the box, through policy changes, education and training, with strong support from leaders and senior managers and, most importantly, by the simple will to do it. She was not saying it would be easy and it would take dedication from a team of Councillors and Officers, plus a borough of inhabitants, many of whom were asking for radical change including nine year old Noah who felt so strongly that insufficient steps were being taken to protect his world that he had contacted her and they had gone on a school strike for climate change.
- 32.5 She stressed that the five other district councils in Gloucestershire, plus the County Council, had already passed climate emergency motions. Stroud District Council had achieved carbon neutrality as long ago as 2015 and Tewkesbury Borough Council could, and should, be following its lead. There was also excellence in other areas; Nottingham Council, for example, and around the globe, communities, councils and countries were leading with exemplary, exciting practices. People often asked her what motivated her to be so 'green', or why she cared so much about the planet, and her simple answer was that she was a mother - surely everyone wanted a decent future for their children. The priorities of elected representatives should be to care for and protect their communities, families, futures and the planet. Only a couple of weeks ago, the UK had recorded its highest temperature ever so there was no longer room for climate change deniers. The desperation to carry on without making protective provision was in itself dying; the evidence was evident and constituents were rightly demanding a rethink of local authority processes and governance. She advised that more than half of the UK's principal local authorities had now declared a climate emergency, making it one of

the fastest growing environmental movements in recent history. In the past eight months, 205 of the UK's 408 principal authorities had declared a climate emergency, with widespread support across political groups, committing them to take urgent action to reduce their carbon emissions at a local level. Many had set 2030 as a target date for going carbon zero in their boroughs, districts and cities. A lot had already started work, switching to renewable energy suppliers on their estates, building more energy efficient homes, planting trees and decarbonising transport. In her view, three simple steps were required: political will; a carbon reduction plan; and fundraising - in theory, local authorities could make bids to a host of organisations for project funding such as electric vehicle charging grants, pollution levies etc.

- 32.6 At Gloucestershire County Council in May, Members had unanimously voted through their climate emergency declaration. Tewkesbury Town Council would be declaring a climate emergency in September and there was already a Climate Change Action Group which had discussed energy, solar, recycling, insulation, water fountains / fill-up stations, plastic-free, community engagement, no mow, wildflowers, compost, wormery, bees, tree planting and wildlife mapping – all at its first meeting. The Local Government Association had declared a climate emergency at its Annual General Meeting in July and agreed to establish the Climate Emergency Network Special Interest Group to support councils and lobby central government. Stroud District Council had declared in November 2018 that it would achieve carbon neutrality by 2030 and the Forest of Dean District Council had done the same in December 2018; Cotswold District Council and Cheltenham Borough Council had both committed to carbon neutrality by 2030 in July 2019 and Gloucester City Council had made a similar commitment, albeit with a target of 2050, so the question remained, what would Tewkesbury Borough Council do?
- 32.7 She reiterated that the planet was facing catastrophic warming within its children's lifetimes, with large parts of the world uninhabitable and major food growing regions ruined by drought or rising seas. Climate warming was an existential risk to human civilisation and, on the current warming path, it was heading towards outright chaos. The failure of community and political leaders to talk about such concerns left unspoken fears lurking just below the surface of public life and the response to the climate crisis must be having the courage to match actions to the size of the problem.
- 32.8 The seconder of the motion indicated that she had little more to add but felt that everyone could agree that climate change was bigger than party politics and they all had a role to play. Tewkesbury Borough Council would be the last district council in Gloucestershire to declare a climate emergency but it still had an opportunity to lead the way. She was proud to second the motion and hoped the Committee would give it their full support.
- 32.9 In the absence of any questions from the Committee, the Chair indicated that he wished to propose an amendment which had been discussed with the proposer of the motion and aimed to provide clarification and a clear direction on the way forward as follows:
- The Council is asked to:
- Declare a "Climate Emergency".
 - Commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council **offices** carbon neutral by 2030 ~~taking into account both production and consumption emissions.~~

- ~~Set up a Working Group consisting of seven Members of the Council (to be nominated at this evening's meeting) to prepare a long term plan to achieve this, together with any initial budgetary requirements, to be reported back to the Executive Committee in October.~~ **Expand the remit of the existing Flood Risk Management Group to deal with climate change matters with the following delegations to the Borough Solicitor in consultation with the Group:-**
 - i) preparation of revised Terms of Reference to include an audit of the Council's current position, an action plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, funding and promotion of good practice throughout the borough including buildings that provide a public service, such as the Tewkesbury Leisure Centre; and*
 - ii) membership of the Group, taking account of its wider role.*
- Call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.
- Commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.

32.10 The proposer of the motion welcomed the suggestion to expand the remit of the Flood Risk Management Group and the inclusion of an audit of the Council's current position. Whilst she was disappointed that the remit had narrowed from Tewkesbury Borough Council to the Tewkesbury Borough Council offices, she believed it was important to make a start and she would be pleased if an agreement could be reached in order to enable that. A Member indicated that she understood the reasons for reducing the remit to the Council offices, notwithstanding this, she felt that 2030 was quite a long time to achieve carbon neutrality for one building. Whilst she accepted that it was unclear how long it would take, she felt that the timescales should be changed in order to do this as soon as practicable and before 2030. The Chair indicated that 2030 had been set as a target but he was sure everyone would strive to achieve this as quickly as possible. He clarified that the amendment to the motion would mean that the Flood Risk Management Group would look at the buildings where the Council had a direct influence, for example, the leisure centre and Tourist Information Centres as well as the Public Services Centre. In response to a query as to when the audit would be complete and a report taken to Council, the Deputy Chief Executive advised that, should the motion be agreed, a key role of the Working Group would be to look at the timescales based on what was achievable and to set out what the milestones might be in terms of delivery. The Member went on to question whether there were expertise within the Council to support the delivery of the motion and was advised that this would also be something for the Working Group to consider. Another Member queried whether the revised Terms of Reference for the Flood Risk Management Group would be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and was advised that the amended motion proposed that the revision of the Terms of Reference be delegated to the Borough Solicitor in consultation with the Flood Risk Management Group so it would essentially be for that Group to agree its Terms of Reference. This method was considered to be the most timely and effective way to proceed.

32.11 A further amendment was suggested to include a report to Council by its meeting on 21 April 2020 at the latest with a detailed action plan for delivery, which both the proposer and the seconder of the motion were happy to accept, and, upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

That it be **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL** that the Council:

- Declare a “Climate Emergency”.
- Commit to doing all in its power to make Tewkesbury Borough Council offices carbon neutral by 2030.
- Expand the remit of the existing Flood Risk Management Group to deal with climate change matters with the following delegations to the Borough Solicitor in consultation with the Group:-
 - i) preparation of revised Terms of Reference to include an audit of the Council’s current position, an action plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, funding and promotion of good practice throughout the borough including buildings that provide a public service, such as the Tewkesbury Leisure Centre; and
 - ii) membership of the Group, taking account of its wider role.
- Call upon central government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards the 2030 target.
- Commit to working with partners in Gloucestershire to achieve Countywide carbon neutrality aims.
- Report to Council by its meeting on 21 April 2020 at the latest with a detailed action plan for delivery.

The meeting closed at 5:00 pm

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted