

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 5 December 2017 commencing at 6:00 pm**

## **Present:**

The Worshipful the Mayor  
Deputy Mayor

Councillor H A E Turbyfield  
Councillor T A Spencer

## **and Councillors:**

R E Allen, P W Awford, K J Berry, R A Bird, R Bishop, G F Blackwell, G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, D M M Davies, J E Day, M Dean, R D East, A J Evans, J H Evetts, D T Foyle, R E Garnham, P A Godwin, M A Gore, J Greening, R M Hatton, B C J Hesketh, S E Hillier-Richardson, A Hollaway, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, A S Reece, V D Smith, Mrs P E Stokes, M G Szymiak, R J E Vines, D J Waters, M J Williams and P N Workman

## **CL.51 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

51.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Furolo, H C McLain and P D Surman.

## **CL.52 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

52.1 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.

52.2 The following declarations were made:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application No./Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b>
P W Awford	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor. Tewkesbury Borough Council representative on the Lower Severn Internal Drainage Board. Member of Severn Wye Regional Flood Defence Committee. Member of Wessex Regional Flood Defence Committee.	Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.

			Life Member of the National Flood Forum.	
R A Bird	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.		Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
K J Cromwell	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.		Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
R E Garnham	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Has a pecuniary interest in the Joint Core Strategy.		Would not speak or vote and would leave the Chamber for the consideration of this item.
V D Smith	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.		Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.
R J E Vines	Item 7 – Joint Core Strategy: Adoption.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.		Had received a dispensation to speak and vote on this item.

52.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

### **CL.53 MINUTES**

53.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

### **CL.54 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

54.1 The evacuation procedure, as set out on the Agenda, was advised to those present.

### **CL.55 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**CL.56 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

56.1 The following question had been received from Councillor Sue Hillier-Richardson to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answer was given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Elaine MacTiernan, but was taken as read without discussion:

**Question:**

If this version of the Joint Core Strategy is adopted today (and by all three Councils) and then goes forward, will this Council then be able to refuse speculative applications for development of over 200 homes in parts of our Borough that are not designated for development in the Joint Core Strategy?

**Answer:**

The adoption of the Joint Core Strategy would mean that its policies had full weight in judging planning applications and gave this Council greater control over the location of new housing.

Importantly, Policy SP1 of the Joint Core Strategy confirmed the housing need for Tewkesbury which provided certainty over what its five year housing land supply target was and reinforced the current position that it had a five year supply on that basis. With a five year supply in place this meant there was no automatic presumption in favour of sustainable development (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework) and the planning policies were not judged to be out of date.

All applications for development would be judged against the policies in the plan. In particular, proposals for residential development would be considered against Policies SP2 – Spatial Strategy and SD10 – Residential Development. Those two policies provided the core principles for determining where housing may be appropriate in the Borough. SD10 stated that housing development, outside of site allocations (in the Joint Core Strategy, Borough Plan or Neighbourhood Plans), would only be permitted on previously developed land in the existing built up areas of Tewkesbury Town, Rural Service Centres and Service Villages. On other sites, housing would only be permitted where it was an affordable rural exception site, infilling within existing built up areas, or brought forward through Community Right to Build Orders or Neighbourhood Development Plans.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required that applications must be determined in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. A speculative application for 200+ dwellings, outside of an allocated site and not on previously developed land, would therefore be contrary to Policy SD10 and the principle would be in favour of refusal. However, as with any application, it would also be important to consider all other policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan and any other material planning considerations, in determining whether a proposal would otherwise constitute sustainable development.

56.2 The Mayor invited a supplementary question and, in response, the Member asked the following:

In view of the response, and bearing in mind the housing already being developed in areas such as Bishop's Cleeve and the government's intention that no New Homes Bonus would be paid on developments which were permitted on appeal, what confidence could Members have that these would be the only large scale sites in the period?

- 56.3 In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that sites which were not allocated through the Joint Core Strategy, the Borough Plan or Neighbourhood Development Plans would have to refer to the policies of those plans, such as SD10 in the Joint Core Strategy, which provided principles on where development would go. If development was outside of the allocated sites they would be contrary to policy and would then have to be viewed against the National Planning Policy Framework and other relevant circumstances on a case-by-case basis to see if a move away from the policy position would be justified.

**CL.57 JOINT CORE STRATEGY: ADOPTION**

- 57.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 13-395, which sought a resolution from Members to adopt the Joint Core Strategy, with the recommended main modifications, as part of the Statutory Development Plan for Tewkesbury Borough and for authority to be delegated to the Chief Executive to progress and sign two Memoranda of Understanding regarding sites within Tewkesbury Borough which contributed towards Cheltenham Borough's housing supply. The report attached, at Appendix 1, the adoption version of the Joint Core Strategy; at Appendix 2, the policy maps; at Appendix 3, the Inspector's final report; and at Appendix 4, the Sustainability Appraisal Adoption Statement. Members were asked to consider the report and resolve to adopt the adoption version of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy as part of the Borough Council's Statutory Development Plan; adopt the amendments (maps and text) to the adopted policies map as set out in the modified and new maps appended to the report; delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Lead Member for the Built Environment, in collaboration with Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils, to make minor spelling, grammatical, cross-referencing or typographical errors and presentational changes (including the addition of a foreword) to the Joint Core Strategy and accompanying policies maps prior to publication; delegate authority to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at Farm Lane, Leckhampton in Tewkesbury Borough to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough; and to delegate authority to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at land to the south of Tewkesbury Road, Uckington, as within Tewkesbury Borough, to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough.
- 57.2 The Chief Executive explained the procedure to be followed at the meeting which would involve the Head of Development Services presenting the report and Members then being given the opportunity to ask questions. A proposer and seconder would then be sought and the item opened up for debate.
- 57.3 The Head of Development Services advised that the report sought a resolution from the Council to adopt the Joint Core Strategy as part of the statutory Development Plan for the Borough. Gloucester City Council had already agreed to adopt the Strategy at its meeting on 23 November and Cheltenham Borough Council would consider the Strategy at its meeting on 11 December 2017. The Inspector's final report had concluded that the submission version of the Joint Core Strategy had a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness and/or legal compliance which meant she recommended non-adoption of it as submitted; however, with the recommended main modifications, as set out in the Appendix to her report, the Joint Core Strategy could be made sound and/or legally compliant and would, therefore, be capable of adoption. The Inspector had recognised the

importance of not delaying the plan and had recommended adoption as soon as possible, subject to the commencement of an immediate review. That review would be needed to address the shortfall of housing supply for Tewkesbury Borough and Gloucester City as well as the retail policy for all three Joint Core Strategy partner authorities. In addition, the report sought delegated authority for the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress two Memoranda of Agreement in respect of two sites within Tewkesbury Borough which would meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough. The site at Farm Lane, Leckhampton now had planning permission but had been removed from the Joint Core Strategy during the Examination. This meant a separate Agreement was needed to allow housing from the site to contribute to Cheltenham Borough's housing need. In terms of the land to the south of Tewkesbury Road, Uckington, while the Inspector recommended its removal from the Green Belt, the Joint Core Strategy did not propose the site was allocated for development. However, the Inspector had recognised that it had the potential to contribute to Cheltenham Borough's housing need if any development were to come forward. Again, as it was not in the Joint Core Strategy, a separate Agreement was needed in order that, in the event development was found to be acceptable, the site would contribute to Cheltenham Borough's housing need.

- 57.4 The Mayor thanked the Officer for the information provided and invited questions from Members. A Member indicated that he would like to make a proposal for an amendment but would need to seek advice from the Borough Solicitor as to whether it was possible. He asked whether the Council could agree to adopt a modified version of the Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy with site A1 removed due to unacceptable flood risk and unnecessary removal from the Green Belt; that options to cover the housing shortage that this created be explored with Stroud District Council using sites already identified on Gloucester's fringe in that authority's District Plan; and that, other than the changes required as a direct result of this, the Council agree to adopt all other criteria set out in Appendix 1 of the report and put it forward to the other Joint Core Strategy Councils and the Inspector for their approval and acceptance. In response, the Borough Solicitor explained that the legislation was very clear; the Council could either adopt with the main modifications recommended by the Inspector, or it could decide not to adopt. The only amendments which could be made at this stage were ones which did not change the substance of the Plan. The omission of a site was a substantive change which could not lawfully be made at this stage. It was therefore clear that the effect of such a change would be failure to adopt the Plan which was a course of action which would have consequential risks to the Council.
- 57.5 Given the media interest and concerns about who had been used as a flood expert, a Member questioned how the Council could justify the numbers of houses being put forward in Twigworth, particularly as a planning application on the site had been refused by the Council. In response, the Planning Policy Manager advised that the evidence base had been worked through to see if any areas were suitable for allocation at a strategic level and then the development management and planning application process looked at them in finer detail. The conclusion had been that Twigworth would be suitable for allocation in the Joint Core Strategy but that, even so, the detail of the application received had not been acceptable, hence the differing conclusions. Another Member indicated that, during the appeal for the Innsworth/Twigworth development which was ongoing, the Inspector had asked the flood expert how he could justify development in the area and he had indicated that building dwellings on stilts would be a mitigation; the Member questioned whether this was acceptable from the Joint Core Strategy point of view. In response, the Planning Policy Manager indicated that the Joint Core Strategy put policies in place and stated that appropriate mitigation would have to be provided. The Council's view was that the application was not acceptable and the approach to mitigation measures was one of the matters at the appeal. In addition, the Head

of Development Services explained that the policies in the Joint Core Strategy set the strategic context. There were options to deliver development at the site but at a local level the view was that had not been proven as part of the application. Referring to the flooding in 2007, a Member questioned why Professor Cluckie's evidence had been used then but he had seemingly not been listened to as an expert on flooding within the Joint Core Strategy process. In response, the Planning Policy Manager indicated that the flooding expertise used for the Joint Core Strategy evidence base was from Mr Michael Thomas. Professor Cluckie's representations had been considered as part of the Joint Core Strategy process and those had been taken into account along with all of the other representations received. This had not ultimately changed the recommendations put forward.

57.6 Another Member referred to the housing that would be within Tewkesbury Borough boundaries, but which would contribute to the housing need of Cheltenham and/or Gloucester, and questioned which Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule would be used for those sites. She also questioned how the six week 'challenge' period worked. In response, the Head of Development Services advised that any properties within the Tewkesbury Borough administrative area would be charged under the Tewkesbury Borough CIL Charging Schedule. The six week 'challenge' period would commence following adoption of the Joint Core Strategy by all three partner authorities; the period was for challenges on a point of law and was not about planning arguments. The Legal Adviser stressed that the grounds for a challenge were that the Joint Core Strategy had not been adopted within legislative powers or that a procedural requirement had not been complied with; "not within legislative powers" could sometimes include things that were about planning arguments, but not things that would be purely a matter of possible judgement. Another Member questioned when agreement on the site at Farm Lane, Leckhampton had taken place. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the previous submission version of the Joint Core Strategy had included a strategic allocation at Leckhampton which had encapsulated land within Cheltenham Borough as well as the Farm Lane site which was within Tewkesbury Borough. That allocation was then to meet Cheltenham Borough's housing needs. However, the Inspector had removed the allocation site from the Joint Core Strategy but recognised that the site at Farm Lane had already been granted planning permission. Therefore the site should be used to meet the needs of Cheltenham Borough Council even though it was within the boundaries of Tewkesbury Borough. For the other strategic allocations the Joint Core Strategy itself provided the agreement in terms of sharing housing but, as the Farm Lane site was not within the Joint Core Strategy, an additional mechanism was needed to gain that sharing agreement.

57.7 Given the mandate provided by the Council on 25 October 2016, a Member questioned how much work had been done on scoring the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sites and whether that evidence had been provided to the Inspector. The Planning Policy Manager explained that a lot of work had been undertaken in looking at sites to help meet the needs of Gloucester City but they had to be suitable, available and achievable in order to be used as well as meeting the joint Core Strategy spatial strategy; Twigworth was the only one that met the criteria. If the land was not available, and there was no evidence to show it could be delivered, it could not be allocated. In terms of the Twigworth allocation, a Member questioned what would happen if the site flooded before the houses were completed. In response, the Planning Policy Manager advised that the Joint Core Strategy kept development outside of high risk areas, and in Flood Zone 1, and any planning application would have to include an effective strategy for mitigation of flood risk both on site and in the surrounding area. The Council knew the extent of the 2007 floods and the developable areas on the Twigworth allocation were not within those areas. Some of the allocation did suffer from surface water flooding but this could be mitigated. In terms of who would be responsible for flooded

properties, the Legal Adviser confirmed that this would be a question of causation and that this would include the situation between the developer and the home owners and, as regards the Council, whether any actions it took had been reasonable in light of expert advice.

- 57.8 Referring to the provision of schools, a Member indicated that Policy A1 sought to provide new primary and secondary schools and he questioned where the funding for that would come from. In terms of the Innsworth/Twigworth site, the County Council had not identified a proposal for a school and he questioned whether that meant the infrastructure would not be delivered. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that any sites in strategic allocations were expected to make provision for education. The County Council had not identified a need for a secondary school in the Innsworth/Twigworth location at this stage but it was understood that the building of thousands of homes could lead to a new school being required in future. In the short term, the County Council would probably look to the expansion of existing facilities as it would take a number of years for a development to be fully built out and therefore to assess the full need for additional school provision.
- 57.9 The Mayor thanked Members for their questions and sought a motion from the floor. The Leader of the Council proposed, and it was seconded, that the Council adopt the adoption version of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, as part of the Borough Council's Statutory Development Plan; adopt the amendments (maps and text) to the adopted policies map as set out in the modified and new maps appended to the report at Appendix 2; delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Lead Member for the Built Environment, in collaboration with Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils, to make minor spelling, grammatical, cross-referencing or typographical errors and presentational changes (including the addition of a foreword) to the Joint Core Strategy and accompanying policies maps prior to publication; delegate authority to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at Farm Lane, Leckhampton in Tewkesbury Borough to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough; and delegate authority to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at land to the south of Tewkesbury Road, Uckington, as within Tewkesbury Borough, to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough. He also, as part of the motion, had an additional proposal to those recommended; that Tewkesbury Borough Council moves swiftly, via the Terms of Reference approved for the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group, to complete, amongst other matters, its local Green Belt review. This is to facilitate the early issue of the consultation draft of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan in accordance with the approved Local Development Scheme. The use of safeguarded land comprising of large areas of Green Belt at North West Cheltenham and Twigworth to meet identified shortfall should not be considered until such time as the local Green Belt review has been completed and all non-strategic housing allocations have been made as part of the local Green Belt review. Through the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group, particular focus shall be given to those areas of the Borough which are identified as Rural Service Centres and Service Villages and therefore comprised sustainable locations for non-strategic development. The Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group will take particular account of the Joint Core Strategy Inspector's comments in Paragraph 105 of the final report, dated 26 October, which makes clear that absolute numbers should be avoided and that more flexibility is required to allow for changing circumstances and to ensure effectiveness. In seconding the motion,

the Deputy Leader of the Council indicated that the Council had to get to grips with the need to build regulated and planned housing and, unfortunately, the consequences of not having a plan had been all too obvious until this point. The Joint Core Strategy had been through extensive deliberation, consultation, scrutiny and legal process and that had resulted in a version of the Plan that was acceptable to the Planning Inspectorate. He urged Members to take that forward and vote in favour of the proposal to adopt the adoption version of the Joint Core Strategy. There was concern amongst a number of Members that they had not seen a copy of the additional proposal and it was agreed that a short adjournment would be held so that Members could receive a copy of the additional wording. The meeting reconvened at 7:00pm with the same membership present.

- 57.10 Referring to the additional proposal, a Member questioned whether the Council could vote on it given that it had not been agreed by Gloucester City Council when it had adopted the Joint Core Strategy. In response, the Borough Solicitor advised that the proposal was Tewkesbury specific and, as such, was not intended to be attached to any decisions made by Cheltenham Borough or Gloucester City Councils. In terms of the Green Belt Review, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the Borough Plan had the opportunity to undertake a small scale review of the Green Belt and this would look at villages which were constrained by it such as Shurdington; it was a very different review to that undertaken by the Joint Core Strategy as it was much smaller scale and linked to specific locations. There was a further discussion about whether the Council could vote on the additional proposal given that it did not have the specific information before it in respect of the Borough Plan. The Borough Solicitor confirmed that the additional proposal sought to take up the points from the Joint Core Strategy which flowed from the first five recommendations on the paper and asked that, when the Council moved to looking at the Borough Plan, those issues be taken into account. The Planning Policy Manager indicated that the Joint Core Strategy provided the housing requirements and the strategic sites covered some of that need. The role of the Borough Plan was to meet some of the remaining need and that work was still to come before Members. The previous consultation on sites and policy options in terms of the Borough Plan had been undertaken in 2015 and the next version of the Plan would set down the preferred options that would meet the outstanding need. A Member asked for assurance that the Council would not end up with development on all of the strategic allocations as well as in all of the Rural Service Centres and Service Villages. In response, the Planning Policy Manager referred to policies SP1 and SP2 of the Joint Core Strategy which set out the housing requirements and how those should be distributed spatially – the additional proposal did not change that position.
- 57.11 The Mayor thanked Members for their questions and welcomed debate on the motion which had been duly proposed and seconded. A Member expressed the view that Councillors were elected to look at the larger picture rather than just the local scene and, in doing that, they should listen to what the experts had to say. He understood the floods in 2007 were still clear in everyone's minds but he felt it was important to remember that much of that had been due to the responsible authorities failing to carry out essential maintenance on streams etc. Another Member indicated that she had never voted for the Joint Core Strategy and would not be doing so that evening. She was of the view that the whole principle of building in urban extensions was flawed and that there were many more suitable sites, which were not in the Green Belt, available if the urban extensions strategy had not been agreed upon. She knew there were sites to the south of Gloucester that were available but would need a Memorandum of Agreement with Stroud District and she could not understand why that had not been sought. She also knew the Twigworth site had seen some flooding in 2014 and she was extremely concerned that any development there could lead to a situation whereby people would be living in houses with much of the development only half built due to

flooding issues. She understood that the Council needed a Plan to address housing need but she did not feel this should be at the expense of the Green Belt. There were already many homes across the Borough that had been built but remained unoccupied as they were not selling so she could not see there was a desperate need for houses at this time. Another Member indicated that he would vote for the Plan as, even though it was not perfect, it was the best the Borough had at this stage. He would have liked to see a new village or garden village as a way to meet the Council's housing need but, as that had not happened, he hoped the Borough Plan would provide some existing villages a small amount of sustainable development to help prevent them from dying out, and at the same time offer some breathing space in terms of meeting housing need.

