

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held remotely on Tuesday, 26 January 2021
commencing at 6:30 pm**

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Deputy Mayor

Councillor G F Blackwell
Councillor A S Reece

and Councillors:

R A Bird, G J Bocking, C L J Carter, C M Cody, K J Cromwell, R D East, J H Evetts,
P A Godwin, M A Gore, D W Gray, D J Harwood, M L Jordan, J R Mason, H C McLain,
P D McLain, H S Munro, J W Murphy, P W Ockelton, C Reid, J K Smith, P E Smith,
R J G Smith, V D Smith, C Softley, R J Stanley, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, S Thomson,
R J E Vines, M J Williams and P N Workman

CL.45 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 45.1 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.46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 46.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Dean and E J MacTiernan.

CL.47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 47.1 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.
- 47.2 There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

CL.48 MINUTES

- 48.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

CL.49 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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

CL.50 MEMBER QUESTIONS PROPERLY SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**CL.51**

50.1 The following questions had been received from Councillor Ockelton to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Could the Lead Member for Built Environment update Council on the planned consultation that was due to take place in January 2021 about the non-statutory A46 Route Options.

Answer 1:

The J9/A46 project, which aims to deliver a solution to the capacity issues of the A46 and its junction with the M5, is being led by Gloucestershire County Council, the Local Highway Authority. Current advice received from the County Council is that it is intended to submit the project proposal, when finally developed, to the Department for Transport (DfT) for funding from the Large Local Majors (LLM) fund. As part of this work, a non-statutory public consultation was scheduled for January 2021. This would have involved public consultation in respect of the preferred route options and their development. The consultation has, however, been postponed on the basis of a request from DfT that Highways England need more time to review the proposals. A new schedule is to be finalised but is currently expected to take place in early summer 2021.

Question 2:

Would the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment update Council on the 5 Year Housing Land supply? (5YHLS)

Answer 2:

The current five year land supply statement covering 2020/21 to 2024/25, available on the Council's website, confirms that the Council has a 4.35 year housing supply. Link to webpage provided. This figure takes into account houses that have already been delivered during the plan period.

https://tewkesburyborough-my.sharepoint.com/:b/g/personal/website_tewkesburyborough_onmicrosoft_com/EW6OiDUPBS1KnYRWkl-JF-kBvHLGHP6Lr6e42A1dlqiv3A?e=JNxNFG

Question 3:

Considering the confidence statement at the December Council meeting (08/12/20) re s106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy, can the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment please inform Council how confident she is that the priorities within that agenda item will be delivered in the period 2021/22 to 2024/25.

Answer 3:

The Infrastructure Funding Statement approved at Council on 8 December, sets out both reports on the income and expenditure of Community Infrastructure Levy and s106 contribution, as well as an infrastructure list.

The infrastructure list refers to 25 projects, without setting out any priorities between them, which the Council intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by Community Infrastructure Levy. The infrastructure list will be reviewed at least on an annual basis.

Regarding s106 contributions, where explicit expenditure has not been set out within the relevant s106 obligation or undertaking, the process for the allocation of available s106 funds is that these are advertised on the Tewkesbury Borough Council website, social media and press release. Community organisations then complete an expression of interest (EOI), explaining how the funds will be spent and what difference it would make to the community. The decision on the award of funds is made by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the s106 Panel.

Question 4:

Could the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment give her assessment for the number of deliverable sites, for monitoring period 2020/21 to 2024/25?

Answer 4:

I am satisfied that the Council's assessment of deliverable sites for the 2020/21 to 2024/25 monitoring period, which is part of the current five year land supply statement already referred to, is robust.

50.2 The Mayor invited supplementary questions. The Member asked the following and answers were provided by the Lead Member for Built Environment.

Question:

The Lead Member for Built Environment stated that the revised consultation is expected to take place in early Summer 2021. We know from other comparables that Highways England consultations usually span a period of about four months with an additional period of three months for them to consider the consultation responses – so roughly seven months to enable a full and proper consultation. Assuming there is no slippage on the “early Summer” consultation (June) – and then we move forward seven months. That takes us to January 2022 – assuming no slippage. The Lead Member should be aware that nothing more can be done on the JCS Preferred Option Consultation until at least January 2022. However, that does not sit squarely with the way reports have been presented on the timetable. Would the Lead Member agree with the timeline I have suggested and inform Council of the implications this would have on the JCS process.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment advised that this was led by the County Council and the advice was detailed in the original response.

Question:

I take the information link given, however, as the Council has lost more appeals than it has won, should the Lead Member for Built Environment not take the advice of those planning inspectors, including our local plan inspector and government advice and stop using oversupply incorrectly and identify deliverable housing sites to cover those being discounted at this time.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment advised that all Members had received a briefing note on the Gotherington appeal and that was the current position.

Question:

I would be grateful if the Lead Member for Built Environment could inform me as to when the A38 A40 Gateway link road (£15.5 million as set out in the 8 December Council meeting, page 69) is likely to be started.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

50.3 The following questions had been received from Councillor Ockelton to the Leader of the Council (as Chair of the Planning Policy Reference Panel). The answers were given by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Bird, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Would the Leader of the Council, as Chair of the Planning Policy Reference Panel (PPRP), please update Council on the current state of the Joint Core Strategy Review.

Answer 1:

At Executive Committee on 6 January 2021 the Local Development Scheme was approved. This sets out the timetable for the JCS review:

- Issues & Options Consultation – Winter 2018/19.
- Preferred Options Consultation – Summer 2021.
- Pre-Submission Consultation – Winter 2022.
- Submission to the Secretary of State – Spring 2023.
- Examination – Summer 2023.
- Adoption – Winter 2023.

Question 2:

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that assessments should go further, and seek to evidence that completions are likely to be forthcoming, as Chair of the PPRP would the Leader of the Council update Members as to how robust the housing delivery is taking into account the requirements of the PPG.

Answer 2:

I am satisfied that the Council's assessment of deliverable sites for housing has been made in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the guidance within the PPG and is therefore robust.

Question 3:

Would the Leader of the Council please inform Council as to his understanding of the "Plan Led Process", as briefly as is possible, for the JCS.

Answer 3:

The Plan Led process for the JCS is that the Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (adopted December 2017) provides the overarching strategic plan for the area covered by the three Councils and sets out the housing requirements for each of the three Councils.

50.4 The Mayor invited supplementary questions. The Member asked the following and answers were provided by the Leader of the Council.

Question:

Why, as Chair of the PPRP, considering your last response, has the Leader of the Council cancelled the Working Group meetings quoting “the Working Group had no business to discuss”. Obviously, that is not true. Council Minutes from December 2017 states the Review would “move swiftly”. I am struggling to see what pace as we are now in 2021.

Answer:

The Leader of the Council advised that advice was given by Officers at the time that at that moment there was not sufficient work to be undertaken by the PPRP.

Question:

As the local plan has a lack of deliverable identified housing sites, how would the Leader of the Council suggest we meet the required housing numbers or is the Leader of the Council happy to continue the practise of allowing Developers to make those decisions at appeal.

Answer:

The Leader of the Council undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

Question:

As Tewkesbury Borough Council has lost 64% of appeals, I would suggest that the strategic plan is demonstrably flawed. Would the Leader please inform Council, as the cost to the taxpayer of these appeals and what is his plan B.

Answer:

The Leader of the Council undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

50.5

The following questions had been received from Councillor Bocking to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Gore, but were taken as read without discussion.

Given the disastrous impact from development on the Innsworth Twigworth Longford ward and neighbouring areas, particularly with regard to flood impact where Decembers flooding (although not exceptional) led to some residents' homes being flooded for the first time, or the first time since the exceptional event in 2007. Consequently, I have several questions regarding flooding and the planning process that allowed this to happen and what measures can be taken to safeguard residents should it ever rain heavily again in these areas.

The questions are Ward specific but carry generic full borough implications within the answers they will generate and the methodology by which these answers are reached.

On 17 November 2020 the surface water drainage plan condition for the development of 74 dwellings at Yew Tree Farm in Twigworth was put before the Planning Committee and the Planning Committee decision on this site on surface water management was very narrowly passed only after the assurance was given that no extra water would go into the recently discovered, and not fully explored, Victorian culvert. For this to happen, as water is planned to be pumped uphill to the gully to remove it from site, the surface water currently must be using the gully at the same rate Pumping it there will generate and this would mean it:

- a) runs uphill from the site to the A38;
- b) that there would be no less evaporation from dramatically reducing the water surface area; and

- c) that an area that uses some soak away to control surface water will not have soak away amounts affected in anyway by being built upon.

Given all the information and the setting of attenuation volumes at around ½ a million litres of water the risk is significant.

The Lead Local Flood Authority has said in answer to subsequent questions that the sites surface water “would have flowed onto the A38” (which is uphill) and that answer is final.

