

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held remotely on Tuesday, 28 July 2020  
commencing at 6:30 pm**

## **Present:**

The Worshipful the Mayor  
Deputy Mayor

Councillor G F Blackwell  
Councillor A S Reece

## **and Councillors:**

C L J Carter, C M Cody, M Dean, M A Gore, D W Gray, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan,  
H C McLain, H S Munro, J W Murphy, C Reid, J K Smith, R J G Smith, V D Smith, C Softley,  
P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, S Thomson, R J E Vines, M J Williams and P N Workman

## **CL.10 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 10.1 The Mayor advised that the meeting was being held under the emergency provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020 and, specifically, The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. The meeting was being broadcast live via the internet, it was not being recorded by the Council but, under the usual transparency rules, it may be being recorded by others.

## **CL.11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 11.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P E Smith and S A T Stevens.

## **CL.12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 12.1 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.
- 12.2 There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

## **CL.13 MINUTES**

- 13.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

## **CL.14 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**CL.15 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

15.1 There were no Member questions on this occasion.

**CL.16 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE****Climate Change and Carbon Reduction Audit and Action Plan**

- 16.1 At its meeting on 8 July 2020, the Executive Committee had considered the climate change and carbon reduction audit and action plan and recommended to Council that it be agreed as having established the Council's current position and carbon baseline; and that agreement be given for detailed work and feasibility studies to commence in relation to the carbon reduction options set out in the action plan.
- 16.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 8-93.
- 16.3 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation and felt it was important to note that the action plan had come forward as a result of proposals agreed by the Council in October. The Climate Change and Flood Risk Management Group had been asked to take the work forward and, thanks to that Group, the action plan was an excellent document which had been approved by the Executive Committee for recommendation to Council. The recommendation was seconded by the Vice-Chair who felt it was a concise and forward-thinking action plan.
- 16.4 A Member thanked all who had worked on the report and was pleased with the suggested substantial savings – both in terms of carbon and financing - and felt this showed that 'green' investments could be beneficial in terms of the environment and business. Notwithstanding this, the original motion had first been introduced 12-months ago and he was concerned with the 10-year timescale given how long it had taken to get to this point, particularly when the motion only focussed on the Council's own buildings. He noted that climate change was an extremely important issue with consequences that would affect the whole world, so everyone had to play their part. Given the flooding issues faced across Tewkesbury Borough, he felt that all Members had a vested interest in improving the effects of climate change and he indicated that, whilst the action plan was a good document, he was concerned about the short and medium-term phasing and the fact that savings needed to be achieved in as short a timeframe as possible. For that reason, he proposed an amendment that the length of the medium-term be shortened to five years instead of seven years with the intention of completing those actions by 2025. In seconding the amendment, a Member reiterated the concerns and felt strongly that the climate change emergency needed to be urgently addressed. Members were advised that safe carbon levels were below 350 parts per million but sustainable practices had to be introduced to get down to that level – as at 26 July 2020 the carbon level was 413 parts per million so there was a long way to go. The Motion only covered Tewkesbury Borough Council owned buildings and, if left with the timetable of 2030, the Council would only have 20 years to ensure the rest of the borough met the government target in 2050. As the action plan had already taken a year to get to this point, the Member was concerned this would be an impossible task. She felt that phase one should be the easy part and if that was addressed quicker more time would be available to concentrate on phase 2. Members were all in this together and the Council must act as quickly as possible to address climate change, particularly now that sustainability was a key priority in the Council Plan.

16.5 The view was expressed by some Members that experts had been employed to undertake the audit and action plan work and it made sense to follow their advice. In addition, the plan had been agreed by both the Climate Change and Flood Risk Management Group and the Executive Committee so had been through the Council's due process. A Member indicated that the experts had not yet applied timescales to the actions so it would be premature to consider an amendment at this stage. Members were advised that Gloucestershire County Council had undertaken to achieve carbon zero across the county by 2050 which would obviously also be of benefit to Tewkesbury Borough. It was noted that the report proposed phased implementation of the actions which, for the medium term, would be from 24 months to seven years meaning they could be achieved within five years because there was already flexibility in the plan. It was noted that this was just the beginning of the plan and it did not make sense to make commitments at this stage that either would not be met or would not be affordable. It was also felt that the amendment could serve to delay things by shortening the medium term so some things that could have been achieved within seven years would instead be put into the longer term meaning they could take 10 years. There were some actions that could be taken immediately to make a difference, such as turning the heating in the Council Offices down, but there were questions about whether the Council could afford to do everything in a quicker timescale. The report before the Council had been carefully examined through the process and the report itself referenced the significant progress Tewkesbury Borough Council had already made in certain areas. Other Members expressed the view that the Council had the opportunity to do something positive in how it dealt with sustainability and climate change and that the amendment proposed was a constructive way to do that. They could not understand why Tewkesbury Borough Council would not wish to set a challenging target and lead by example on this issue. In supporting the amendment, a Member indicated that the first and foremost thing to remember was that the Council had acknowledged this was an emergency and by implication was urgent. The amendment was modest, sensible and achievable and made environmental and financial sense. The original Motion to declare a climate emergency had been put forward a year ago but then had been considered by Members and 'watered down' until it came back to Council in October; the longer the situation remained unaddressed the more it would cost both environmentally and financially. Actions such as putting photovoltaic panels on Council buildings would also provide jobs which was exactly what the country needed now. It was considered by many that the Council's funds were safer in climate action than in commercial property even though the returns were longer. It was an emergency and there was urgency so to bring the timescales forward from seven to five years was a bold but necessary move.

16.6 In summing up, the proposer of the amendment advised that he had heard a number of spurious arguments against reducing the medium term timescale but he believed it could be achieved for the benefit of the residents of the Borough and that the climate emergency had to be addressed sooner rather than later or the consequences could be dire. 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>
C L J Carter	R A Bird	J H Evetts	P E Smith
C M Cody	G F Blackwell		C Softley
L A Gerrard	G J Bocking		S A T Stevens

D J Harwood	K J Cromwell
M L Jordan	M Dean
H S Munro	R D East
P W Ockelton	P A Godwin
R J G Smith	M A Gore
R J Stanley	D W Gray
M G Sztymiak	A Hollaway
S Thomson	E J MacTiernan
P N Workman	J R Mason
	H C McLain
	P D McLain
	J W Murphy
	A S Reece
	C Reid
	J K Smith
	V D Smith
	P D Surman
	R J E Vines
	M J Williams

16.7 With 12 votes in favour, 22 against and one abstention, the amendment was lost.

16.8 A Councillor proposed a further amendment that Officers bring back a report to Council in six-months' time detailing the business case of how to achieve implementation of photovoltaic installation (the cost of which would result in an overall saving to the Council after six years). She indicated that she was new to the Council but had noted that photovoltaic installation had not been looked at as a business case to date. She was also of the view that the funding the Council had been unable to invest in a commercial property could be used instead to achieve part of the photovoltaic programme; this would be identified as part of the business case. She had raised this issue at the Executive Committee meeting and the Head of Finance and Asset Management had indicated that a business case would be required which was the reason for proposing the current amendment. In addition, there was a possibility of the local electricity emergency bill coming through parliament and it made sense for the Council to join that as early as possible and move forward with this positive investment. In seconding the amendment, a Member indicated that it asked for a minor change to what was already suggested within the report with a reasonable 12-month timeframe. Officers had indicated that 12-months would be sufficient and achievable, so it made sense to formalise that position. In response to a query, the proposer of the amendment confirmed that, ideally, all the

Council's buildings would have photovoltaic panels but viability would need to be confirmed within the business case. The report stated that panels on the Roses Theatre could halve its bills so that in itself would be worth investigating. It was confirmed that the amendment asked for a business case to come forward within 12-months to understand the feasibility and what the returns would be.

- 16.9 During the discussion which ensued, a Member questioned whether funding that had been earmarked for commercial investment could be used for other things. In response, the Chief Executive confirmed that the Council would have to raise money for any capital investment, whether for commercial buildings or environmental matters. Another Member indicated that a lot of investments were insecure in the current climate, but the amendment as proposed would result in Tewkesbury Borough Council being greener and having more money in its pocket. At a time when the cost of electricity and fuel was increasing it made sense for the Council to be generating its own energy. He noted that respiratory disease affected one in five people and the annual economic burden of lung conditions, including lung cancer, cost £11billion so improving air quality would help save lives as well as improving the climate and saving money.
- 16.10 A Member suggested that the amendment could actually mean there would be a delay in bringing forward a business case for photovoltaic panels. In response it was confirmed that this was not anticipated to be the position. Officers had indicated they would not be able to do the work requested by the amendment within six months – which was what the proposer and seconder had originally wanted – but that the 12-month timescale would be achievable. Without the amendment the timescale would be completely open-ended and supporters of the amendment felt this would be unacceptable. They indicated that the amendment did not require the Council to spend money at this stage, it merely asked for a business case to see if photovoltaics would be cost effective. The idea was to introduce a timeframe for the work to be undertaken.
- 16.11 The consultant that had undertaken the carbon audit for the Council thanked Members for the interesting conversation. He felt the only aspect to raise from his perspective was the 12-month timeframe for photovoltaic panels. The main risk was that, if the panels were installed ahead of knowing the demand, the operator may not be able to export the additionally generated energy and the Council ran the risk of installing an excessively large system with the energy needing to be dumped rather than used. The action plan focussed on low / no cost measures to bring down the energy demand. Once the level was known, the photovoltaic panels could be sized accordingly to reflect demand across the Council's whole estate - 12 months was not unrealistic, but the demand / reduction side of things was a lot of work so there may become a pinch point on resources.
- 16.12 Speaking against the amendment, a Member reiterated that the action plan had been agreed as it had come forward and the Council had a structure in place to meet that action plan; as such, he felt Members needed to allow the process to continue and then push it as quickly as possible in a realistic way. He felt the experts must be allowed to do their job and advise the Council accordingly. Another Member agreed and indicated that the Council had a sensible action plan before it which prioritised actions in a rational way to ensure the most urgent things were addressed first. He advised that the Council currently had panels on its office building because it was a leader and was effective at doing the right thing at the right time. He also felt it would have been more effective to have had these discussions in Working Group meetings rather than trying to make ad-hoc amendments at Council.

16.13 A Member requested a recorded vote 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>
C L J Carter	R A Bird		P E Smith
C M Cody	G F Blackwell		C Softley
L A Gerrard	G J Bocking		S A T Stevens
D J Harwood	K J Cromwell		
M L Jordan	M Dean		
H S Munro	R D East		
P W Ockelton	J H Evetts		
R J G Smith	P A Godwin		
R J Stanley	M A Gore		
M G Sztymiak	D W Gray		
S Thomson	A Hollaway		
P N Workman	E J MacTiernan		
	J R Mason		
	H C McLain		
	P D McLain		
	J W Murphy		
	A S Reece		
	C Reid		
	J K Smith		
	V D Smith		
	P D Surman		
	R J E Vines		
	M J Williams		

16.14 With 12 votes in favour and 23 against, the amendment was lost.

16.15 With no further amendments, the original proposal was put to the vote and accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That the audit report be **AGREED** as having established the Council's current position and carbon baseline.
2. That the action plan be **NOTED** and agreement given for the detailed work and feasibility studies to commence in relation to the carbon reduction options set out in the action plan.

**Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee - Extension of Operating Period**

16.16 At its meeting on 8 July 2020, the Executive Committee had considered an extension to the operating period of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee and recommended to Council that the notice period of 12 months, contained in the Inter Authority Agreement of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee in respect of the extension of that agreement, be waived and removed; that the Council works in partnership with all Gloucestershire local authorities to enable the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee to continue to operate for a further 18 months from 30 September 2020 until 31 March 2022, with Tewkesbury Borough Council as a member, under the terms of the existing Inter Authority Agreement; and that authority be delegated to the Borough Solicitor to conclude the necessary legal agreements associated with the previous two resolutions.

16.17 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 94-100.

16.18 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation and noted that the time limit of this important partnership was nearing an end and an extension was required to enable it to continue its good work. The recommendation was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

16.19 A Member questioned what the key successes of the Committee were. In response, the Chief Executive advised that the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee was the only joint decision-making body in the County for economic growth. It managed the Gloucestershire business rates pool; had set up a strategic economic development fund - which had peaked at £4.5 million in terms of its ability to support growth in the county - and had funded a range of projects and continued to do so; and had taken a principle role in co-ordinating the economic response to COVID-19 across the county. In essence, this was a very important Committee which held a lot of funding for projects in the county. The 18 month extension would also be used as time to look at the governance arrangements generally and understand the best approach going forward.

16.20 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED**

1. That the notice period of 12 months, contained in the Inter Authority Agreement of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee in respect of the extension of that agreement, be waived and removed.
2. That the Council works in partnership with all Gloucestershire local authorities to enable the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee to continue to operate for a further 18 months from 30 September 2020 until 31 March 2022, with Tewkesbury Borough Council as a member, under the

terms of the existing Inter Authority Agreement.

3. That authority be delegated to the Borough Solicitor to conclude the necessary legal agreements associated with resolutions 1 and 2 above.

## **CL.17 GOLDEN VALLEY DEVELOPMENT - SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

- 17.1 The report of the Planning Policy Manager, circulated at Pages No. 101-507, attached the Golden Valley Development Supplementary Planning Document which Members were asked to approve.
- 17.2 In making a proposal, the Lead Member for Built Environment advised that the strategic site at west Cheltenham had been allocated through the Joint Core Strategy when it was adopted in December 2017. The site was formally designated for approximately 1,100 new homes and 45 hectares of employment land to be focused on a cyber security hub. The site had also subsequently been awarded Garden Community status by the government. In order to proactively influence the development and drive up quality, it was agreed jointly by Tewkesbury and Cheltenham Borough Councils to develop a Supplementary Planning Document in order to provide further detailed and site specific guidance to steer the development and help determine future planning applications. In early 2019, consultants Avison Young had been commissioned to support the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document. The document set out the vision and objectives for the development of the area as well as providing a strategic masterplanning framework to ensure a comprehensive approach to the site. The Supplementary Planning Document was based around five key objectives of sustainability; land use; landscape; movement; and design quality and, under each objective, there were a set of detailed principles to inform and guide future development. Following a series of early informal consultation events with key stakeholders to develop a draft, the document was published for a formal consultation period which took place over five weeks between January and February 2020. This had included a series of four community drop-in events which had been attended by 210 people and a dedicated consultation website which had been visited by over 2,800 people. The feedback to the consultation had been considered and, where appropriate, amendments made in response. The proposal was seconded.
- 17.3 Members were advised that the Supplementary Planning Document was a culmination of the work to date and was presented at Appendix 1 to the report – this marked the final stage of the process with the document becoming a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications once it was approved by both Councils. Cheltenham Borough Council had already approved the document at its Council meeting on 20 July 2020, so Tewkesbury Borough Council was now asked to approve it as set out in the report. The Lead Member clarified that, although the first recommendation in the report sought ‘approval’ of the Supplementary Planning Document, it should be worded as seeking ‘adoption’ of the document meaning the decision of the Council would be to formally adopt the Supplementary Planning Document.
- 17.4 During the discussion which ensued, a Member indicated that, whilst he broadly supported the Supplementary Planning Document, he was disappointed that it did not include a vision for high speed broadband for communities and he would like to see high speed internet for 100% of houses and businesses in the Borough in future. Another Member expressed the view that he had not had time to thoroughly understand and review the document; however, he had a number of queries: Page No. 35 of the consultation section made a comment referencing ‘Chapter one’, however, it was not clear where Chapter one was located; consultants Avison Young had been appointed at a cost of £189,832 and he queried who had agreed

the Terms of Reference and how much Tewkesbury Borough Council had contributed; the five week consultation period had run from 13 January to 17 February 2020 but how long had been set aside to quantify the results; the town's Golden Valley development would see the United Kingdom's first campus built around cyber technology, called Cyber Central, constructed with a 3,000 home Garden Community built next to GCHQ, Cheltenham Borough Council had said they had drawn up a list of six high calibre potential partners to deliver the project after its search closed earlier in the month – was the figure 1,100 or 3,000, how many were within Tewkesbury Borough and should that form part of the deliberations within the Planning Policy Reference Panel for the Joint Core Strategy review; the cyber business park; a campus focussed around the rapidly growing cyber technology sector would be completed by 2023 – was this a realistic target date; Cheltenham Borough Council had announced it had borrowed £37.5million from several Councils across the UK to purchase the land on the west of Cheltenham, next to Hesters Way, Fiddlers Green and Springbank – what was Tewkesbury Borough Council's liability, if any, with that loan; the cyber security sector had doubled in value in the last year and was now worth £8.3billion – would Tewkesbury Borough Council see any benefit from that increase; and, as Policy DS7 was three years out of date and there was uncertainty on the densities and final number of houses – what was the timescale for a traffic assessment across the Golden Valley and wider road networks leading to Junction 10. In response, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the reference to Chapter one referred to the introductory chapter; the site was allocated in the Joint Core Strategy for 1,100 – the 3,000 likely referred to the potential wider area including the safeguarded land which was being looked at as part of the Joint Core Strategy review but that still required assessment which was why the Supplementary Planning Document referred to 1,100; and Policy DS7 was the transport strategy and was part of the evidence base for the Joint Core Strategy – this had been done based on expected growth in the Joint Core Strategy including the west of Cheltenham site – the Supplementary Planning Document had done some high level work but any application would have to do its own transport modelling and the Joint Core Strategy review would review all transport work. The Chief Executive explained that Cheltenham Borough Council had invested in land for housing and commercial development which was the way it had decided to help bring development forward. Tewkesbury Borough Council was engaged in the process as a local planning authority for the area falling within the borough – it was not a landowner in the area. The growth in the cyber industry was a big success for the UK, that sector would continue to grow and would be of benefit to Tewkesbury Borough in terms of growth in the area so this was an extremely important project with the jobs to be created of national and international importance. The Planning Policy Manager explained that the consultation had closed in February and the consultant team and Officers had spent a couple of months going through them and considering the implications for the plan; the document had been jointly commissioned and Tewkesbury Borough Council had contributed to the costs; the development of the site was a long term project, particularly housing – the 2023 figure was probably more for the cyber central element which might come forward earlier due to the investment / need; and all delivery timescales were best estimates at the time. Referring to the Member's contention that the Council had not had long enough to consider the document, the Chief Executive reminded Members that the Council had received the draft document for approval for consultation previously and the changes since then had been minimal so the Council had seen the document as it had come through the stages to adoption. Clearly, the COVID-19 pandemic had resulted in some issues in terms of Member engagement being slightly delayed which was the reason the seminar had been held the day before the Council meeting - ideally that would have been held earlier but the intention was certainly not for Members to feel as though they had not had long enough to consider the document fully. It was quite a high level but vital document.

