

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 22 June 2021 commencing at 6:30 pm

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Deputy Mayor

Councillor A S Reece
Councillor J W Murphy

and Councillors:

K Berliner, R A Bird, G F Blackwell, 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, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, H C McLain, P D McLain, H S Munro, P W Ockelton, C Reid, P E Smith, R J G Smith, V D Smith, C Softley, R J Stanley, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, S Thomson, R J E Vines and M J Williams

CL.13 ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

CL.14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

14.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L A Gerrard, J K Smith and P N Workman.

CL.15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

15.1 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.

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

CL.16 MINUTES

16.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2021, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.17 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

17.1 There were no items from members of the public.

CL.18 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

18.1 The following question had been received from Councillor Cody to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answer was given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but was taken as read without discussion.

Specifically referring to Planning Application 21/00039/ENFB - Part Parcel 8917, Tewkesbury Road, Coombe Hill, Gloucester, planning permission was given to this application with the specific condition that ancient hedgerow was not to be removed.

Following the removal of the hedge, the Council's response that the situation is disappointing - but that it has been satisfactorily appeased by the promise of planting a new hedge - surely misses the point.

Ancient hedges cannot simply be replaced by new - not only do these take years to establish, but the current wildlife is stripped of its habitat and quite often these hedges and trees are not watered or cared for properly and die anyway. In addition to the ecological damage, there is also the immorality and the avoidance of any sanction which set precedent for others to do the same elsewhere.

The approved plans indicate that the eastern hedgerow running parallel with the A38 was due to be altered in order to incorporate the new highway access and its visibility splays and the relocation of the existing north bound bus stop. Altered does not mean removed.

Question:

What is the point of planning permission and conditions associated with them if they can just be blatantly ignored?

Answer:

Where appropriate, Officers will seek the retention of trees and hedgerows on development sites through the application process although this is not always possible.

The approved plans for the development adjacent to the Swan public house indicated that the eastern hedgerow, running parallel with the A38, was due to be altered in order to incorporate the new highway access and its visibility splays and the relocation of the existing north bound bus stop. The County Archaeologist was consulted as part of the application and did not identify any ancient hedgerows on the site.

Given the proximity of the pre-existing hedgerow to the carriageway this could only realistically be achieved by removing the hedgerow. A replacement hedgerow will be secured through the approval of the landscaping plan – this new hedge will enjoy protection for at least five years following completion of the development.

The clearance of the site was overseen by a qualified ecologist. Officers were advised that vegetation and boundary hedgerows were thoroughly checked but no nesting birds were discovered. Other wildlife checks were also carried out.

18.2 The Mayor invited the Member to ask a supplementary question. The Member indicated that she had no supplementary question on this occasion.

18.3 The following questions had been received from Councillor Munro 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:

At Council in January 2020, an assurance was given that the planning Scheme of Delegation would be reviewed in 2020/21. At Council in February 2021, in response

to a question on when this review was to be scheduled, the minuted response was that this was not currently scheduled to be reviewed. Officers are asked to confirm that the review will be scheduled as per the assurance given at Council in January 2020, the anticipated date for this review and what needs to happen for this review to take place.

Answer 1:

The email sent to all Members on 21 September 2020 by the Head of Development Services set out the position regarding the review of the Scheme of Delegation, which has yet to be progressed further. It is anticipated that the review will be included within the Development Services Service Plan for 2022/23. It is at that stage that the details and timeline for the review will be assessed and confirmed.

Question 2:

At the same meeting of Council in January 2020, assurance was given to review the Statement of Community Involvement. It is understood that the brief for this work is finalised and that consultants are expected to be appointed by the end of July. Please can this be confirmed or, if the timetable has slipped, Members updated with the current position.

Answer 2:

The Planning Policy Team is on target to appoint consultants by the end of July, with consultation anticipated to commence in October followed by adoption of a revised Statement of Community Involvement in March 2022.

18.4 The Mayor invited the Member to ask a supplementary question. The Member asked the following and the Lead Member advised that a written response would be provided outside of the meeting:

1. Is the review of the Planning Scheme of Delegation a priority for the Council?
2. Will Members be involved in the review of the Scheme of Community Involvement?

18.5 The following question had been received from Councillor Thomson to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answer was given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but was taken as read without discussion.

Across our borough, residents are concerned at the delays in delivering S106 infrastructure such as parks, cycle paths, sports facilities or community buildings. It's unacceptable for residents to have to wait so long for infrastructure given that a priority of this administration is to 'support infrastructure and facilities delivery to enable sustainable communities'.

Question:

We would like to thank the Officers for the work they have put in place so far to ensure our communities receive the correct infrastructure, but would like to ask the administration why they have allowed S106 project delivery, and the monitoring of S106 agreements, to slip so far behind and what steps the administration will take to ensure this is resolved.

Answer:

S106 agreements are legal commitments by developers, and Tewkesbury Borough Council works to ensure that developers deliver on their obligations within the planning and legal requirements. Where there are non-specific S106 sums for community facilities there is a clear procedure in place for expressions of interest from community groups to be considered by the Council. The most recent expressions of interest were considered in early June at this meeting three bids were considered and agreed.

Some of the S016 infrastructure requirements such as cycle paths are the

responsibility of the County Council. The Council's Community Development Officers work closely with communities on the provision of community infrastructure, and we are very grateful to Parishes and communities for working with us on these issues.

In the last year, the Council employed a temporary resource to start moving across S106 agreements onto a new computer system. In recognition of the importance of S106 and its impact upon the communities across the Borough, the Council has allocated funds to employ a S106 Monitoring Officer. This role will shortly be advertised. The role will put improved processes in place regarding S106 monitoring. Once the system is up to date, it will also enable reports to be run providing information on the status of S106 for developments and access to these reports will be available to Borough Councillors for their particular wards.

- 18.6 The Mayor invited the Member to ask a supplementary question. The Member asked the following and the Lead Member advised that a written response would be provided outside of the meeting:

Why have the administration allowed delivery and monitoring of community infrastructure to slip so far behind?

CL.19 CONSIDERATION OF A PETITION REQUESTING THAT THE COUNCIL INSTIGATES A FULL TRANSPARENT REVIEW OF PLANNING AND WATER MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR THE AREA OF ASH LANE AND DOWN HATHERLEY LANE IN DOWN HATHERLEY.

- 19.1 The Mayor welcomed the representative of the petitioner and invited her to present the petition to the Council. She thanked Members for the opportunity to speak. She indicated that Tewkesbury Borough Council promised good quality of life for all residents, however, the residents of Ash Lane and Down Hatherley Lane felt the development taking place in the area showed no consideration for their quality of life, which was in serious jeopardy, and they were looking to the Council to address that and help them to continue to live in a safe and sustainable neighbourhood. The signatories to the petition felt that developers were being allowed to treat the community with disrespect and avoid having to invest in the infrastructure to ensure development was fit for purpose or that the area was safe from flooding and drainage problems.

- 19.2 She highlighted three issues of concern. Firstly, development was being approved in a piecemeal way which allowed developers to avoid contributing to overall infrastructure. The Regulation 2 stage process avoided the need to consider the infrastructure impacts that developments of ten or more dwellings would require and she questioned what the strategic plan was to govern that situation as it ran counter to the Down Hatherley Neighbourhood Development Plan and was not good for the community. Secondly, she questioned why the usage of a private road, which residents paid for, had not been included in the planning process – in fact residents had been told they were not a consideration for planning applications and she wondered how the Council could develop an approach which acted in the collective interest rather than ignoring residents. Lastly, she felt flooding concerns were being ignored. Last winter, Ash Lane had suffered more from flooding and backed up sewers than ever before as had Down Hatherley Lane. This all coincided with local development and would be exacerbated as the effects of climate change continued. There was evidence in the Twigworth and Down Hatherley Flood Watch Group report which spelt that out and it was suggested that needed to be reflected in any plans for the area. She asked that an Officer carry out investigations and liaise with local residents and the Parish Council, which could be arranged through the petition organiser, to look into all immediate issues and pick up the specific issues highlighted in the second petition which was being considered by the Council to address flooding risks and, in the meantime, to agree an interim policy restricting

further approvals. She felt the Council needed to find a means of restricting further development so that quality of life, rather than greed, was placed at the top of the agenda.

- 19.3 The Head of Development Services thanked the petitioners for highlighting the issues. In presenting her report, she explained that the Council had a Joint Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan. It had a duty to consider planning applications so could not refuse to deal with them. Concern had been expressed by Ash Lane residents in connection with legal status and the fact that it was a private road was not a material consideration that could be taken into account. It was perfectly possible to apply for planning consent on land which was not within an applicant's control so that could not be considered. In terms of flooding issues, Officers had met with Flood Watch representatives who had requested a detailed review of water management policies and she confirmed that the Council would be reviewing those as part of the JCS review. The Council was not proposing to allocate anymore strategic sites until the review of the JCS was complete. She was happy to work with residents and consider any information they had as part of the JCS review process.
- 19.4 A Member proposed that the Council thanked the petitioners for bringing the matters to the Council's attention and requested Officers to have a meeting with representatives of the petitioners to understand their concerns; and consider the planning issues raised by the petition as part of the review of the Joint Core Strategy. The proposal was seconded.
- 19.5 During the discussion which ensued, a Member indicated that the particular area being discussed was fairly unique, with sensitive issues, and it was the Council's duty to send an Officer to talk to the community and identify any issues that could be dealt with for them. Another Member agreed that the proposal was a positive way forward and he thanked the Flood Watch Group for its work in bringing the petition forward. He also indicated that he was aware the County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, was working with Severn Trent Water and the Environment Agency to understand contributing factors to the last flood event.
- 19.6 Another Member felt the proposal fell short of a full transparent review of the Council's water management policy and he would like to see that undertaken as part of the investigations. He also asked that Members be informed of the outcome of conversations, as well as the views of the petitioners, when they were discussed. A Member agreed and noted that the issues raised in the petition were legitimate for many areas not just Twigworth and Down Hatherley this meant lessons also needed to be learnt and applied to the rest of the Borough. It was further suggested that, when Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers met with the petitioners, it would be helpful if the County Council and Severn Trent were involved in the conversation.
- 19.7 Accordingly, it was
- RESOLVED** That, the Council thanks the petitioners for bringing these matters to the Council's attention and requests Officers to:
- a. have a meeting with representatives of the petitioners to understand their concerns; and
 - b. consider the planning issues raised by the petition as part of the review of the Joint Core Strategy.
- 19.8 The Mayor thanked the representative for her time and invited her to watch the remainder of the meeting from the public gallery.

CL.20 CONSIDERATION OF A PETITION REQUESTING THAT THE COUNCIL REDUCE FLOODING, EXAMINE FLOOD RISK IN DETAIL BEFORE ALLOCATING MORE DEVELOPMENT SITES

- 20.1 The Mayor welcomed the representative of the petitioner to present to the Council.
- 20.2 The representative explained that the petition was put together in the communities and collected the required number of signatures to force a Council debate almost immediately which was impressive during lockdown. He knew the Council was well aware of the flooding specifics and strength of feeling in the community but the petition reflected concerns the community had regarding shortfalls due to the limitations of the Environment Agency, the impact of climate change and the lack of cohesive protections in the Inspector's modified JCS piecemeal approach and there was now flooding to dwellings which had not flooded in 2007. The representative felt the Council not only owed a duty of care to residents but also to those who may be affected in the future if the Council did nothing or put off doing something. By adopting the petition, and agreeing to commission a cumulative food risk assessment, it not only supported affected residents but also demonstrated the Council's commitment to providing protection to all residents in the Borough. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that "strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources" and government guidance on "how to prepare a strategic flood risk assessment" stated that Councils may need to review a strategic flood risk assessment when there were changes to the predicted impacts of climate change on flood risk, the forecasts had changed or there were changes to the Local Plan, spatial development strategy or relevant local development documents. In addition, even at the lowest level 1 strategic flood risk assessment should also include a supporting report with information on the cumulative impacts of development, expected effects of climate change, opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding and recommendations on how to address flood risk in development; it also stated that "you may need to commission new or updated modelling if climate change allowance (predicted effects of climate) in the model was not in line with current climate change allowances" and those were now recognised as higher than those at the time of the original JCS. JCS policy INF2 stated that "development proposals must avoid areas at risk of flooding, in accordance with a risk-based sequential approach. Proposals must not increase the level of risk to the safety of occupiers of a site, the local community or the wider environment either on the site or elsewhere. For sites of strategic scale, the cumulative impact of the proposed development on flood risk in relation to existing settlements, communities or allocated sites must be assessed and effectively mitigated". The petition raised points that would support the Council in achieving that and should contribute towards alleviating some of the problems currently being seen. One example was the Innsworth A40 gateway project where a watercourse was blocked during construction and was working with a lack of drainage consent and monitoring of conditions; that work had been highlighted in the Environment Agency guidance. Addressing the action called for by the petition would provide the Council with an evidence base that could be used in the determination/conditions for specific sites. He felt this was especially important for a Council that had declared a climate emergency and should be leading by example. The petition highlighted the Council's commitment to take flood risk to a higher level ensuring it raised the bar in that critical area and was something the Council could not afford not to do and he hoped Members could support the petition.
- 20.3 The Head of Development Services was invited to present the Officer report to the Council. She explained that, as required by the NPPF, the Council would be undertaking strategic flood risk assessments when determining strategic sites to be allocated and this would be done as part of the JCS review. This was to be

produced in accordance with government guidance and involved working with key agencies taking climate change into account. This meant the Council would be undertaking the work requested by the petition. The strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken by specialist consultants so, whilst Officers were not clear which maps the Environment Agency used, they would be involved as a key body in any flood risk work. A number of Members expressed the view that the Environment Agency maps were not accurate and in 2007 there were some areas flooded which were still not shown on the flood maps.

- 20.4 A Member proposed, and it was seconded, that the Council thank the petitioners for bringing the matters to its attention. The identification of strategic site allocations would be informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, prepared as part of the review of the Joint Core Strategy, and Officers would be requested to ensure the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment included a detailed pluvial and fluvial flood risk assessment, to include cumulative impacts, climate change, other influencing factors and all development completed, planned or projected (including major infrastructure projects) since 2014 and that it is commissioned prior to allocating any new sites; consult relevant agencies and Parish Councils to give them an opportunity to present their local evidence for consideration as part of the work carried out in respect of the Flood Risk Assessment referred to above; and consider what mechanisms were available to enable flood mitigation requirements to be imposed during the construction phase of development. The seconder was pleased that the proposal was covering all types of flooding, including pluvial and fluvial, as he felt this was very important. Another Member noted that flooding in homes was something that really needed to be looked at in a different way as reference to a one in 100 year or one in 30 year flood event etc. meant nothing to most people; however, the statistic that every property had a 63% chance of flooding was very stark.
- 20.5 Referring to his support of the motion proposed, a Member felt there was a real problem with development making flooding worse in some areas and developers needed to be stopped so speculative development was no longer taking place in areas which were unsuitable and he felt the Council needed to take an urgent look at its policies to try and stop those issues. Another Member agreed and felt mistakes from the past must be learned from ensuring that good sites were not stopped from being developed in favour of 'damper' areas. It was suggested that local residents and Members had a lot of helpful knowledge about where places flooded and where they did not and this should be used to help inform development areas. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that the Council would have to undertake a strategic flood risk assessment as one of the key pieces of evidence for site allocations which would have to be submitted as part of the examination. In terms of specific issues regarding flooding, those were looked at by the Climate Change and Flood Risk Management Group with the strategic flood risk assessments being addressed formally and informally through the various Working Groups and Committees of the Council.
- 20.6 Upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the Council thanks the petitioners for bringing the matters to its attention. The identification of strategic site allocations would be informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, prepared as part of the review of the Joint Core Strategy and Officers would be requested to:
- a. ensure that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment included a detailed pluvial and fluvial flood risk assessment, to include cumulative impacts, climate change, other influencing factors and all development completed, planned or projected (including major infrastructure projects) since 2014 and that it is commissioned prior to allocating any new

sites;

- b. consult relevant agencies and Parish Councils to give them an opportunity to present their local evidence for consideration as part of the work carried out in respect of the Flood Risk Assessment referred to in a. above; and
- c. consider what mechanisms were available to enable flood mitigation requirements to be imposed during the construction phase of development.

CL.21 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Treasury and Capital Management

- 21.1 At its meeting on 3 March 2021, the Executive Committee had considered a range of policies, strategies and statements in respect of the Council's treasury and capital management. It had recommended to Council the adoption of the Capital Strategy 2021/22; the Investment Strategy 2021/22; the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2021/22; the Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22; and the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Policy 2021/22.
- 21.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 45-77.
- 21.3 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation and the Vice-Chair seconded it.
- 21.4 A Member noted that the Council was in extremely difficult times financially and she questioned whether there were any plans for Member seminars in 2022/23 to help Members understand the specific detail of the policies. The Head of Finance and Asset Management agreed that many of the financial reports the Council had to make were very complicated and he was happy to provide Members with specific training if they needed it, as well as providing information sessions for all Members as necessary. Another Member agreed that approach would be helpful as Councillors could never be too informed. In respect of Page No. 47, Paragraph 2.5, the Member advised that the Treasury Management Strategy talked about investment income and interest being higher than income. He understood the Council was gaining a positive return on investment income so asked for clarification. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that this referred to the money invested from cash balances and the money borrowed from capital investments; he was happy to provide training on elements like that as well should Members so wish.
- 21.5 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED

That the following be **ADOPTED**:

- The Capital Strategy 2021/22.
- The Investment Strategy 2021/22.
- The Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2021/22.
- The Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22.
- The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Policy 2021/22.

CL.22 ANNUAL STATE OF THE BOROUGH REPORT

22.1 The Leader of the Council was invited to make his State of the Borough presentation which covered the following key points:

- Our COVID response - the Council had responded very quickly and efficiently to the demands of the pandemic on its community – the Leader of the Council felt the structure put in place by the Council had been second to none and he thanked all Officers involved for their hard work in delivering it; the Council had supported local businesses to gain access to government COVID-19 support grants – with more than £30 million awarded to over 1,500 local businesses since March 2020; businesses had been supported throughout the pandemic through the Growth Hub – including around 100 webinars to more than 360 attendees – topics included online marketing, video development, social media and goal setting; the Council had provided support to reopen the high streets and retail centres across the Borough through a range of promotion activity funded by the Reopening High Streets Safely Fund; the Council had worked with community groups to provide a winter grant scheme which had helped 556 vulnerable families struggling to pay for food, essential supplies and fuel costs; a COVID-19 microsite had been built and maintained so information was easier to access and digest; the countywide response and recovery to homelessness had been actively supported – the Leader of the Council explained that the country had a huge housing problem and the Council was responsible for making strategic plans and providing housing for those that needed it - there were two priorities in the Council Plan that aimed to address that; and delivery of 81 virtual Committees and Member Working Groups.
- Key achievements included – the Tewkesbury Garden Town was awarded £2.4 million of funding by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) – the Leader of the Council advised that he could not stress enough how significant this was and the support and commitment it showed from the government to ensure the Council achieved its ambitions; a crucial part of the infrastructure needed for Tewkesbury’s emerging Garden Town, a bridge over the railway at Ashchurch and Northway, had been permitted by the Planning Committee; building on the Council’s longstanding commitment of improving sustainability through its Clean and Green Environment Portfolio, it had one of the best recycling rates and had approved a climate change and carbon reduction action plan with the aim of becoming carbon neutral by 2030; the Garden Waste Club now had more than 18,500 customers enabling them to dispose of their garden waste in a sustainable way; a new long term lease for Cleeve Hill Golf Club was agreed with Cotswold Hub Co with the facilities and area set to be completely transformed – the Leader of the Council advised that this had responded to a very difficult problem when the previous organisation had pulled out he expressed how pleased he was at the way the situation had turned around and he thanked the Officers involved for their hard work; more than £192,000 in Community Infrastructure Levy payments were delivered to Parish Councils; the investment portfolio continued to perform well with a new commercial property being purchased which brought the total amount invested to £60 million – generating around £3.43 million gross rental and just under £2 million benefit to the Council; the new Business Transformation team had been launched and would help deliver improvement projects – the team had introduced a new digital platform within six months of going live helping the Council to provide its customers with a significantly improved online experience; an end-to-end review of the bulky waste service had been carried out and the Council now recycled/reused most of what was collected,

booking lead times had reduced from seven weeks to one week, customers could now book online and the Council was on target to make £90,000 savings in the first year; and the Council had hosted a Local Government Association Peer Challenge with effective leadership, embracing digital change and a 'can do' attitude being reported among the positive feedback.

- Looking forward – the Council would continue to deliver its Council Plan and Recovery Plan priorities – those needed to be flexible to accommodate its ongoing response to COVID while ensuring businesses and communities remained well supported; the Business Transformation team would continue to build on its early successes to date and the team's new priorities would include support to licensing, planning, trade waste and community safety; Raisin UK, an online savings platform, had released findings of an economic study which revealed Tewkesbury Borough as the place most likely to recover the fastest from COVID-19 and the Leader of the Council expressed the view that this illustrated the effectiveness of Tewkesbury Borough Council; and financial sustainability would be challenging but the Council had found this drove a desire to improve further and do more with less – with austerity came innovation and the Council had proven over the years that was something it was good at.

22.2 The Mayor thanked the Leader for his informative presentation and invited questions from Members. A Member indicated that she had spoken to a lot of people in her community recently and everyone had expressed how helpful the Officers had been and, in many cases, the amount of help offered had exceeded expectations which residents could not thank them for enough in extremely difficult times. Another Member expressed the view that the State of the Borough leaflet and presentation was a treasure trove of information which should be distributed far and wide across the Borough.

22.3 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the Leader of the Council's annual State of the Borough report be **NOTED**.

CL.23 ANNUAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT

23.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 89-117, which attached the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's annual report for 2020/21. Members were asked to approve the report.

23.2 The Mayor invited the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to present the report. Members were advised that it would be remiss not to mention the challenging environment of working virtually over the last year and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chair thanked the Officers from the Democratic Services and ICT teams for ensuring the meetings had gone as smoothly as possible. In terms of his Committee, the Chair indicated that it had continued to work effectively despite the challenges brought by COVID-19 and had continued to review the delivery of the Council Plan and the new COVID-19 Recovery Plan. It had also considered updated strategies for Customer Care and Communications as well as received progress reports on key strategies such as Economic Development and Tourism, Housing and Workforce Development. The Council had also entrusted the Committee to scrutinise and make recommendations on two motions. The Chair advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had a comprehensive work programme for 2021/22 and that had already been added to by the Committee requesting oversight of the action plan which would come from the review of the planning service. He thanked everyone involved with scrutiny for their involvement and hard work in the process.

23.3 A Member questioned when the motion on the local electricity bill would be brought

back to Council and the Chief Executive confirmed that it had been dealt with by the Committee following a motion to Council and would therefore not be brought back to the Council.

23.4 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the annual Overview and Scrutiny report be **NOTED**.

CL.24 COVID-19 EMERGENCY DECISION TAKEN UNDER URGENCY POWERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION

24.1 The report of the Chief Executive, circulated at Pages No. 118-122, advised Members of a decision which had been taken by the Chief Executive under the urgency powers set out in Part 3 of the Constitution as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Members were asked to note the decision taken in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

24.2 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the decision taken by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the appropriate Lead Member, as set out in the Appendix to the report be **NOTED**.

CL.25 NOTICE OF MOTION: SUPPORT OF THE CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCY BILL - PLEASE NOTE THIS ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

25.1 Members were advised that the proposer of the Motion had withdrawn it.

CL.26 SEPARATE BUSINESS

26.1 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.27 REVIEW OF TEMPORARY MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

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

27.1 Members considered the Council's temporary management arrangements and agreed the proposed senior management arrangements to be established on a permanent basis.

The meeting closed at 8:20 pm