Yew Tree farm specific questions:

Question 1:

Can you please confirm that all surface water on the site currently runs uphill from the site to the A38.

Answer 1:

Surface water does not run uphill. Following development, water will be pumped with an electrical pump from the attenuation ponds into the surface water culvert that runs under the A38 and discharges into the Hatherley Brook.

Question 2:

Can you also confirm that there would be no less evaporation from dramatically reducing the water surface area which currently pools across the entire site to just the attenuation ponds surface area, only a small fraction of what it is now.

Answer 2:

The evaporation reduces if the area reduces.

Question 3:

Can you confirm that an area that uses some soak away to control surface water will not have soak away amounts affected in anyway by being built upon.

Answer 3:

The area will be affected by being built on which is, of course, why there is a requirement for suitable drainage systems to be implemented on development sites.

Overall area questions

Question 1:

The local residents, supported by hydrology expert professor Ian Cluckie, have put together a document of flood evidence for the area but there is a delay in it being incorporated into official records due to what has been stated as funding issues, hence could all development in the Twigworth area be suspended while the community’s evidence on flooding is incorporated with Environment Agency data and then flood risk and mitigation is re-evaluated for the area taking all of it into account.

Answer 1:

No, the developers are carrying out works, for which they have in place the necessary planning permissions.

Question 2:

If a developer pumps water off site and it causes flooding or environmental damage elsewhere who is responsible for holding them to account and how are they held accountable.

Answer 2:

This is a civil matter between respective land/property owners.

Question 3:

I am led to believe that Gloucestershire County Council, through its Scrutiny Committee is setting up a scrutiny panel to look at flood mapping, flooding and the planning system, can we ensure that Tewkesbury Borough Council takes an active role with this panel and completes its own scrutiny review to feed into it.

Answer 3:

The County Council has confirmed that a full summary of the December flooding event will be presented to its Environment Scrutiny Committee in March 2021. The summary will be an assessment of the event, comparison of meteorological data, identification of worst hit areas and potential next steps for resilience building. Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers have been working with Gloucestershire County Council Officers to feed back on the impact and the role the Borough Council played in immediate response and initial assessment.

Question 4:

Given that there is the potential for other sites to emerge during the JCS review process how can we, as an authority, guarantee that a full cumulative impact assessment with regard to flooding, both pluvial and fluvial is carried out and fully assessed prior to any sites inclusion.

Answer 4:

A strategic flood risk assessment will be undertaken which will inform whether a site is included within the JCS. This will also consider cumulative impacts.

Question 5:

Because of the increase of flood risk currently being demonstrated in the Innsworth Twigworth Longford Ward and surrounding areas, since the adoption of the JCS and its subsequent impact on properties, who is legally liable should inaccurate conclusions and/or information, or faulty or out of date evidence be shown to be used concerning flood risk in firstly the JCS and secondly the Borough planning process and as the planning authority, what liability do we have if agreed mitigation is not completed to standard or timescales.

Answer 5:

Any legal liability could only be determined on the facts of any particular case.

The Local Planning Authority has a responsibility to ensure, through its planning policies and its determination of planning applications, that future developments are sustainable and do not increase flood risk elsewhere. Development Plans (JCS / Borough Plan) are adopted and individual applications determined following a statutory process that includes examination of the evidence available at that time.

If agreed mitigation, secured by way of planning conditions/obligations, is not completed in accordance with the approved details and at the right time, the Council will take steps as necessary and expedient to enforce any such conditions/obligations.

50.6 The Mayor invited supplementary questions. The Member asked the following and answers were provided by the Lead Member for Built Environment.

Question:

Given that Yew Tree farm's drainage condition only just passed in Planning Committee based on the assurance that no extra water would be having to use the only partially explored, and somewhat dilapidated, Victorian culvert under the A38, and this would have required the current water, (which is due to be pumped there

uphill after development) to be going there now, meaning the water must currently be flowing uphill and defying the scientific rules of evaporation and absorption - which the answers prove it does not. Consequently, could this development be put on hold until there is proof that this somewhat insubstantial culvert is capable of handling this now known about substantial extra volume of water in order to keep existing residents and indeed the A38 safe.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

Question:

Given that no developments in the area can be put on hold because of the existence of planning permission, it somewhat limits our options so should it be agreed by Council, Section 97 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that the Local Authority can revoke the planning "In exercising their functions under subsection (1) the authority shall have regard to the development plan and to any other material considerations." While the ins and outs of whether we go down this road is a debate for another time and not relevant here could you please explain what the actual process for the Council for revoking planning under this act is - a material consideration in this case could be flooding.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

