

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 28 January 2020 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, L A Gerrard, 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, R J Stanley, S A T Stevens, P D Surman, M G Szymiak, S Thomson, R J E Vines, M J Williams and P N Workman

CL.53 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

53.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor C Softley.

CL.54 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

54.1 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.

54.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
P W Ockelton	Item 9(d) – Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Discounts.	Declaration made in accordance with Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of this item.
S A T Stevens	Item 9(d) – Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Discounts.	Declaration made in accordance with Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the meeting for the consideration of this item.

54.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

CL.55 MINUTES

55.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2019, and of the Extraordinary meeting held on 26 November 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.56 ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

56.2 The Mayor welcomed the Independent Remuneration Panel members to the meeting for Item 7 – Scheme of Member Allowances and indicated that a one minute silence would be held to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day.

CL.57 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

CL.58 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

58.1 The following questions had been received from Councillor Jordan to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Following a protracted dispute between a traveller family and Gloucestershire County Council/Tewkesbury Borough Council, have Gloucestershire County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council agreed on a strategy to solve this problem?

Answer 1:

The individual circumstances of this case are complex and had involved both Tewkesbury Borough Council and Gloucestershire County Council and a number of Parish Councils in the Borough which had been required to use their powers. Discussions had involved both the planning and housing advice service to seek suitable alternative solutions. The County Council was also doing what it could to ensure a place could be found for the family.

Question 2:

This issue, although complex, highlights the fact that the site allocation for travellers does not seem to be fit for purpose. What does Tewkesbury Borough Council propose doing to address that need?

Answer 2:

The adopted Joint Core Strategy set out the established needs for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Borough between 2016 and 2031. With planning permissions already granted since 2016, and the site allocations proposed in the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan, the full Joint Core Strategy needs for those who met the government's definition of a traveller had been satisfied, as required by the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Nevertheless, demand for additional pitches from individuals/families may occur in the plan period, outside of the identified need in the Joint Core Strategy. However, the Joint Core Strategy provided a criteria-based policy under which additional sites may be considered, through the planning application process, providing they were in accordance with

the plan's policies.

It was recognised that, county-wide, there was likely to be an additional need for separate public/affordable pitch provision, and how any public provision would be delivered and maintained. This issue was being explored jointly with the six Gloucestershire local authorities and the County Council and the need for any sites would be considered through the ongoing review of the Joint Core Strategy.

58.2 The Mayor invited supplementary questions and the Member asked the following:

Question 1:

Do Tewkesbury Borough Council and Gloucestershire County Council have an action plan/timetable for the actions identified in question and answer 1 above?

Answer 1:

It is difficult to provide a timetable due to the need to work with other authorities but more detailed information can be circulated following the meeting.

Question 2:

With regard to answer 2 above, whilst I am aware of the table of need identified for sites in the Tewkesbury Borough plan, I am unaware of the actual sites identified; could the locations of the suggested sites be emailed to all Councillors.

Answer 2:

The locations of the sites will be emailed to all Members.

58.3 The following questions were received from Councillor Ockelton to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Would the Lead Member for Built Environment please confirm the current January 2020 housing land supply for the authority and confirm the housing trajectory for the next two years?

Answer 1:

The five year housing land supply for the Borough was 4.33 years (for the period 2019/20 to 2023/24). This was as set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Position Statement (August 2019).

This position statement also provided the housing trajectory for the next five years. This only includes those sites granted planning permission as of 1 April 2019 and did not include the emerging Borough Plan sites.

The five year supply position would be recalculated following completion of the housing monitoring for 2019/20 which would start from 1 April 2020.

Question 2:

What is our Plan B if the Borough Local Plan Examination Inspector asks us to find more sites for housing?

Answer 2:

If an Inspector considered that there was a need to allocate further housing sites then it was likely that the examination would be suspended and the Council would be requested to consider what sites might be suitable and available for allocation.

To do this we may draw on sites that had been submitted through the last consultation period as being available for allocation. We may also refer to the sites that had been submitted to our Assessment of Land Availability.

Question 3:

Why was the A38/A40 Link Road, not pursued at the Innsworth appeal?

Answer 3:

No link road was proposed by the Appellant for the Innsworth scheme. Highways England and Gloucestershire County Council, as the respective highway authorities, assessed the proposals at application and appeal stage and at no point indicated that such a link road would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.

Question 4:

As the Joint Core Strategy is an equal partnership, how has Gloucester City managed to come up with brownfield sites for almost 1,000 houses as part of the recently published Gloucester City Plan. Can the Leader of the Council, Lead Member for Built Environment or Chief Executive provide assurances that further strategic scale development WILL NOT be sought at Twigworth, Innsworth, Longford, Churchdown, Brockworth or Down Hatherley in terms of the duty to co-operate with Gloucester City Council which clearly have more than adequate brownfield sites?

Answer 4:

The adopted Joint Core Strategy already made allowance for Gloucester allocating housing sites within its City Plan. Therefore, the sites within the recent City Plan consultation were already accounted for within the Joint Core Strategy supply and were not additional homes. It was not the role of the Joint Core Strategy to allocate smaller, non-strategic sites within the city and was always intended for the City Plan.

In the Joint Core Strategy, Gloucester's supply consisted of sites already built since 2011, those that already had planning permission, an allowance for small-scale windfall sites and capacity for sites to be brought forward in the City Plan. Even with these sources of supply, Gloucester could still not meet its needs and therefore strategic allocations on the edge of city, within Tewkesbury Borough, were required.

The Joint Core Strategy Review would need to consider again the needs of Gloucester beyond the current plan period (to 2031). In developing the plan, all reasonable alternatives had to be considered to determine the most sustainable approach to meet these needs. At this early stage of plan-making Officers were not in a position to state where that future development would be located or indeed rule out any particular areas.

58.4 The Mayor invited supplementary questions and the Member asked the following:

Question 1:

Can a detailed trajectory, a full list of housing sites, the number of properties and timescale for delivery be emailed to all Members?

Answer 1:

The five-year housing land supply is available on the website and can be emailed to all Members following the meeting.

Question 2:

Will Officers go back to Highways England and Gloucestershire County Council and insist that the vital A38/A40 link road was reinstated in its Road Investment Strategy (RIS 2)?

Answer 2:

The planning applications had been granted on appeal without the link road and neither Highways England nor Gloucestershire Highways had insisted on its inclusion. Given the planning status of the sites, it would be difficult to provide the link now so at this stage Officers could not promise it could be reinstated.

Question 3:

According to the Minutes of the Council meeting in October 2016, Gloucester City Council's capacity needed to be explored and it was felt that work needed to be done on that before the plan came back to the Council, this information had not come back to Council for its consideration – why not?

Answer 3:

Issues relating to Gloucester City Council's supply had been discussed throughout the life of the Joint Core Strategy and debated at the examination in public. Officers could not comment on the detail of the particular Minutes at this time but the sites had always been intended for the Gloucester City Plan not the Joint Core Strategy.

CL.59 SCHEME OF MEMBER ALLOWANCES

- 59.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 13-26, asked Members to determine a Scheme of Allowances to take effect on 1 April 2020 until 31 March 2021 having regard to the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel set out in its report at Appendix 1 Pages No. 17-18.
- 59.2 The Mayor invited the Chair of the Panel to address the Council. The Chair thanked the Council for inviting the Panel to introduce its report. He explained that, over the years, the Panel (with one new member having joined in the autumn) had met with a large number of Councillors and over the forthcoming year intended to speak to as many new Members as possible. He felt this was extremely important in helping them to understand the hard work and level of commitment shown by Members to both their local communities and the Council. The Panel had looked at the allowances nationally, across the County and at local level. In recent years, the Panel had increased Special Responsibility Allowances as well as introducing a new allowance for Support Members. Previously, the Panel had indicated that it could not suggest an increase in the Basic Allowance given that it was already consistently one of the highest in the country; however, the Panel understood that this was effectively a cut in real terms and felt that this continued approach was no longer sustainable. It was for that reason that a £150 per year increase in the Basic Allowance was recommended.
- 59.3 The Leader of the Council thanked the Panel for its hard work and proposed the recommendations as set out in the Panel's report at Appendix 1 to the report. The recommendation was seconded.
- 59.4 During the discussion which ensued, Members questioned whether there was a need for the Panel to review the allowances on an annual basis or whether it could be extended to two/three years and what the cost of the Panel meeting on an annual basis was. In response, the Panel Chair explained that the allowances did not have to be reviewed on an annual basis, indeed the Panel could recommend a scheme for a four-year period; however, the Panel felt it was able to offer better advice on an annual basis rather than over the longer term which would be based on a certain amount of speculation. In terms of costs, the Panel received a small retainer, paid on an annual basis, to ensure it was available for work on allowances at any time, this meant the costs would be the same no matter how frequently the

scheme was reviewed. In terms of the increase recommended, the Chair of the Panel indicated that, given the Council was in the top quartile of Basic Allowances paid in the country, it would be easy to recommend a freeze in allowances but actually, as the allowances had been the same for the last five years, in real terms Councillors had seen a cut – the recommended increase was very small given the inflation over that five-year period.

59.5 A Member thanked the Panel for its report but expressed the view that, given the Council's uncertain financial future, along with the fact that the Council's Basic Allowance was already one of the highest in the Country, a raise of £150 per year would not amount to much extra in a Councillor's income but would make a difference to the Council's budget. If anything, he felt the roles of Leader and Deputy Leader should see an increase rather than all Members. Another Member indicated that he would not support an increase in any of the Council's allowances – he expressed the view that a 2% increase was not the correct thing to do in the current financial uncertainty which was a view shared by a number of other Members.

59.6 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the Scheme of Member Allowances, with an increase in the Basic Allowance for all Members of £150 per year, as recommended at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED** with effect from 1 April 2020 until 31 March 2021.

CL.60 APPOINTMENT OF CIVIC HEADS FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR

Mayor

60.1 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED That Councillor Andrew Reece, be appointed Mayor for the ensuing Municipal Year.

Deputy Mayor

60.2 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED That Councillor John Murphy be appointed as Deputy Mayor for the ensuing Municipal Year.

CL.61 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Council Plan 2020-2024

61.1 At its meeting on 8 January 2020, the Executive Committee had considered the new Council Plan for 2020-2024 and recommended to Council that it be adopted subject to some of the more business-related photographs being replaced by photographs of tourism/environment related areas.

61.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 27-48 and Members were advised that the Council Plan document, attached to the current Agenda, included new photographs.

61.3 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation and thanked all Members for their involvement in the creation of the Plan which he felt neatly set out what the Council's priorities were for the period. The recommendation was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

- 61.4 A Member indicated that one of the opening photographs in the document was of the M5 motorway and she questioned whether that was how the Council wanted to promote the Borough; in response, the Head of Corporate Services indicated that he would take that comment away for consideration. Another Member questioned whether the garden town was in the right place given concerns about flooding and infrastructure. She hoped it would prove to be the first truly sustainable garden town but for that to happen the government needed to act with changes to planning laws etc.; she felt the Council should not be prevented from doing its best in that regard. She also expressed the view that, whilst the inclusion of sustainability in the document was a good start, and she thanked Officers for making the changes she has suggested, it must be clear that words were not enough and deeds had to follow. In supporting those comments, a Member advised that he felt the Council Plan did not go far enough in terms of the climate change emergency or sustainability – the clock was ticking and he felt the Council’s commitment to making a difference needed to be stronger. The County Council had a ten-point plan which it was working towards and he felt Tewkesbury Borough Council needed to have a commitment like that to tackling climate change. In terms of Tewkesbury Garden Town, he was also exceptionally concerned about the flood risk which would be brought to the existing Tewkesbury Town.
- 61.5 The Leader of the Council indicated that the Council Plan set out the Council’s priorities and specific reference had been made to flooding and climate change with one of the objectives being to work with the County Council in delivering its climate change agenda. It was a fact that the County Council had the authority and resources to take the lead on climate change, as such, the Council’s priority to support that work was the correct way forward. It was also necessary to bear in mind that the Council Plan was a ‘live’ document that would be revised throughout the four-year period to take out achievements and bring in new objectives.
- 61.6 Accordingly, it was
RESOLVED That the Council Plan 2020-2024 be **ADOPTED**.

Medium Term Financial Strategy

- 61.7 At its meeting on 8 January 2020, the Executive Committee had considered the Medium Term Financial Strategy and recommended to Council that it be adopted.
- 61.8 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 49-71.
- 61.9 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation which was seconded by the Vice-Chair. The Chair advised that this was the latest version of the Medium Term Financial Strategy which the Council was required to have to protect it for the next five years. Currently, the document was a best guess as there were many areas of the Council’s finances which were out of its control and the next 12-months would be a critical period.
- 61.10 Accordingly, it was
RESOLVED That the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2020/21-2024/25 be **ADOPTED**.

Treasury and Capital Management

- 61.11 At its meeting on 8 January 2020, the Executive Committee had considered a suite of reports in respect of Treasury and Capital Management and recommended to Council that the strategies and policies be adopted.
- 61.12 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 72-105.
- 61.13 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation which was seconded by the Vice-Chair.
- 61.14 A Member questioned why the 2021 debt was higher than in previous years. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that, in October, a report had been considered by the Council which approved further expenditure on the Council's commercial property portfolio; this anticipated £15,000 spend in the current year and the rest the year after which was what the figure in the report related to. In terms of checks and balances on the spend of that funding, Members were advised that the Commercial Investment Strategy set out how the investments were made. Treasury advisors were used to undertake due diligence and make recommendations and the Commercial Investment Board was made up of six Members who supported the decision-making process.
- 61.15 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED** That the following strategies and policies be **ADOPTED**:
- Capital Investment Strategy 2020/21.
 - Investment Strategy 2020/21.
 - Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2020/21.
 - Treasury Management Strategy 2020/21.
 - Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Policy 2020/21.

Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Discounts

- 61.16 At its meeting on 8 January 2020, the Executive Committee had considered the Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Discounts and recommended to Council that the default Council Tax Reduction Scheme be adopted to be effective from 1 April 2020 with a minor revision to the national working age regulations to allow for a de minimis tolerance for income changes; that authority be delegated to the Head of Finance and Asset Management, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management, to agree the uprating of the working age regulations incorporated into the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme in line with those announced by the Department for Work and Pensions; and that the following Council Tax discounts be effective from 1 April 2020:
- The discount for unoccupied and substantially unfurnished properties was 25% for a maximum period of six months.
 - The discount for properties which are vacant and require major repair work to render them habitable is 25% for a maximum period of 12-months.
 - The discount for unoccupied furnished properties (second home) is zero.
 - An empty homes premium of an additional 100% is levied on properties that have remained unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than two years.

- An empty homes premium of an additional 200% is levied on properties that have remained unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than five years.

61.17 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 106-115.

61.18 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation which was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

61.19 Referring to Page No. 107, a Member welcomed the fact that claimants would not need to be continually reassessed; however, he questioned whether £10 was the maximum allowed or whether there was any flexibility. In response, the Revenues and Benefits Manager explained that the team had explored many options but the recommended way forward would make Tewkesbury Borough consistent across Gloucestershire.

61.20 Accordingly, it was

- RESOLVED**
1. That the default Council Tax Reduction Scheme be **ADOPTED** to be effective from 1 April 2020 with a minor revision to the national working age regulations to allow for a de minimis tolerance for income changes.
 2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Finance and Asset Management, in consultation with the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management, to agree the uprating of the working age regulations incorporated into the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme in line with those announced by the Department for Work and Pensions.
 3. That the following Council Tax discounts be **ADOPTED** to be effective from 1 April 2020:
 - The discount for unoccupied and substantially unfurnished properties is 25% for a maximum period of six months.
 - The discount for properties which are vacant and require major repair work to render them habitable is 25% for a maximum period of 12 months.
 - The discount for unoccupied furnished properties (second home) is zero.
 - An empty homes premium of an additional 100% is levied on properties that have remained unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than two years.
 - An empty homes premium of an additional 200% is levied on properties that have remained unoccupied and substantially unfurnished for more than five years.

CL.62 PROPOSED COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACTION TO SUPPORT DELIVERY OF THE PROPOSED WEST CHELTENHAM DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

62.1 The report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 116-123, detailed proposed compulsory purchase action to support the delivery of the proposed West Cheltenham Development Scheme which Members were asked to agree in principle.

62.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the adopted Joint Core Strategy had allocated land at West Cheltenham, Policy A7, for approximately 1,100 homes and 45 hectares of employment land to be focussed upon a cyber security hub. Significant progress had been made regarding the comprehensive development of the allocation, including a masterplan and acquiring Garden Community status etc., and the report therefore sought a resolution for a Compulsory Purchase Order to be used, if necessary, to support the delivery of that development. This would be an 'in principle' decision at this stage as the power was only to be used as a last resort.

62.3 The recommendation, as set out on page No. 117, was proposed and seconded and, accordingly, it was

RESOLVED

1. That, in principle, for reasons set out in the report, the Council may need to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire the land within the area described in the report and shown edged red on the plan attached at Appendix 1 to:
 - a) secure delivery of the West Cheltenham development and its housing and job-creation objectives;
 - b) facilitate the development of the site in partnership with an appointed developer by assembling the land interests within a reasonable timeframe and at a reasonable cost; and
 - c) contribute to the promotion and improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of the Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Boroughs.
2. That the Deputy Chief Executive undertake any preparatory work required for the compulsory purchase order process in collaboration with Cheltenham Borough Council and noting that, as an outcome of this preparatory work, if it is necessary and appropriate, for one or more compulsory purchase orders to be made, that a further report will be taken to Council seeking approval to the making of an Order.

CL.63 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

63.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 124-127, set out the proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2020/21. Members were asked to adopt the Schedule as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

63.2 The Leader of the Council proposed that the Schedule be adopted. Upon being seconded, it was

RESOLVED

That the Schedule of Meetings for 2020/21, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED**

CL.64 ROYAL GARDEN PARTY

64.1 It was

RESOLVED That Councillor Mary Jordan and guest accompany the Mayor and his guest as the Council's nominees at the Royal Garden Party in May 2020.

64.2 It was agreed that Councillor Paul Smith be nominated as a reserve to attend in the event that Councillor Jordan should be unable to make the date.

CL.65 NOTICES OF MOTION**Notice of Motion - Review of Delegated Planning Powers to Officers**

65.1 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 considered at the current meeting.

65.2 In explaining her reasoning for presenting the Motion, the proposer indicated that she understood Officers would be bringing forward a review of the Statement of Community Involvement and the Planning Scheme of Delegation and, subject to receiving an assurance that this was the case, she was prepared to withdraw the Motion. The Head of Development Services confirmed that a review of the Statement of Community Involvement in plan-making and development control matters and the Planning Scheme of Delegation were in the Development Services service plan for 2020/21.

65.3 Accordingly, the Notice of Motion was **WITHDRAWN** by the proposer and seconder.

Notice of Motion - New Primary School in Bishop's Cleeve

65.4 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 considered at the current meeting.

65.5 The Motion, as set out on the Agenda, was proposed and seconded.

65.6 The proposer of the Motion explained that the intention was to try and address issues with primary school provision in Bishop's Cleeve which had arisen as a consequence of development in the area. The Member understood that education was a County Council responsibility but she felt that Tewkesbury Borough Council had a responsibility to help the County Council achieve the best for residents of the Borough. Bishop's Cleeve had grown significantly in size in recent years with a lot of the new development being in the north of the village. There were three existing primary schools in the south and east all within 0.5 miles of each other; there was also a secondary school in the south. This meant that in the north there were no schools at all. The County Council had increased capacity in the existing primary schools but there had been an error in the calculations for school numbers which meant the area actually required another primary school for the amount of

development. There were concerns that the same error could also have been made in other areas of the Borough which would need to be considered. The County Council had undertaken an options appraisal and this favoured a site known as land at Kayte Lane but this was also in the south side of the village which meant children as young as four years old would have no choice but to walk two miles to school every day. It was felt strongly that schools should be located within walking distance of new development and it was hoped that Tewkesbury Borough Council, working closely with the County Council, could achieve the best outcome for residents. The seconder of the Motion agreed with the comments made and felt that, whilst this was an urgent consideration for Bishop's Cleeve, it was something that could potentially affect many other communities across the Borough. He also explained that the County Council's own policy stated that schools should be in the heart of development which the suggested site clearly was not. In addition, the proposed site was an existing playing field and he felt this should remain a field. Air pollution and the climate emergency faced surely meant that children should be able to walk to school rather than having to be driven when it was really not necessary.

- 65.7 In a bid to gain cross-party support, the proposer and seconder indicated that they wished to withdraw paragraph 2 of their Motion: "Investigate as a matter of urgency the suitability of sites in the area for local school provision".
- 65.8 A Member felt the issue was one that was Boroughwide rather than just in Bishop's Cleeve and, as such, he proposed an amendment to paragraph 1 that "the Council confirm its continued support for the provision of adequate school places across Tewkesbury Borough, noting the County Council's own policy that any such primary schools should be within walking distance of most of the new developments". The seconder of the original Motion expressed concern that this lost the sense of urgency which the Motion was intended to purvey in terms of the school provision in Bishop's Cleeve and questioned whether the amendment could include a line that "priority be given to the most urgent settlements".
- 65.9 It was suggested that a short adjournment would help ensure all parties were happy with the wording of the Motion.
- 65.10 The meeting resumed at 7.35pm with the same membership present.
- 65.11 The proposer and seconder of the original Motion, again in a bid to gain cross-party support, accepted the proposed amendment which became the substantive Motion for debate.
- 65.12 A Member welcomed the Motion and was pleased an agreement had been reached. He understood this was a specific issue in Bishop's Cleeve but one which could affect the whole Borough. He also felt it was important to note that representatives at both the Borough Council and County Council were committed to seeing the provision of primary school education was appropriate for the needs of the community. Another Member agreed with this view and felt the Motion brought genuine value to what Tewkesbury Borough Council could do to affect school provision given that it was ultimately a County Council responsibility. He felt it should be noted that the School Place Planning Strategy made reference to the closure/amalgamation of small village/rural schools and he felt the Council needed to be mindful of this as there may be a need to establish sustainable transport from outside of the immediate walking area.

65.13 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the amended Notice of Motion be **AGREED** as follows:

1. The Council confirms its continued support for the provision of adequate school places across Tewkesbury Borough, noting the County Council's own policy that any such primary schools should be within walking distance of most of the new developments.
2. That the Council works with the County Council, and any other interested party, to find a solution that works for everyone.

CL.66 SEPARATE BUSINESS

66.1 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.67 SEPARATE MINUTES

67.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.68 JOINT WASTE PARTNERSHIP - STAFFING AND CURRENT POSITION

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

68.1 Members considered and approved the new staffing structure in connection with the Council's Joint Waste arrangements.

The meeting closed at 7:50 pm