17.6 A Member indicated that he would vote in favour of adopting the Supplementary Planning Document; as with any project of this large scale there were some areas that everyone may not fully agree on but, on the whole, he was of the view it was a very exciting opportunity for job and high tech creation. In an ideal world, the Member seminar would have been held sooner but he understood why this had not been possible. Another Member agreed that she would vote for the adoption of the document but noted that she had struggled with such a large document and, whilst the seminar had been very informative, there had been a lot of information to absorb in a short time. She also asked for more notice to be provided for seminars so Members could schedule them into their diaries avoiding other commitments. The Chief Executive advised that those comments would be taken on board. In terms of the Planning Policy Reference Panel, Officers were already working on a schedule of meetings and work programme for the Panel which was linked to the Joint Core Strategy review.

17.7 Having considered the information provided, it was

- RESOLVED**
1. That the Golden Valley Development Supplementary Planning Document, as provided at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED**.
  2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Development Services to make any minor editorial changes to the approved Supplementary Planning Document in terms of formatting, presentation and accuracy prior to final publication.

## **CL.18 APPOINTMENTS**

### **COVID-19 Health Protection Board - Member Engagement Board**

18.1 Attention was drawn to the Agenda which asked the Council to note the Leader and Deputy Leader's representation on the Member Engagement Board of the COVID-19 Health Protection Board.

18.2 Accordingly, it was

- RESOLVED** That the Leader and Deputy Leader's representation on the Member Engagement Board of the COVID-19 Health Protection Board be **NOTED**.

### **Pensions Committee**

18.3 Attention was drawn to the Agenda which asked the Council to note Councillor Gray's appointment to the Pensions Committee as the District Councils' representative.

18.4 Accordingly, it was

- RESOLVED** That Councillor Gray's appointment to the Pensions Committee as the District Councils' representative be **NOTED**.

## **CL.19 ADJOURNMENT**

19.1 The meeting was adjourned for a five-minute break at 8:40pm. The meeting reconvened at 8:45pm with the same Membership present.

**CL.20 NOTICES OF MOTION****Support for Tech Talent Charter**

- 20.1 The Worshipful the Mayor referred to the Notice of Motion set out on the Agenda and indicated that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, it was necessary for the Council firstly to decide whether it wished to debate and determine the Motion at this evening's meeting, or whether it wished to refer the Motion, without debate, to a Committee for consideration with authority either to make a decision on the matter or to bring a recommendation back to Council.
- 20.2 Upon being put to the vote it was  
**RESOLVED** That the Motion be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

**Making a Change to Improve the Borough as a Lasting Consequence of the COVID-19 Emergency**

- 20.3 The Worshipful the Mayor referred to the Notice of Motion set out on the Agenda and indicated that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, it was necessary for the Council firstly to decide whether it wished to debate and determine the Motion at this evening's meeting, or whether it wished to refer the Motion, without debate, to a Committee for consideration with authority either to make a decision on the matter or to bring a recommendation back to Council.
- 20.4 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 A Bird			P E Smith
G F Blackwell			C Softley
G J Bocking			S A T Stevens
C L J Carter			
C M Cody			
K J Cromwell			
M Dean			
R D East			
J H Evetts			
L A Gerrard			
P A Godwin			
M A Gore			
D W Gray			
D J Harwood			

A Hollaway

M L Jordan

E J MacTiernan

J R Mason

H C McLain

P D McLain

H S Munro

J W Murphy

P W Ockelton

A S Reece

C Reid

J K Smith

R J G Smith

V D Smith

R J Stanley

P D Surman

M G Sztymiak

S Thomson

R J E Vines

M J Williams

P N Workman

20.5 With 35 votes in favour it was unanimously agreed that the Motion would be discussed at this evening's Council meeting.

20.6 The Motion, as set out on the Agenda, was proposed and seconded. The proposer of the Motion felt that the world was currently living through the greatest health and economic crisis of a lifetime. As of 25 July, there had been 255 COVID-19 cases in Tewkesbury Borough and 580 deaths in the county and, nationally, over 45,000 people had lost their lives. Every citizen had been affected whether by lockdown, restricted travel, furlough, loss of jobs, self-isolation etc. Many had made resolutions on how to change their lives in the future and numerous great volunteer groups had been set up. She thanked volunteers and Officers for their hard work during this turbulent time and felt it was right to take the opportunity to make a change to improve the borough so that something positive could come from the pandemic and to commemorate the people who had lost their lives as well as celebrating the people who had done great things. The proposal was not for an expensive or elaborate scheme - ideas included planting wildflower seeds, providing certificates

to businesses to show how they had been champions in their area or writing letters of thanks to those individuals involved - but it was felt appropriate to include something in the Council's recovery plan to mark the pandemic. In seconding the Motion, a Member indicated that he had been struck by how everyone in the communities had come together in a way that was rarely seen in any other situation. The community spirit had been amazing and she felt it was right to have a tangible memorial of some description, possibly a memorial garden or space in each town/village in the borough for people to sit and reflect, this would fit into the recovery plan as well and it was hoped the Council could collectively pass the Motion as proposed.

20.7 In supporting the Motion, a Member noted that there were several different ideas, but the Motion asked the Council to explore what could be achieved. He strongly felt that something needed to be done in recognition of the efforts made by so many keyworkers. In offering an alternative view, another Member indicated that he could not support the Motion as it stood. He explained that the country was still amidst the emergency and it was therefore not appropriate to celebrate at this stage. He also expressed concern that there had already been different suggestions on how to fulfil the Motion and he felt it would be more helpful to have one idea. He suggested that a conversation about the way to commemorate the pandemic could be held when the recovery plan actions were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Another Member agreed that excellent work had been undertaken across the borough and he commiserated with those that had lost loved ones; however, the recovery plan would look to make things better and learn lessons which was the reason it would be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

20.8 It was agreed that the crisis was ongoing, and a Member pointed out that no one was talking about celebrating but rather marking, respecting and building goodwill for those who had gone above and beyond. That could be done at any point so there was no need to wait until the crisis was over. In response to a query regarding point 1 of the Motion, the proposer explained that the Council would put out a press release to the effect that it intended to make one significant change post-emergency for the benefit of its local residents. The County Council had recently unanimously approved a similar Motion and it was hoped the Borough Council could do the same. The Motion had deliberately not been made prescriptive in terms of the memorial as this was felt to be something the Council should agree together. Supporters of the Motion expressed concern at some of the comments that had been made and felt that parts of the discussion and debate had been offensive in terms of the Motion being 'a waste of time' and other Members felt they could not see any issue with the Motion as it stood as it was asking to make a change post-emergency and to support the idea of some kind of memorial. A suggestion was made that Parish/Town Councils were in a much better position to send letters to community volunteers and it was noted that some Parishes had already started to work on this by sending letters and flowers or putting memorial benches in place; however, others were not in a position to organise those kind of things. A Member indicated that people had worked really hard throughout the crisis and they deserved recognition from their elected representatives – it was not suggested the Borough Council would replace the work being done by Parishes but that, as the lead authority, it could do something positive for its communities in this difficult time.

20.9 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>
G F Blackwell	R A Bird	M Dean	P E Smith
C L J Carter	G J Bocking		C Softley
C M Cody	K J Cromwell		S A T Stevens
L A Gerrard	R D East		
D J Harwood	J H Evetts		
M L Jordan	P A Godwin		
E J MacTiernan	M A Gore		
H S Munro	D W Gray		
P W Ockelton	A Hollaway		
R J G Smith	J R Mason		
R J Stanley	H C McLain		
M G Sztymiak	P D McLain		
S Thomson	J W Murphy		
P N Workman	A S Reece		
	C Reid		
	J K Smith		
	V D Smith		
	P D Surman		
	R J E Vines		
	M J Williams		

20.10 With 14 votes in favour, 20 against and one abstention, the Motion was lost.

20.11 Accordingly, it was

**RESOLVED** That the Motion not be approved.

The meeting closed at 9:30 pm