Question:

Whilst I fully appreciate, we are all human and mistakes will be made, going forward what protections can we, as a local planning authority, put in place so that we can rectify decisions made under the influence of unclear or incorrect information.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

Question:

Following on from my questions on potential liability for this Council, and given that currently one developer has been pumping water off their site on a major scale into a local watercourse which is believed by some residents to have had significant impact on flooding, pollution etc. As we are currently not using any enforcement powers to stop this, who is liable if we stand by and do nothing and could we be held accountable for non-action in regard to a known issue.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

Question:

As the JCS has fallen seriously short in this area, can we as a Council or with our JCS partners retrospectively and immediately commission a cumulative flood impact assessment including both pluvial and fluvial flood risk as well as impacts from our neighbours and other known external influencing factors (as mentioned) and incorporate this into our development plans? And how can Members and the wider community be reassured that the disjointed approach currently being demonstrated will not be repeated.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Built Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

- 50.7 The following questions had been received from Councillor Jordan to the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment. The answers were given by the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment, Councillor Mason, but were taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

It is understood that Gloucestershire County Council has an ambition to plant 1 million trees within the next 10 years.

Please can the Portfolio holder for the Clean and Green Environment confirm how many trees Tewkesbury Borough Council planted in 2020 and how many trees were cut down or died in the same year on Tewkesbury Borough Council land or other land over which he has any interest/authority.

Answer 1:

The Council's Tree Safety Management Policy requires that any tree felled on Council land must be replaced, ideally with the same species. Council records indicate that 12 trees were felled and replaced in 2020.

Question 2:

Given the importance of trees to our environment and taking into account issues such as Ash dieback, the Portfolio holder is also asked what Tewkesbury Borough Council's tree planting plans and ambitions are for the next decade.

Answer 2:

The Council's only approved tree management policy is the Tree Safety Management Policy which as previously highlighted requires a one-for-one replacement. The policy does not go further to outline plans to increase the number of trees being planted but the Council will take opportunities within specific projects to plant further trees where possible. The Council is also a partner in the Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership which has produced a Gloucestershire Tree Strategy that includes a target, amongst others, of trees and woodlands covering at least 20% of the county by 2030.

- 50.8 The Mayor invited supplementary questions. The Member asked the following and answer was provided by the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment.

Question:

Is the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment able to put in place a timebound tree planting strategy to help address this emergency.

Answer:

The Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment undertook to ensure a written response was circulated.

CL.51 SCHEME OF MEMBER ALLOWANCES 2021/22

- 51.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 7-17, asked Members to determine a Scheme of Allowances to take effect on 1 April 2021 until 31 March 2022 having regard to the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

51.2 The recommendation of the Panel was proposed and seconded. During the discussion which ensued, a Member thanked the Independent Remuneration Panel for its report and expressed the view that even with the recommended freeze on allowances, the Council would remain above the national average and given the very difficult and serious effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on so many residents in the Borough, it would be sensible to amend the scheme to introduce a 10% reduction across the Special Responsibility Allowances. This would result in a reduction of £7,147.50 in the total budget requirement which would offset the increase made last year. Other Members agreed with that view and accordingly the amendment was proposed and seconded. Upon being put to the vote the amendment was lost. Councillor C M Cody asked that her vote in favour of the proposal be recorded.

51.3 A recorded vote was requested and, upon receiving the appropriate level of support, voting on the proposal to accept the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel was recorded as follows:

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

R J E Vines

M J Williams

51.4 With 21 votes in favour and 10 against, it was

RESOLVED That the Scheme of Allowances for 2021/22 remain unchanged and be as set out in Appendix 1 to the report in accordance with the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

CL.52 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

52.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 18-29, asked Members to approve the Pay Policy Statement 2021-22.

52.2 In proposing that the Pay Policy Statement be approved, the Lead Member for Organisational Development advised that, whilst the Council had always had such a statement, and the activities detailed within it formed part of the Council's business, in terms of transparency it was necessary for the Statement to be approved on an annual basis. The purpose of the Pay Policy Statement was to ensure clarity and accountability with regard to the Council's approach to setting pay and, as detailed in Paragraph 2.1 of the report, this included the method by which salaries and severance payments were determined, the remuneration of senior managers and the remuneration of the lowest level of posts within the Council. The systems, processes and policies which supported the statement were under continual review by the HR team and the statement itself had been scheduled into the team's work programme to ensure it came forward on an annual basis.

