

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 26 September 2023 commencing at 6:00 pm

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Deputy Mayor

Councillor I Yates
Councillor P N Workman

and Councillors:

N D Adcock, C Agg, H J Bowman, T J Budge, C L J Carter, C M Cody, C F Coleman, S R Dove, P A Godwin, D W Gray, S Hands, D J Harwood, A Hegenbarth, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan, G C Madle, J R Mason, H C McLain, P D McLain, J P Mills, P W Ockelton, K Pervaiz, G M Porter, J K Smith, P E Smith, R J G Smith, R J Stanley, H Sundarajoo, M G Sztymiak, R J E Vines and M J Williams

CL.49 ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

CL.50 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

50.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E M Dimond-Brown, M A Gore, C E Mills, E C Skelt and M R Stewart.

CL.51 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

51.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 24 January 2023 and took effect on 1 February 2023.

51.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
H C McLain	Item 9 – Notice of Motion: Fostering	Is a foster carer.	Would not speak or vote in relation to this item.
P D McLain	Item 9 – Notice of Motion: Fostering	Is a foster carer.	Would not speak or vote in relation to this item.
R J Stanley	Item 9 – Notice of Motion: Fostering	Is a foster carer.	Would speak and vote.

51.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

CL.52 MINUTES

52.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2023, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

CL.53 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

53.1 There were no items from members of the public.

CL.54 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

54.1 The following question was received from Councillor Cody to the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Mary Jordan. The answer was given by the Lead Member for Built Environment and was taken as read without discussion.

Question 1

At the Council meeting on 22 June 2021, I asked a question regarding the removal of the hedgerow at Coombe Hill (new housing next to the Swan public house). For reference, please see my original question and the answer that followed:

Question from Cllr Cody 22/06/21

“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.”

Referring to the answer to my question in 2021, I quote, “*this new hedge will enjoy protection for at least five years following completion of the development*”. The majority of the hedge that was planted is now dead, especially the end nearest the junction. Who is responsible for monitoring the ‘protection’ of hedges and indeed trees for that matter and who will be enforcing this and making sure another hedge is duly replanted?

Answer

Following an inspection on 19 September 2023, it has been identified that much of the hedgerow planting to the frontage of the site is dead or defective. Some trees planted within the site have also been identified as defective. Consequently, it appears there has been a breach of planning condition 2 of planning permission ref: 22/00876/FUL. Condition 2 states: *The landscaping scheme approved under Condition discharge application 21/00041/CONDIS shall be implemented no later than the first planting season following the completion of the development. The planting shall thereafter be maintained for a period of 5 years. If during this time any trees, shrubs or other plants are removed, die, or are seriously diseased, these shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. If any plants fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5 year maintenance period.*

The LPA will be getting in touch with the developer of the site to ensure that adequate remedial measures are taken.

54.2 The Mayor invited supplementary questions and the Member asked the following which the Lead Member for Built Environment advised would be answered in writing:

Q1 - As Officers would not be able to look at all relevant sites in the borough, who was responsible for monitoring those sites and would protection, which was supposed to last for five years, start again when replanted.

CL.55 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tewkesbury Garden Town Review - Progress Update

55.1 At its meeting on 6 September 2023, the Executive Committee considered the progress made against the 17 recommendations from the gateway review report, in particular the new approaches to engagement with communities and robust programme management, and recommended to Council that progress be noted; that the new governance arrangements, including revised programme monitoring and reporting designed to improve visibility and transparency be approved, subject to amendments to Page No. 135, Paragraph 4.1 - Membership of the Tewkesbury Garden Town Assurance Board to be updated to include three Members from the Members Engagement Forum, Page No. 136, Paragraph 4.3.1 – Reference to the Programme Board to be changed to the Project Board, and Page No. 136, Paragraph 4.6.1 – Members Engagement Forum to meet once a month for the first six months following which meeting frequency would be reviewed by the Tewkesbury Garden Town Assurance Board; and to agree that the Council, as

promoter, explores opportunities with developers and landowners within the Garden Town area to align their proposals for development with the developing vision and aspirations for Tewkesbury Garden Town.

- 55.2 A report had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 17-36.
- 55.3 As Chair of the Executive Committee, the Leader of the Council proposed that Members had already received a briefing in relation to the progress made against the 17 report recommendations but, in terms of the governance arrangements, it had been a lengthy process to reach this point and, along with the Chief Executive, he had met a number of Parish and Town Councils where it had quickly become apparent that they wanted to be part of a governance board in order to have oversight of the project which, up until now, had been missing. The Executive Committee had recommended some minor amendments which would make the governance arrangements more robust and that had been shared with other Parish and Town Councils who had attended a meeting at the Council Offices. He recognised that the governance structure would not restore their faith or confidence in the authority but it was an important first step to show it was intent on involving them and giving them that oversight. The third part of the recommendation related to the need to continue to explore and work with landowners and developers and be open and transparent in relation to that. In seconding the proposal, the Lead Member for Built Environment felt it was important to recognise the amount of work that had been done in a relatively short space of time. The proposal would ensure that a sound framework was in place going forward and working closely with the community would be essential to the success of the project.
- 55.4 A Member sought clarification as to whether Ward Councillors would be invited to attend future meetings between the Chief Executive, Leader of the Council and Town and Parish Councils. He indicated that the governance structure had been presented to Ashchurch Rural Parish Council for comment and questioned how this could represent meaningful engagement. Furthermore, in terms of location, Ashchurch Rural was a primary site for the Garden Town and he sought clarification as to whether that was reflected in the governance structure. He also questioned the involvement of the local Ward Councillors on the Tewkesbury Garden Town Assurance Board and asked whether the governance structure had been tested with other Garden Town projects elsewhere in the country. In response, the Leader of the Council advised that the invitation to attend meetings with himself, the Chief Executive and Town and Parish Councils would be extended to Ward Councillors and he believed that had been the case in terms of the meeting with Ashchurch Rural Parish Council. He stressed that work had been done at pace since the current administration had inherited the Garden Town project – it was important to establish a governance structure which involved Town and Parish Councils for openness and transparency but it could evolve and change over time if it was not working. Whilst the local Ward Member was not specifically represented on the Assurance Board, it was intended that it would include three representatives from the Member Engagement Forum, to be nominated by the Forum. Although it was a decision for the Council in terms of having specific Members, or more Member representatives on that board, it was important the programme was manageable and it was felt that three representatives was appropriate. In terms of Parish Council involvement, it would be up to the Parish Council Liaison Group in terms of the membership they wanted to put forward. The decision regarding the governance structure had to stay with the Council but the Oversight Board would have an opportunity to engage and comment.
- 55.5 A Member indicated that she found the diagram at Page No. 32 of the report confusing. She sought clarification as to who was on the Assurance Board, how many Members were on the Project Board and who else was on it. She expressed

the view that the Ward Members in the locality of the Garden Town were those who knew the most about the area, including Tewkesbury Town Council, and she would like to see more clarification before she could vote in favour of the governance arrangements. The Leader of the Council indicated that membership of the Assurance Board was set out at Page No. 29, Paragraph 4.1 of the report. He felt that it was a fair point in terms of the three local Members having the most knowledge about the area and he would be happy to support that they be included within the membership if that was the majority view. In terms of the Project Board, this was detailed at Page No. 29, Paragraph 4.3.1 of the report which set out that it would be responsible for managing the project plan and fulfilling the promoter role on behalf of the Council; it would have no decision-making powers unless they were delegated by the Senior Responsible Owner (SRO) and the board would be chaired by the Project Lead Officer, supported by the Project Manager, and comprised of technical officer leads from finance, communications and legal and others as required as the project progressed. With respect to the diagram, the Chief Executive indicated that some changes had been made following initial engagement with Town and Parish Councils to demonstrate changes to colleagues and those had inadvertently become embedded into the diagram.

55.6 A Member acknowledged the amount of hard work which had been done in a short period but his position remained unchanged and he felt both Members and the public would benefit from a record of the Executive Committee meeting where this had been discussed in separate business - he felt it was important that the public were aware of the broader views of the Council rather than simply seeing a resolution in favour of the recommendations. In terms of the engagement plan, he asked who was involved in terms of businesses and community group and how those meetings would be publicised. He noted the comment that the governance structure could be reviewed at any point but asked how this would be scrutinised to establish whether it continued to fit with what the Council wanted to achieve. In response, the Leader of the Council advised that he hoped that having local Ward Members on the Assurance Board would give that broader view. He indicated that the Council had made a commitment to a Garden Town in that area long before the elections in May and the time for debate as to whether or not it should go ahead had now passed; it was now about securing quality developments and retaining control to ensure the project's success. This was a starting point and would continue to change and evolve going forward – that was the whole point of engagement. In terms of the make-up of groups, substantial work had been done to obtain feedback from Members and Town and Parish Councils on which community groups should be included and he provided assurance that any which had been missed could still be involved. The Interim Executive Director: Place advised that the community liaison groups list was available for Members to scrutinise and he undertook to ensure that was circulated following the meeting. The first community engagement sessions would be with businesses and the Growth Hub had inputted into that list. He apologised if any had been missed but was confident that most of the people Members would want to see on those groups would be receiving invitations.

55.7 A Member drew attention to Page No. 29 of the report which referred to the membership of the Assurance Board and asked if it would be politically balanced; she supported the view that the three representatives from the Member Engagement Forum should be local Ward Councillors. The Leader of the Council indicated that, following the Executive Committee meeting, an amendment had been made to include the Lead Member for Community within the membership; this was in addition to the Lead Member for Built Environment and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council. As it currently stood, the make-up was three Liberal Democrats and one Green and therefore was not politically balanced; however, someone had to take ownership of the project and be held accountable for its delivery and he was happy to do that.

- 55.8 In terms of consultation with schools and young people, a Member sought assurance this would go further than the naming competition referenced in Recommendation 13 at Page No. 26 of the report. She noted this recommendation was green and Appendix 3 to the report suggested the workshop format had been finalised so she asked whether this had been properly examined and what had been decided upon in that regard. In response, the Chief Executive clarified that engagement would be with three secondary schools including Alderman Knight School and they could be named in the document. He would be happy to meet with the Member to go through the proposed methodology for engagement and, should the governance structure be approved, this would go to the Assurance Board to be tested. Whilst primary schools were not included, he provided assurance that the views of parents of primary school age children needed to be captured. In response to a query regarding Workshop 1 on Thursday 5 October 2023, as set out in the Cratus Engagement Timetable at Appendix 4 to the report, the Leader of the Council clarified that this was for all Tewkesbury *Borough* Councillors and confirmed that all Members had been invited to attend.
- 55.9 During the debate which ensued, a Member indicated that his concern, as he had raised at the Executive Committee, was with the third recommendation regarding the Council exploring opportunities with developers and landowners within the Garden Town area to align their proposals for development as at no stage had the public been consulted on the Garden Town process and it had not formed any part of the strategic plan – the Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury Strategic and Local Plan approach had a step by step process and it did not form part of that. The SLP was the right place to identify preferred options and that stage was 18 months away; however, this was telling developers there would be a Garden Town in this location which was predetermining the outcome of the SLP in his view. The Garden Town would have a profound impact on the nature of Tewkesbury Borough but that debate had not been had. There was an assumption that the Garden Town must go ahead but he felt people should have the right to influence where they lived – the Garden Town was something being “done to” the public rather than with them and this undermined the democratic process so he would not support the motion. Another Member indicated that she would also be voting against it. In terms of recommendation 3, it was still unclear what the Garden Town area was. Originally, Members had been advised that 10,000 houses were required to achieve Garden Town status but at the last Council meeting it had been suggested that it did not necessarily need to be that many. None of the developers working on sites south of the A46 which had either had been granted planning permission, were being constructed or had already been built were aligned to the Garden Town principles; others which would make-up the Garden Town would not come into being until 2028 at the earliest and she raised concern as to what might happen if the market turned and developers found the demand was no longer there – they had no commitment to wait for the Council to put a Garden Town in place and she did not believe they would wait. As long as the Council did not have a five year housing land supply, planning permission would be granted.
- 55.10 With regard to the threshold of houses to be built in this location to qualify as a Garden Town, a Member indicated that this hinged on the provision of new access onto the M5. The strategic outline business case for the A46 scheme had been submitted to the Department for Transport in January 2020 and three and a half years later that continued to drift on. A report on further funding for the M5 Junction 9/A46 scheme had been considered and approved by Gloucestershire County Council on 27 March 2023 and he had attended a recent Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee where the Executive Director of Gloucestershire County Council had suggested that, if it was not achieved quickly, future funding would not be available/would be withdrawn/would be difficult to achieve. In that scenario there would be no Garden Town and any control over what would be built in that location

would be lost. The Leader of the Council felt this was an excellent point and part of the case for the holistic approach was to work with partners to secure the additional infrastructure needed. He could not speak for what had happened in the past but since taking office a significant amount of work had been done at speed and there was renewed impetus. The Garden Town was part of the basis of funding for transport infrastructure in that area and without that there would be continued piecemeal development without the support needed. In summing up the debate, matters had been raised which had been talked about previously and the principle of continuing with the Garden Town was not what was being considered tonight. The matter being discussed was the approval of a body to have oversight of what was happening; that had been a vital missing component to date and could only be a positive thing in his view. He did not disagree with comments that the Garden Town project had started from the wrong place in terms of community engagement but that could be addressed through the proposed governance structure. Development of some description would happen in this area with or without a Garden Town and, given the lack of a five year housing land supply, planning permission would continue to be granted for development which did not adhere to the Garden Town principles. In his view, this approach needed to be taken to make the best of the situation for residents of Ashchurch and Northway and give them oversight of the process moving forward. He stressed that this would be a valuable start to, not the end of, a journey.

55.11 Having been proposed and seconded, a recorded vote was requested and, upon receiving the appropriate level of support, voting was recorded as follows:

For	Against	Abstain	Absent
N D Adcock	C F Coleman	J P Mills	E M Dimond-Brown
L C Agg	P A Godwin	J K Smith	M A Gore
H J Bowman	E J MacTiernan		C E Mills
T J Budge	M G Sztymiak		E C Skelt
C L J Carter	P W Workman		M R Stewart
C M Cody			
S R Dove			
D W Gray			
S J Hands			
D J Harwood			
A Hegenbarth			
M L Jordan			
G C Madle			
J R Mason			
H C McLain			
P D McLain			

P W Ockelton

K Pervaiz

G M Porter

P E Smith

R J G Smith

R J Stanley

H Sundarajoo

R J E Vines

M J Williams

G I Yates

55.12 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED

1. That progress against the 17 recommendations from the gateway review report, in particular the new approaches to engagement with communities and robust programme management, be **NOTED**.
2. That the new governance arrangements, including revised programme monitoring and reporting designed to improve visibility and transparency, be **APPROVED**.
3. That it be **AGREED** that the Council, as promoter, explores opportunities with developers and landowners within the Garden Town area to align their proposals for development with the developing vision and aspirations for Tewkesbury Garden Town.

CL.56 STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS - RETURNING OFFICER AND ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER

56.1 The report of the Executive Director: Resources, circulated at Pages No. 37-40, asked Members to ratify the appointment of the Chief Executive as the Returning Officer for Borough Council elections as previously agreed as part of the report taken in closed session at the Council meeting on 24 January 2023 but not specifically included within the public Minutes of such meeting; to appoint the Chief Executive as the Returning Officer for Parish and Town Council elections within the Tewkesbury Borough area; to ratify the decision taken under urgency powers by the Executive Director: Resources, following consultation with (and with support of) the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council, to appoint the Chief Executive as the Council's Electoral Registration Officer; and to appoint the Executive Director: Resources, Director: Corporate Resources and Head of Service: Democratic and Electoral Services as Deputy Electoral Registration Officers.

56.2 The Executive Director: Resources advised that Members would recall the report taken to Council in January 2023 seeking approval of the management restructure which proposed the appointment of the Chief Executive as Returning Officer. At that time, no formal recommendation had been made to approve the appointment so confirmation of that was now being sought. In addition, the Council was required to appoint an Electoral Registration Officer and Deputy Electoral Registration

Officers. Prior to this meeting, use had been made of the Council's urgency powers to appoint the Chief Executive as the Electoral Registration Officer in order to mitigate the risk of running the annual canvass which had commenced a few weeks earlier and Members were being asked to ratify that appointment. In addition, appointment of a number of Deputy Electoral Registration Officers was recommended as set out in the report.

56.3 The report recommendation was proposed by the Leader of the Council and seconded by the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management. A Member noted that the report stated that fees would be met from the election fund and he asked what the fees were. The Executive Director: Resources indicated that he did not know the exact figure and undertook to circulate this information following the meeting. He stressed that all roles were needed to carry out an election and the Returning Officer had a major role in the successful running of an election.

56.4 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

1. That the appointment of the Chief Executive as the Returning Officer for Borough Council elections be **RATIFIED**.
2. That appointment of the Chief Executive as the Returning Officer for Parish and Town Council elections within the Tewkesbury Borough area be **APPROVED**.
3. That the decision taken under urgency powers to appoint the Chief Executive as the Council's Electoral Registration Officer be **RATIFIED**.
4. That appointment of the Executive Director: Resources, Director: Corporate Resources and Head of Service: Democratic and Electoral Services as Deputy Electoral Registration Officers be **APPROVED**.

CL.57 NOTICE OF MOTION: FOSTERING

57.1 The Mayor referred to the Notice of Motion, as 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 bring a recommendation back to Council.

57.2 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED

That the Motion would be discussed at this evening's Council meeting.

57.3 The Motion, as set out on the Agenda, was proposed and seconded. The proposer of the Motion advised that this Motion had also been considered by Gloucestershire County Council earlier this month and he felt that it was necessary to take a proactive approach to promoting fostering and to put on record the Council's appreciation for the hard work of foster carers and what a difference they made to children's lives. As representatives of the community, it was necessary to ensure that Councillors had all of the necessary resources available to help.

57.4 The seconder of the Motion indicated there was a crisis in Gloucestershire with children being moved outside of the county to Worcestershire due to a lack of foster carers. This had a significant impact on children who had to change schools and move away from friends and family and support networks. He felt that anything which could be done to keep them within the county should be done and that Gloucestershire County Council colleagues should be supported to ensure that foster carers were respected and valued. The Council could play its part by

promoting fostering on social media and acting as a facilitator in the community to encourage as many people as possible to come forward as foster carers.

57.5 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned what financial support was available for foster carers and the seconder of the Motion indicated that was not relevant to this particular Motion which was about doing as much as possible to promote fostering on behalf of the County Council; however, whilst foster carers did receive a full package of support, which contained elements for the foster carer themselves and to meet the needs of the child, it was not a job which was done for financial gain. A Member sought clarification as to whether “adding a section on foster recruitment to our local newsletters/updates if this is appropriate, and not attached to any party-political messaging” was encouraging Borough Councillors to include information in leaflets or suggesting that it was not done on the basis that it was a political newsletter. In response, the proposer of the motion confirmed it was the former as the intention was to encourage anyone to actively promote fostering in any material, whether that be leaflets or online; rather than making a political point, the purpose of the Motion was about coming together to do something positive and promote a worthwhile service. Another Member expressed the view that this was something which Borough Councillors should be doing in any case and suggested there was other work being done by the County Council which they should also be promoting including that in relation to homelessness and the environment. The proposer of the Motion agreed and encouraged other Members to submit Motions for various things they wanted to promote and to speak to Officers and Members about including this in communications. A Member indicated that she wholeheartedly supported the Motion and, in terms of sharing information, that was something which some Members were already doing and there was nothing preventing them from doing that. Another Member felt this was an excellent Motion - he had come across fostering as a member of the adoption panel at the County Council and had seen first hand the incredible work foster carers could do and the impact that had on outcomes for children. He indicated that the question of financial support was worth thinking about as it could be a potential barrier. There was a shortage of foster carers in the county and he wondered whether the Motion should be further extended to search for prospective adopters.

57.6 In summing up, the seconder of the Motion indicated that he had been told that capacity was beyond 90% in Gloucestershire, hence why there was a crisis, and it was incumbent upon everyone to support the County Council in encouraging fostering. He felt that adoption should potentially be looked at separately. The proposer of the Motion indicated that this was not a difficult thing to achieve and could be as simple as putting information on the Council website to signpost. Ultimately, the fantastic work done by foster carers needed to be applauded and they should be helped in any way possible.

57.7 Accordingly, the Motion was proposed and seconded as set out on the Agenda and, upon being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED

1. That it be **NOTED** that:

- there are over 800 children in the care of the County Council, and approximately 250 in-house foster carers in Gloucestershire - but many more carers are needed to meet growing demand;
- nationally and locally, recruiting and retaining sufficient foster carers is an enormous challenge;
- that all elected Members, as representatives of our communities, should be encouraged to help promote fostering and support potential carers to come forward so that we can create a resilient, diverse, and caring foster

parent network that can meet the needs of all children in our care; and

- whilst the responsibility for recruiting and retaining foster carers sits with the County Council, Tewkesbury Borough Council can assist by signposting prospective carers to where they can find relevant information, including a dedicated page on the Borough Council's website.

2. That the Council supports Borough Councillors in promoting fostering and encouraging them to begin sharing information on foster carer recruitment across all networks to ensure the message gets out boroughwide across a variety of platforms. This can include:

- sharing information about foster recruitment on social media;
- adding a link to <https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/fostering/> onto email signatures;
- adding a section on foster recruitment to our local newsletters/updates if this is appropriate, and not attached to any party-political messaging; and
- sharing information on foster recruitment with Parish and Town councils, local schools and community organisations so that these groups can also help to disseminate information.

CL.58 SEPARATE BUSINESS

58.1 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.59 SEPARATE MINUTES

59.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2023, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

The meeting closed at 7:20 pm