COUNTY COUNCIL
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Honorary Aldermen
Bill Hobman

12. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2013 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A copy of the declarations of interest is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

14. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Safeguarding adults
   The Chairman advised that the Council had been named in the Winterbourne View report as creating best practice in commissioning services for those with complex needs. He noted that officers had been running a system of quality checks on the care given in Gloucestershire to those with learning disabilities. He commended both Cllr Noble, the Cabinet Member for People with Long Term Support, and officers for the work they had undertaken.

b) Cllr Ron Allen
   The Chairman reported that Cllr Allen’s wife, Mary, had recently passed away following a short illness. He stated that Mary had been a great support to Ron over the years and he said that he had written to Cllr Allen to express the Council’s condolences.

15. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Seven public questions were received. A copy of the questions and answers were circulated and are attached to the signed copy of these minutes.

The following supplementary questions were asked:
Question 2 – Sue Oppenheimer drew members’ attention to the BBC Radio 4 Coasting the Earth programme. She provided information regarding Mechanical Biological Treatment plants and questioned the information provided by Cllr Theodoulou. She asked:

How can the Council justify such a high capital spend when there are alternative cheaper options available that dispose of the waste more efficiently and effectively?

In response, Cllr Theodoulou stated that only residual waste left over after as much as possible had been composted or recycled would be put into the incinerator. Other methods still left waste that needed to be incinerated elsewhere and he gave the example of waste being shipped to Holland.
Question 3 – Sue Oppenheimer questioned the answer provided by the Cabinet Member providing members with information around fees charged by Mechanical Biological Treatment plants. She suggested the incinerator would charge more. She then asked:

How does the incinerator meet the proximity principle when it will be exporting 6 tonnes an hour, or 48,000 tonnes a year of bottom ash around the country as aggregate for roads, and a tonne an hour or 8,000 tonnes per year of hazardous air pollution control residues which will be taken all the way to be dumped in landfill in Peterborough 130 miles away? In the light of this, isn’t his quoting of the proximity principle hypocritical?

In response, Cllr Waddington stated that the bottom ash was recovered material and was not subject to this principle. The transport to a land disposal site was a temporary measure and his aspiration for the future was for there to be zero waste to landfill.

Question 4 – Gerald Hartley asked

Would the Cabinet member explain how his answer:

a) makes Gloucestershire County Council compliant with DEFRA’s advice that the proximity principle should not exclude the duty to cooperate with other local authorities to make best use of extant or planned residual waste facilities, and

b) squares with Urbaser Balfour Beatty sending circa 8,000 tonnes per annum of hazardous waste to Peterborough and the fact that Gloucestershire’s recyclates are all sent out of county.

Councillor Theodoulou replied that the answer had been given to the previous question and that the DEFRA principles were adhered to and consultation with DEFRA had been undertaken throughout.

Gerald Hartley asked an oral question regarding whether answers to public questions could be made available to the public before the morning of the Council meeting. The Chairman indicated that he would give a written response.

Question 5 – Diana Shirley asked:

Can district councils, or the public, have any confidence in the Planning Committee determining the application with integrity and without political considerations when you are trying to rush this decision through a few days before Purdah. If the
decision was purely based on the planning regulations and made by unbiased councillors it wouldn’t matter which political party the members of Planning Committee belonged to and therefore whether or not the decision was made before the next election. Also, when did you decide that the Planning Committee date was going to be 21 March 2013?

Cllr Fellows responded that he had every confidence that the members of Planning Committee would conduct themselves in accordance with the rules and regulations that govern their appointment to such a committee. Gloucestershire County Council as determining authority was required by law to determine the application as soon as possible.

Question 6 – Diana Shirley asked:

If planning applications are only determined on the basis of valid planning reasons, which excludes political considerations, why don’t professionally qualified planners determine planning applications rather than putting politically minded councillors in the path of temptation?

Cllr Quaile responded that this was all contained within the constitution.

Question 7 – Ian Richens asked for a response regarding suggestions of predetermination during the process of employing consultants used by Aspinalls as detailed in the original question.

Cllr Fellows responded that a written response would be provided following the meeting.

16. MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS

Thirty seven member questions were received. A copy of the answers was circulated and is attached to the signed copy of these minutes.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 3 – Cllr Duncan Smith asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that there was no excuse for any organisation to use the figure of £500 million for the costs of the proposed plant at Javelin Park. He suggested that the Council should be congratulated regarding the savings associated with the plant.