52.3 During the discussion which ensued, a Member queried whether the Council employed anyone on zero hours contracts. In response, the Human Resources and Organisational Development Manager explained that the Council did have some staff on casual contracts who were paid for the hours worked. However, this did not apply to many people so was not a significant part of the workforce. In terms of whether or not that should be included in the Pay Policy Statement, the Member was advised that zero hours contracts were one of a number of ways people could be employed by the Council but none of those were required to be included in the Pay Policy Statement. If the Council felt it necessary a paragraph could be included but there was no such obligation upon the Council in that regard.

52.4 Upon being proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED That the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 be **APPROVED**.

CL.53 RECOMMENDATION FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Medium Term Financial Strategy

53.1 At its meeting on 6 January 2021, the Executive Committee had considered the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22-2025/26 and recommended to Council that it be adopted.

53.2 The report which was considered by the Executive Committee had been circulated with the Agenda for the current meeting at Pages No. 30-53.

53.3 The Chair of the Executive Committee proposed the recommendation and the Lead Member for Finance and Asset Management seconded it.

53.4 A brief discussion ensued during which a Member referred to Paragraph 1.2 of the Strategy and noted that, whilst she understood what was actually meant by the sentence 'These are unprecedented times for local government as it responds to the coronavirus pandemic and looks forward to a post Brexit future and a significant impact on the likely level of resources available for public spending in the long term', she felt it would be better to use the word 'faces' instead of 'looks forward to'. The Head of Finance and Asset Management understood the point being made and agreed that the sentence would be amended. Another Member thanked the Head of Finance and Asset Management for taking the time to explain the paper to her and was pleased to note at Paragraph 12.5 that by doing the right thing for the planet the Council was able to save money.

53.5 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That, subject to the amendment of Paragraph 1.2 to replace the words 'looks forward to' with 'faces', the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021/22 – 2025/26 be **ADOPTED**.

CL.54 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2021/22

54.1 The report of the Head of Democratic Services, circulated at Pages No. 54-56, set out the proposed Schedule of Meetings for 2021/22. Members were asked to adopt the Schedule as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

54.2 The Leader of the Council proposed the Schedule of Meetings as set out on the paper and it was seconded.

54.3 A Member noted that the Council meetings were spread across the year at different intervals and she queried why that was. In response, the Head of Democratic Services explained that the Council had previously made a decision that it did not require meetings on a monthly basis but there were certain events at specific times of the year that needed to be put into the Work Programme, as well as the recommendations from other Committees also feeding in, and this meant the meetings could not just be moved to different months and was the reason that some meetings were closer together than others. There followed a detailed discussion as to the timing of Council meetings going forward as they had been held at 6.30pm while taking place on Zoom but the Schedule of Meetings anticipated that they would move back to 6pm when meetings were once again being held face to face. A number of Members were of the view that 6.30pm was a better time for those that worked during the day and also for members of the public to attend; whereas others felt that 6pm had always worked in previous years and, in order to take account of the workload of Officers, seemed a sensible time to commence the meetings assuming things went back to normal. It was suggested that the Schedule as provided should be agreed at this stage and then could be reviewed in due course given it was not clear currently what would happen in terms of remote meetings going forward. Other Members felt it was clear that thought needed to be given to how to accommodate people that had difficulty attending meetings at 6pm and it was suggested that consideration needed to be given as to the best way to canvass opinion and make a sensible proposal as to whether a change was required.

54.4 Having been proposed and seconded, it was

- RESOLVED**
1. That the Schedule of Meetings for 2021/22, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be **ADOPTED**.
 2. That the Leader of the Council consider the issue of the timing of Council meetings in liaison with the other Group Leaders to determine whether there was a need for the timing of Council meetings to change once remote meetings end and the future of how meetings are to take place going forward was clear.

CL.55 ROYAL GARDEN PARTY

55.1 Attention was drawn to the Agenda which asked Members to note the cancellation of this year's Royal Garden Party due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

55.2 Accordingly, it was

- RESOLVED** That the cancellation of the Royal Garden Party for 2021 be **NOTED**.

CL.56 SEPARATE BUSINESS

56.1 The Mayor proposed, and it was

- RESOLVED** That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

CL.57 SEPARATE MINUTES

57.1 The separate Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

CL.58 SEPARATE RECOMMENDATION FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ubico Contract Review

(Exempt – Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

58.1 At its meeting held on 6 January 2021 the Executive Committee had considered the extension of the Ubico contract and made a recommendation to Council. The Council considered that recommendation and agreed the extension of the Ubico contract.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm