

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive Committee held at the Council Offices,
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Wednesday, 17 July 2024 commencing
at 9:30 am**

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor R J Stanley
Councillor S Hands

and Councillors:

C M Cody, S R Dove, D J Harwood, M L Jordan, G C Madle, J R Mason, J K Smith
and M G Sztymiak

also present:

Councillor M Dimond-Brown

EX.1 ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

EX.2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D W Gray and A Hegenbarth. There were no substitutes for the meeting.

EX.3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 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.

3.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
J R Mason	Item 9 – Cleeve Hill Golf Clubhouse Write-Off.	Was a Member of Cleeve Hill Golf Club until 2020.	Would speak and vote.

3.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

EX.4 MINUTES

- 4.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2024, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

EX.5 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 5.1 There were no items from members of the public.

EX.6 FEEDBACK FROM CHAIR OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

- 6.1 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was invited to provide feedback from the last meeting of the Committee held on 26 March 2024.

- 6.2 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee advised that Members had considered the financial update report for the third quarter of 2023/24 and were broadly content with the stated position. The lack of overall debt recovery targets was noted, as it was the intent for the Audit and Governance Committee to take a more active role in debt management. It was noted that the Lead Member for Customer Focus had attended the meeting in relation to the Customer Care Strategy and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had welcomed the introduction of a new set of Care Standards and the omnichannel customer care portal. Questions had been raised about the appropriateness of the Citizens' Panel, particularly in terms of representing the diversity of the community, and asked for this to be investigated further. The Committee had found it disappointing that there were no meaningful metrics to assess the success, or otherwise, of the Customer Care Strategy and hoped that any new strategy would ensure that it could be effectively and meaningfully scrutinised. It was felt that the governance of customer care needed to be tidied up going forward – currently both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Transform Working Group provided scrutiny – and, as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, he would speak with the Lead Member about the best way forward. Since the meeting in March, the Committee had spoken with the Lead Member in relation to the Housing and Homelessness Strategy Action Plan to express the view that, whilst the actions delivered by the team were laudable, the strategy was currently too ambitious rather than being focused on what was achievable and did not provide the ability to measure progress and effectively communicate real success to the community. It was noted that a revised strategy was being developed and would come before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October. With regard to the Depot Services Working Group annual report, it was noted that the Working Group continued to have its finger on the pulse of in-year delivery of Ubico services; the future of the Working Group would be discussed as part of the development of the new Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme. The Chair indicated that the Committee was looking forward to scrutinising the work delivered under the new Council Plan; however, it was recognised that its Work Programme was likely to come under some pressure given the ambitions within the plan and the new and revamped strategies and action plans being considered. Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were holding preliminary conversations with Lead Members and Officers about the best time for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider policies and strategies over the next 12 months. To date, meetings had been held with the Lead Members for Economic Development, Environmental Services, Health and Wellbeing, Housing and Homelessness, Community Safety and Young People and meetings had been scheduled with the Lead Members for Planning and Place Making and Climate and Ecology; all remaining Lead Members would be contacted shortly to arrange similar sessions. It was noted that the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was on 23 July 2024 and would

consider the Ubico Annual Report; updated Household Waste and Recycling Collection Service Policy and Procedures; and the performance tracker for the final quarter of 2023/24. Following the summer break, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would meet on 10 September 2024 to consider the revised Economic Development and Tourism Strategy; flood response and recovery report; and the performance tracker for the first quarter of 2024/25.

6.3 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED: That the feedback from the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be **NOTED**.

EX.7 FEEDBACK FROM CHAIR OF AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

7.1 The Vice-Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee was invited to feedback on the last meeting of the Committee held on 27 March 2024.

7.2 The Vice-Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee advised that he had chaired the meeting on 27 March where five key elements had been discussed. Firstly, Members had considered the external audit annual report which was the final report from the outgoing auditors, Grant Thornton, and looked at the Council's value for money arrangements. Overall, it was a positive report with only a small number of recommendations including the involvement of Overview and Scrutiny in the financial management process; improving public consultation on budget proposals; and development of a data strategy. All recommendations were accepted by management and scheduled for implementation. At the same meeting, the new external auditors, Bishop Fleming, had introduced its annual work plan and the Committee looked forward to a constructive working relationship with them. Members would recall an internal audit report in relation to Section 106 was presented to the Audit and Governance Committee in January. The findings of the audit regarding elements of the Section 106 process had not been positive and the Committee had requested that an action plan in response to those findings be brought back for its consideration. A prompt management response had resulted in an action plan being presented at the meeting; however, Members had expressed disappointment in what had been put forward with his view being that the plan was fairly light, and largely a regurgitation of the audit recommendations, which failed to inspire confidence it would be delivered against. Whilst the action plan tried to cover the audit recommendations, through discussion it was evident the whole Section 106 process needed to be reviewed and, therefore, a more comprehensive action plan was required. In terms of the internal audit recommendations, he was aware the team was in the process of following-up those recommendations and the outcome would be reported to the Committee in September. At each Committee meeting, the Internal Audit team presented the work undertaken since the previous meeting and it was very positive to receive reports of a substantial audit opinion in relation to the administration of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme and recycling credits. The Committee had also approved the Internal Audit team's six-monthly plan - the breadth of the work to be undertaken ranged from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, to flood recovery grants and licensing. He encouraged all Lead Members to keep abreast of the planned audit work in their portfolio areas. The Committee had also considered the Corporate Risk Register, a high-level document that captured the Council's key risks and how they were being managed. These ranged from cyber security and financial sustainability to delivery of climate emergency work. External audit had recommended there should be wider oversight of the risk register and bringing this document to Executive Committee, as well as the Audit and Governance Committee, in future would seem an appropriate way forward.

7.3 A Member valued the work being undertaken by Internal Audit, particularly in relation to Section 106 which Members had raised as an issue for some time and he was keen to see improved, and he asked how much of this would be reliant on resource. In response, the Director: Corporate Resources confirmed the Internal Audit team was fully resourced with two full-time equivalents and the introduction of the new Head of Service last year. The team had been operational for almost two years following the pandemic and there were no issues in terms of resource. With regard to Section 106 resource, the Executive Director: Resources advised that consideration would need to be given to any ongoing resource needed to manage the Section 106 process effectively. The Chair felt it would be interesting to read the report which went back to the Audit and Governance Committee in September as Section 106 was a priority focus for the Council to ensure that development within the borough was sustainable.

7.4 It was

RESOLVED: That the feedback from the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee be **NOTED**.

EX.8 FINANCIAL OUTTURN REPORT

8.1 The report of the Associate Director: Finance, circulated at Pages No. 15-46, highlighted the Council's financial performance for the previous year, setting out the General Fund and capital outturn positions. Members were asked to consider the General Fund outturn for 2023/24, the financing of the capital programme and the annual treasury management report and performance; and to approve the transfers to and from earmarked reserves.

8.2 In introducing the report, the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management felt it should be noted that the report had been put together during a period of high intensity for Officers with them having to close the financial year, whilst also supporting the delivery of the Parliamentary election, as well as having auditors undertaking their work related to the accounts and year end. Reporting on the quarter 3 position, the Executive Committee had been updated in March that a forecast £202,000 surplus was anticipated by the end of the financial year. From reading the report, Members would note that the Council had performed significantly better than predicted with a final outturn of £2.9m surplus. It should be noted that a transfer of £1.49m to externally ringfenced reserves was required, which left an overall surplus of £1.4m. As had been the case throughout the year, some areas had overspent whilst there had also been higher levels of income than expected elsewhere. He had picked out some key details which included a surplus of £1.9m in services expenditure largely due to the cost of employees being £218,000 under budget; however, it should be noted that there was a target within the Council's corporate expenditure to save £209,000 from employment costs across the Council which reduced the predicted underspend to £9,000. Payments to third parties showed a £550,000 overspend which included an additional £235,000 for the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) gate fee, and emergency homeless accommodation costs were £128,000 over budget due to increased demand. Externally funded projects showed an underspend of £1.03m due to phasing of funding and project delivery – these funds had been transferred into reserves for use when required. Income showed a £1.5m surplus, primarily linked to payments including the Council being awarded a significant costs claim against two defendants in health and safety cases, planning fees and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) administration fees. It was noted that corporate expenditure was in surplus by £919,000 with the main reasons being an additional £539,000 of treasury investment income compared to budget as a result of the high interest rates and timely management decisions, and business rates retention being £222,000 higher than budget. With regard to capital budget and reserves,

set out at Appendices B and D respectively, spending was broadly in line within the approved budgets. It was worth noting that capital spend was approximately £550,000 underspent due to longer than expected lead times for new vehicles and would now be purchased in the next financial year, as well as a £280,000 underspend on the installation of the new heating system for the Public Services Centre. In terms of the surplus, decisions on how this was utilised would be taken after the formal accounts had been completed; these would be presented to the Audit and Governance Committee in September. Unfortunately, due to the timeline for publication of the Executive Committee Agenda, the final figures for the Ubico contract had not been available ahead of today's meeting; however, this had now been reported as £156,000 under budget and the details would be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee next week. Throughout this year, the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) report, attached at Appendix E to the report, gave further context to the financial performance, and, based on the recent requirement from the revised Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Prudential and Treasury Codes to report the prudential indicators on a quarterly basis, these were attached at Appendices C and F of the report.

- 8.3 A Member drew attention to Page No. 19 of the report which showed an underspend in relation to Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) – this was not surprising as she was aware from her casework that a lot of people were ineligible for things which they required such as dropped kerbs for access and wet rooms. She found it particularly concerning that people living in properties owned by housing associations were able to pay for adaptations themselves but were required to remove these when they left at the end of their tenancy. She asked if there was anything the Council could do in terms of speaking to the government about relaxing the criteria as people who needed help were not currently getting it. In response, the Associate Director: Finance clarified there was an overspend in relation to DFGs – Tewkesbury Borough Council was given £800,000 by the County Council but the actual outturn position was £878,851. The Head of Service: Environmental Health advised that applications could only be processed by the Council on receipt of a referral from Occupational Health; however, he undertook to raise the issue in relation to adaptations in housing association properties at the Gloucestershire DFG Liaison Group. The Chair indicated that he was also happy to raise this with housing associations and pointed out it was not just adaptations which had to be removed when tenants moved out – if any carpets were put down these also had to be taken out despite many being in perfectly good condition so it was worth having a discussion around that.
- 8.4 A Member noted there was an underspend of £117,000 in relation to the Heritage Action Zone yet Appendix B stated this had been completed so he asked what would happen to that money and whether it had been allocated to any projects. In response, the Associate Director: Finance advised that the scheme had ended in March but, as there were projects in place, this had been allowed to be carried over and she confirmed all of the money had been spent in April. The Member acknowledged there was a £12,000 overspend on Environmental Health agency contracted services, of which £8,000 was for boarding up Healings Mill due to the health and safety risk to the public. He asked if it was possible to recoup any of this from the owner; in his view Healings Mill was an eyesore and boarding it up was no improvement. The Chief Executive advised that, if the owner did not bring a satisfactory solution forward for the building, there may be an opportunity for the authority to step in to deliver the project and discussions were taking place with the relevant government departments in relation to funding for that. He undertook to circulate a recent newspaper article which described Tewkesbury as a 'hidden gem' and he felt there was a real opportunity to use the Healings Mill site to build on that – this would be particularly important in setting Tewkesbury apart from Cheltenham and Gloucester in terms of any devolution deal for Gloucestershire which may be forthcoming as a result of plans outlined in the King's Speech. The

Head of Service: Environmental Health advised that a Community Protection Notice had been served on the owner of Healings Mill requiring them to put permanent security measures in place; they had not complied which had resulted in antisocial behaviour at the site. The Council wanted to prosecute in the hope a court order would be issued which would persuade the owner to take action. Although there had been detailed discussions with the owner about their intentions for the building going forward, that was not a reason to defer taking enforcement action on public health grounds.

- 8.5 A Member felt that £233,000 in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) administration fees seemed quite high and asked if it was due to inaccuracies in estimations. In response, the Executive Director: Resources advised that the administration fee was generally 5% depending on the number of properties and Tewkesbury Borough Council's administration fees were a lot lower than expected. It was intended to put in place external resource and expenditure so it was closer to 5% and to utilise the money for the benefit of Tewkesbury Borough and the county. The CIL Manager explained that his figures were likely to be different to those in the accounts due to a variation on how they were recorded – accruals made a difference as, when the demand notice was issued, this set out a schedule of instalments towards the cost of the whole notice whereas he reported on cash in year. A Member asked if the figure in the report was just for Tewkesbury Borough and confirmation was provided that was the case. The Member asked if there was any frustration on the part of Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils that the money had not yet been spent and the CIL Manager advised that Gloucester City Council was grateful for the support – without the partnership, it would probably not be a CIL authority - and nobody at Cheltenham Borough Council had raised it as an issue. The Chief Executive explained that, if infrastructure needed to go into other authority areas to provide strategic capacity there should be no objection in that sense; however, if Tewkesbury Borough had its own strategic requirements on the CIL list, it would be able to use CIL money generated in its own area for those requirements. He did not think it was a problem that CIL was not ringfenced for Tewkesbury Borough alone.

- 8.6 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council's general fund outturn for 2023/24, the financing of the capital programme and the annual treasury management report and performance be **NOTED**.
2. That the transfers to and from earmarked reserves be **APPROVED**.

EX.9 CLEEVE HILL GOLF CLUBHOUSE WRITE-OFF

- 9.1 The report of the Director: Corporate Resources, circulated at Pages No. 47-49, asked Members to approve the write-off of £74,166.46 for The Share Club Ltd due to the company being dissolved and Tewkesbury Borough Council not being a preferential creditor.
- 9.2 In introducing the report, the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management explained that Members would recall that this item was deferred from the previous meeting and, with regret, the Committee was being asked to approve a write-off due to The Share Club Ltd having been dissolved and the Council not being classed as a preferential creditor. This dated back to late 2018 through to early 2021, with invoices for rent not being paid by The Share Club Ltd which had been leasing the Cleeve Hill Golf Clubhouse from the Council at the time. The organisation was facing financial difficulties, heightened due to the pandemic, and

ultimately dissolved in March 2023. Unfortunately, there was no chance of the Council being able to claim this sum back.

- 9.3 A Member asked whether the Council could be in a similar position in the future in terms of not being a preferential creditor and the Executive Director: Resources advised that Cleeve Hill Golf Club had a new tenant who was up to date with payments so no problems were envisaged in that regard. The Associate Director: Finance indicated that, if a company was insolvent, all creditors were assessed and paid in preferential order with staff being paid first – Tewkesbury Borough Council was at the bottom of the list and, in this case, there was no money left so it would not receive anything.
- 9.4 A Member pointed out that Cleeve Hill Golf Club had always been advertised as a municipal golf course and asked if there were any plans for the Council to invest in the facilities for community benefit. In response, the Executive Director: Resources advised there was no plan for the Council itself to invest; however, the new tenant planned to invest significantly in the facility and a long term lease had been granted based on its plans for the redevelopment of the clubhouse and surrounding area and a draft plan was expected later this year.
- 9.5 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED: That the write-off of £74,166.46 for The Share Club Ltd, due to the company being dissolved and Tewkesbury Borough Council not being a preferential creditor, be **APPROVED**.

EX.10 SAFEGUARDING POLICY

- 10.1 The report of the Community Safety Team Leader, circulated at Pages No. 51-67, asked Members to adopt the revised Safeguarding Policy and to delegate authority to the Director: Communities in consultation with the relevant Lead Member to make minor and inconsequential amendments to the policy.
- 10.2 The Head of Service: Environmental Health advised that the Council had a legal obligation to consider the safeguarding needs of both children and vulnerable adults when discharging its functions and conducting its operations. In 2020, the Council adopted a Safeguarding Policy which set out the Council's arrangements to deliver its safeguarding obligations. This report concerned a recent review of the policy to ensure that it was fit for purpose and reflected current professional best practice. Paragraph 2 of the report outlined the key changes and updates which included: increased detail on the safeguarding training expectations for Members and Council employees, specifically all front-line staff being required to complete at least level 1 safeguarding training every two years, and Council staff working directly with children and vulnerable adults being required to undertake higher level face to face training, with Members having an in person briefing every four years; recognition that some Members and employees may require a higher level of training dependent on their role within the organisation; and updated contact details for key Council personnel and external agencies involved in the safeguarding referral process.
- 10.3 A Member drew attention to Page No. 57 of the report which set out who the Council's Safeguarding Officers were but did not provide contact details, and similarly, Page No. 65, bullet point three which stated "if you are not sure what to do your first response should be to contact a Line Manager, Deputy Safeguarding Lead or Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)...". In addition, Page No. 65, bullet point eight referred to passing a completed form to the DSL but did not explain what the form was or where to get it from. The last bullet point mentioned that the DSL must report the incident or seek advice from LCC Children Services and she asked whether that was Gloucestershire County Council. In response, the

Community Safety Team Leader explained that Officer names and contact details were not included in the policy as it could easily become out of date with changes to personnel; however, it was possible for the DSL information to be included on the Tewkesbury Borough Council Contact Details Sheet which was available on the Members' section of the intranet and circulated to Members by email as and when it was updated. Another Member pointed out that Page No. 57 included the Director: Communities as 'Safeguarding Lead' but should read '**Designated** Safeguarding Lead'. The Chief Executive acknowledged that Page No. 57 also referred to the Associate Director: People, Performance and Culture as a Deputy Safeguarding Lead; however, Members would be aware there was currently nobody in that post, as such, there were only two Deputy Safeguarding Leads.

- 10.4 In response to a query as to what was meant by the term 'periodically' with regard to the policy being reviewed, the Head of Service: Environmental Health advised the intention was to carry out a comprehensive review of the policy every three years; however, it would be updated to reflect any changes to personnel on an annual basis. A Member indicated it was good practice to display posters in relevant parts of the Public Services Centre with the name and photograph of current DSLs so that staff knew who to approach. The Director: Corporate Resources provided assurance that the screens on the first floor of the building displayed details of who staff should report any safeguarding concerns to. A Member asked if that could be made available in the Members' Lounge as well.
- 10.5 A Member drew attention to Page No. 59 of the report and noted that the first bullet point in the volunteers section stated 'volunteers are recruited safely' and asked what that meant. She also noted that, with regard to training, Members would receive an additional face to face briefing every four years and she asked if all Members had received training following the elections in 2023. The Head of Service: Environmental Health advised that safe recruitment of volunteers included ensuring the relevant Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks and clearances were in place and confirmation was provided that Member safeguarding training had been held on 24 July 2023 as part of the Member Induction Programme.
- 10.6 Another Member expressed the view that, if people needed to access the Safeguarding Policy, this tended to be in order to react to a potential issue, therefore the policy needed to be easily understandable, or have a summary attached as an appendix for ease of reference. He went on to indicate that the terms Safeguarding Officers and Designated Safeguarding Officers were used at different points in the report but he assumed these were the same people; furthermore, there were references to DSLs but there were also Deputy DSLs so this needed some clarification. With regard to Page No. 65 of the report, the fourth bullet point mentioned contacting the Police on 999 and then informing a Designated Safeguarding Officer but it was unclear whether that was a Police Officer or a Council Officer. On the same page under the 'Safeguarding within specific circumstances involving the Council' section, there was reference to LADO – he understood who that was but it might not be obvious to everyone reading the policy. He suggested it may be beneficial to include a glossary of terms and acronyms at the end of the policy. With regard to Page No. 58 of the report, it set out that the Monitoring Officer had responsibility for receiving safeguarding concerns and allegations made against elected Members and, whilst he agreed with what was written, he felt it would be appropriate for the Group Leader to be notified if a complaint was received about someone within their Group to ensure they were not asked to carry out a duty which may put children or vulnerable adults in danger. As such, he asked for a form of wording to be included in the policy which would also cover the eventuality that a complaint was received about a Group Leader themselves. A Member suggested that if a complaint was about the Group Leader, the Deputy Group Leader should be notified.

- 10.7 Given the amount of amendments that had been discussed, it was proposed that the item be deferred to the next meeting in order for Officers to make the necessary changes. The proposer made clear this was not a reflection of the work that had been done but, due to the importance of the policy, it was necessary to ensure it was as robust as possible. This proposal was duly seconded and it was

RESOLVED: That the Safeguarding Policy be **DEFERRED** to the Executive Committee meeting on 4 September 2024 in order to incorporate the amendments and additions requested by Members.

EX.11 FOOD SAFETY SERVICE PLAN 2024/25

- 11.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Service: Environmental Health, circulated at Pages No. 69-90, which attached, at Appendix 1, the draft Food Safety Service Plan 2024/25. Members were asked to approve the plan.
- 11.2 The Lead Member for Environmental Services explained that Tewkesbury Borough Council was the statutory competent authority responsible for the enforcement of food safety legislation in the borough. As such, it was required by the Food Standards Agency to publish an annual Food Safety Service Plan. The purpose of the plan was to set out the Council's arrangements for the delivery of official food controls which included inspections, audits, sampling and enforcement interventions. The draft plan for 2024/25 was set out at Appendix 1 to the report. Paragraph 2 of the report summarised the key targets for the service which included: a commitment to inspect 100% of all high and medium risk food businesses within one month from their inspection due date; a commitment to inspect 100% of all low-risk food businesses within the 2024/25 year; a commitment to take at least 40 samples to verify compliance with food safety requirements and to respond to 100% of infectious disease notifications within the relevant timescales in line with standard operating procedure which indicated food borne illness including reports of Salmonella, E.coli, Campylobacter, Listeria and Clostridium. Paragraph 2 also set out the Council's internal arrangements for Officer competency and performance monitoring which included: an authorised Officer to be subject to at least one validation visit with the Council's Lead Food Officer; the Lead Food Officer to periodically review inspection reports; and authorised Officers to participate in both national and regional consistency exercises. Although the delivery of the plan was anticipated to require two full-time equivalent authorised Officers, it was not expected that any additional resource would be needed to meet the targets set out.
- 11.3 A Member drew attention to the legal implications section of the covering report, set out at Page No. 69, and indicated that two of the regulations listed appeared to be the same. In response, the Head of Service: Environmental Health clarified this was an error and the Council was responsible for enforcing the provisions of Regulation (EC) 852/2004, Regulation (EC) 853/2004 and Regulation (EC) 854/2004. The Member went on to draw attention to Page No. 76 of the report and the 'Organisational structure' section of the Food Safety Service Plan which referred to the 'Clean and Green' portfolio and pointed out this was now the 'Environmental Services' portfolio. In response to a query as to whether local Members should be notified when there were issues with food premises in their areas, the Head of Service: Environmental Health advised that a Member Update would be circulated to all Members if a premises was being closed, or if there was an urgent public health risk. He pointed out that anyone could search for businesses which were zero rated on the Food Standards Agency website but would be happy to contact Ward Councillors specifically if there was a serious health situation in their area.

11.4 A Member queried whether there was a role for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to play in terms of monitoring delivery of the plan and the Head of Service: Environmental Health explained there were no Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) relating to the plan within the performance tracker so it would not be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; however, there were KPIs within the service plan which went to the Chief Officers Group (COG) so it would be monitored by senior Officers. The Chair pointed out that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could request to monitor the plan should that be felt necessary at any point. A Member sought assurance there was enough Officer resource to meet the timescales set out within the plan and was advised that this would be the focus for two full-time equivalent Officers so it was hoped that would be sufficient. Notwithstanding this, it would be difficult to achieve 100% as not all premises were open or trading so the figures would need to be adjusted to reflect those which were available for inspection. If the targets were not being met, this would be monitored by COG which would help to support a case for additional resource.

11.5 It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED: That the Food Safety Service Plan 2024/25 be
APPROVED.

EX.12 APPOINTMENT TO COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY JOINT COMMITTEE

12.1 The report of the Community Infrastructure Levy Manager, circulated at Pages No. 91-94, asked Members to ratify the appointment of the Leader of the Council and the Lead Member for Planning and Place Making as the Committee Member and Reserve Member on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Joint Committee respectively.

12.2 The Lead Member for Planning and Place Making advised that, on 23 January 2024, the Council had approved the establishment of a CIL Joint Committee with Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils. At the Executive Committee meeting held on 10 January 2024, the Leader had stated that he would be the Committee Member and the Lead Member for Built Environment – as it was at the time - would be the Reserve Member on the Joint Committee but that had not formed part of the formal resolution.

12.3 Accordingly, it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED: That the appointment of the Leader of the Council as Tewkesbury Borough Council's Committee Member on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Joint Committee, and the Lead Member for Planning and Place Making as the substitute Member, be **RATIFIED.**

EX.13 PRODUCTIVITY PLANS

13.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Executive Director: Resources, circulated at Pages No. 95-98, which asked Members to note the use of urgency powers to establish a Productivity Plan Member Working Group to oversee the development of the plan and to delegate authority to the Executive Director: Resources, in conjunction with the Member Working Group, to finalise and submit the Productivity Plan.

13.2 The Chair, as Leader of the Council, explained that the previous government had set out that it wanted to see efficiencies from local government as part of additional funding in the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2024/25. Officers had worked quickly to establish a Working Group to submit the Productivity Plan by the

deadline of 19 July 2024 and Members were asked to note the use of urgency powers in order to achieve that. The Executive Director: Resources advised that the draft plan had been circulated to Members earlier that day; whilst it was a working document, it gave a feel of the document being submitted to the government. The Chair expressed the view that the plan which had been produced was a positive document about the work Tewkesbury Borough Council had been doing to drive efficiencies. The Chief Executive advised that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) had confirmed the new government was still keen on doing this and it was important to show the authority was efficient and effective and carrying out transformative work in view of potential cuts in public sector funding – this was something Tewkesbury Borough Council was already doing so it was hoped that would stand the authority in good stead.

- 13.3 A Member asked if this was something which ought to be promoted publicly to demonstrate efficiency to members of the public and the Chair agreed that positive communications would be helpful to make a case for what the Council was doing. It was subsequently proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED: That the use of urgency powers to establish a Productivity Plan Member Working Group to oversee the development of the plan, and to delegate authority to the Executive Director: Resources, in conjunction with the Member Working Group, to finalise and submit the Productivity Plan, be **NOTED**.

EX.14 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

- 14.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 99-116, which Members were asked to consider.

- 14.2 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee's Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

EX.15 SEPARATE BUSINESS

- 15.1 The Chair 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.

EX.16 SEPARATE MINUTES

- 16.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2024, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The meeting closed at 11:40 am