- 57.12 Referring to the Twigworth site, a Member expressed concern that it would be extremely difficult to build on the land given the height of the water table. He had seen first-hand the loss felt by residents when their homes had been flooded and he would not want to do that to the people of Twigworth; he expressed the view that it would not be the new houses that flooded, as their floor levels would be higher, instead the water would most likely be worse in the surrounding areas. Another Member expressed the view that the Council really had no choice but to adopt the Joint Core Strategy as it would otherwise have no control over development in the area. He believed that the local area should decide on development rather than central government and that was the reason he would be voting to adopt the Joint Core Strategy. Another Member expressed the view that, despite there being potential options available around Gloucester City and Cheltenham Borough, Tewkesbury Borough seemed to have supported the housing needs of those partners and still been left with a massive shortfall of its own. He felt it was a shame that precious few people would have read the Twigworth Flood Study, or the representations made by Professor Cluckie, as they were extremely important. Personally he felt he was in an extremely difficult position as, in seeking to protect areas from growing by proxy, he had no choice but to support the Joint Core Strategy and this did not sit comfortably with him. Over the last six/seven years he had tried hard to remove Twigworth as a strategic allocation only for it to be put back into the Joint Core Strategy on three occasions. In addition, a Member felt it important to note that, in some cases, the Council had lost appeals because sites were in the Joint Core Strategy as well as because it did not have a Plan. He would not support the Joint Core Strategy as flooding issues were a major problem, which three different experts had confirmed but none of whom had provided any satisfactory mitigation. He felt there were other options to meet Gloucester City's housing needs and that those should be explored thoroughly with Stroud District Council whilst it was undertaking its Core Strategy review; especially as Stroud District had committed to working with Gloucester City to meet its needs and had identified a number of sites on Gloucester's fringes that could help.
- 57.13 Referring to the additional proposal, a Member understood it offered flexibility but felt the consequence would be more housing in places like Bishop's Cleeve where the infrastructure could not cope. She was of the view that the Joint Core Strategy was not that of the three partner authorities but was instead the Inspector's Plan; the Inspector had decided on the housing need number, the modifications, changes to the Green Belt and now seemed to be influencing the Borough's own local plan and the Member felt this was not acceptable. She had no confidence that speculative development would be prevented by the Joint Core Strategy and felt strongly that the government's focus in favour of housing meant the Council would have limited options to defend against developers. She was also concerned about the possibility of housing that was allowed on appeal not receiving New Homes Bonus funding as that was a large part of the Council's budget planning. Another Member agreed that the Plan was not that of Tewkesbury Borough Council and he could not vote in favour of it. He felt strongly that there were issues

with the possible development of land at Mitton which would come forward through Wychavon District Council's Plan even though it would be the services in Tewkesbury, e.g. schools, policing, doctors surgeries etc., which would have to cope with the additional people, not to mention the resultant flooding problems which would most likely be suffered. In addition, the Bredon Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan did not support development in that area and therefore was being undermined. In offering an alternative view, some Members felt it was important to challenge the assertion made that, by not voting for the Plan, the Council would be able to continue to prevent unplanned strategic applications; it was felt this was unsustainable. If the Council did not vote for the Plan it would have no defence for resisting planning applications; only voting in favour of the Joint Core Strategy would offer some defence. They were of the view that the Borough Council had a responsibility to all residents to prevent unplanned, unstructured development applications as well as helping to meet the ambitions set out in its Economic Development and Tourism Strategy. Without growth, employment land for jobs could not be delivered and, in the main, growth would bring good things to the Borough which could benefit all residents. It was suggested that the Council had to adopt the Plan and begin to deliver houses otherwise anything that was done economically would be a waste of time. Those Members felt that, at least if it had a Plan, the Council would have some control over all of those aspects.

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

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Absent</b>
R E Allen	K J Berry	V D Smith	R Furolo
P W Awford	R Bishop		R E Garnham
R A Bird	G J Bocking		H C McLain
G F Blackwell	K J Cromwell		P D Surman
D M M Davies	A J Evans		
J E Day	J Greening		
M Dean	S E Hillier- Richardson		
R D East	P E Stokes		
J H Evetts	M G Sztymiak		
D T Foyle	M J Williams		
P A Godwin	P N Workman		
M A Gore			
R M Hatton			
B C J Hesketh			
A Hollaway			

E J MacTiernan

J R Mason

A S Reece

T A Spencer

H A E Turbyfield

R J E Vines

D J Waters

57.15 With 22 votes in favour, 11 against and 1 abstention, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That the adoption version of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED** as part of the Borough Council's statutory development plan.
2. That the amendments (maps and text) to the adopted policies map, as set out in the modified and new maps within Appendix 2 to the report, be **ADOPTED**.
3. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Lead Member for Built Environment, in collaboration with Cheltenham Borough and Gloucester City Councils, to make minor spelling, grammatical, cross-referencing or typographical errors and presentational changes (including the addition of a foreword) to the Joint Core Strategy and accompanying policies maps prior to publication.
4. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at Farm Lane, Leckhampton in Tewkesbury Borough to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough.
5. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, in consultation with the Leader of Tewkesbury Borough Council, to progress and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council in respect of the delivery of housing at land to the south of Tewkesbury Road, Uckington, as within Tewkesbury Borough, to meet the housing needs of Cheltenham Borough.

6. That Tewkesbury Borough Council moves swiftly, via the Terms of Reference approved for the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group, to complete, amongst other matters, its local Green Belt review. This is to facilitate the early issue of the consultation draft of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan in accordance with the approved local development scheme. The use of safeguarded land comprising of large areas of Green Belt at North West Cheltenham and Twigworth, to meet identified shortfall, should not be considered until such time as the local Green Belt review has been completed and all non-strategic housing allocations have been made as part of the local Green Belt review. Through the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group, particular focus shall be given to those areas of the Borough which are identified as Rural Service Centres and Service Villages and therefore comprise sustainable locations for non-strategic development. The Tewkesbury Borough Plan Working Group will take particular account of the Joint Core Strategy Inspector's comments in Paragraph 105 of the final report dated 26 October which makes clear that absolute numbers should be avoided and that more flexibility is required to allow for changing circumstances and to ensure effectiveness.

## **CL.58 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

### **Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19-2022/23**

- 58.1 At its meeting on 22 November 2017 the Executive Committee considered the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19-2022/23 and recommended to Council that it be adopted subject to two amendments: Paragraph 10.3 of the Strategy be amended to read: 'The previous Medium Term Financial Strategy recognises the likely need for further increases in future years in order to provide the flexibility to deal with the anticipated deficit faced. Although Council finances have improved, and additional revenue streams are now being developed, there may continue to be a need to resort to some measure of further Council Tax increase each year over the Strategy period. The Council will maintain this previous financial strategy, accepting the likely need for future increases, but seeking to maintain the Council Tax to the lowest possible levels'; and Table 7 of the Strategy be amended so the heading reads 'Potential Council Tax Strategy' and the table includes percentage, as well as monetary, amounts.
- 58.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 396-422 and the amended information had been circulated as an addendum to that report.
- 58.3 The recommendation was proposed by the Chair of the Executive Committee and subsequently seconded.
- 58.4 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED** That that the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19-2022/23 be **ADOPTED**, subject to the following amendments:

- Paragraph 10.3 of the Strategy be amended to read: 'The previous Medium Term Financial Strategy recognises the likely need for further increases in future years in order to provide the flexibility to deal with the anticipated deficit faced. Although Council finances have improved, and additional revenue streams are now being developed, there may continue to be a need to resort to some measure of further Council Tax increase each year over the Strategy period. The Council will maintain this previous financial strategy, accepting the likely need for future increases, but seeking to maintain the Council Tax to the lowest possible levels'.
- Table 7 of the Strategy be amended so the heading reads 'Potential Council Tax Strategy' and the table includes percentage, as well as monetary, amounts.

### **Affordable Housing Allocations on Strategic Sites**

58.5 At its meeting on 22 November 2017 the Executive Committee had recommended that the lettings and sales arrangements for affordable housing allocations on strategic sites be adopted.

58.6 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 423-431.

58.7 The recommendation was proposed by the Chair of the Executive Committee and subsequently seconded.

58.8 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED** That the lettings and sales arrangements for affordable housing allocations on strategic sites be **ADOPTED**.

### **CL.59 CHANGE TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

59.1 Members **NOTED** that, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 2.1, the Borough Solicitor had exercised her delegated authority to approve a change to the membership of the Planning Committee whereby Councillor D J Waters had resigned and been replaced by Councillor P W Awford.

The meeting closed at 7:50 pm