Cllr Theodoulou agreed with the member’s comments.
Question 5 – Cllr Awford asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that it was hypocrisy for the Liberal Democrats to criticise the Gloucestershire plans for waste, when the Liberal Democrat run London Borough of Sutton was pursuing a larger contract.

Cllr Theodoulou replied that he agreed with the member’s comments.

Question 6 – Cllr Vernon Smith asked whether the Cabinet Member agreed that the changes to the Alderman Knight School had left the school in a better position to develop in the future.

Cllr Hall stated that it had been an excellent achievement and she would urge all members to visit the school and see the positive difference.

Question 9 – Cllr Lunnon asked whether the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy had been reviewed after five years. She asked that if a review was still to take place could she chair it.

Cllr Theodoulou responded that he would inquire as to whether it had been reviewed and that chairing such a review would depend on the outcome of the next election.

Question 10 – Cllr Lunnon questioned whether the removal of bio-genic material from the waste arisings would result in 100% of the CO2 emissions of the Javelin Park facility being considered climate changing.

Cllr Theodoulou stated he would seek advice and provide a written response.

Question 11 – Cllr Lunnon asked, given the change in waste arisings, what analysis had been undertaken to understand why the waste reduction strategies were not working.

Cllr Theodoulou stated that he was not sure that the strategies were not working as suggested. This had yet to be analysed as the figures had only just been announced.

Question 13 – Cllr Oosthuysen asked which part of the Private Eye articles contained the serious inaccuracies suggested in the answer to the original question.

Cllr Hawthorne responded that the member should not believe everything he read in Private Eye and that it was important that the member did his own research into the issues. He hoped that the member would take up the offer to discuss with officers.
Question 15 – Cllr Hilton asked whether the Cabinet Member would apologise for comments in the Gloucestershire Echo regarding families who took out crisis loans.

Cllr McLain stated that his comments had not been reported accurately, but that crisis loans were important for those families who needed them in the short term during an emergency. Despite this there were occasions when the loans were being used multiple times in a short period and the ability to access the loans should not be abused. Since telephone claims were introduced the daily rate of spend had trebled. The Cabinet Member quoted the Liberal Democrat Minister for Pensions to illustrate the view that crisis loans needed reform.

Question 16 – Cllr Hilton stated that there were 30 people sleeping ‘rough’ in Gloucestershire and he asked whether the Cabinet Member would guarantee that by November 2013 there would be less people homeless on the street. Cllr McLain stated that it was difficult to make any guarantees and that from 1 March 2013 there would be 31 bed spaces available across the county. It was important to recognise that some individuals wished to remain homeless as a lifestyle choice.

Question 17 – Cllr Hilton asked whether the Cabinet Member would congratulate the Liberal Democrats who had been campaigning to stop the proposals to alter the Air Balloon roundabout on the A417, now that the administration was withdrawing support.

Cllr Chas Fellows stated that given the lack of public engagement by the Highways Agency, the decision had been made to withdraw support.

Question 18 – Cllr Hilton asked why members of the Planning Committee had not been given advanced notice of the meeting on 21 March 2013.

Cllr Theodoulou responded that a clear line had been kept between the executive and the planning side. For this reason he would not be answering the question.

Question 19 – Cllr Hilton asked whether there had been changes to the planning consultants employed by the County Council.

The Chairman stated that this was not a valid supplementary question.

Question 20 – Cllr Hilton asked when the Conservatives would be announcing their candidate for the Quedgeley division.

Cllr Hawthorne responded that the announcement would be made when Gloucestershire Conservatives were ready.
Question 22 – Cllr Jones requested that he be provided with details of the divisions where the ‘Fix First Time’ pilot had been carried out.

Cllr Windsor Clive stated he would provide a written response.

Question 24 – Cllr Jones asked whether the £1,250 spent on signage would have been better spent on other things such as repairing pot holes.

Cllr Windsor Clive responded that there was a balance between what needed to be communicated to the public and what didn’t and the amount to be spent on that. There were times when the Council was doing a good job and the public were unaware, so it was important to ensure the public was well informed.

Question 25 – Cllr Jones acknowledged that it was hard to measure the success of focussed youth provision but asked whether there were any targets or figures which could be provided to demonstrate the success of the inputs.

Cllr McLain stated that there was evidence of relative success around those young people not in employment, education or training (NEETs) and with a reduction in reoffending rates. He would provide Cllr Jones with the appropriate information.

Question 26 – Cllr Jones questioned the use of the Council’s press releases, suggesting that they should only state the facts and not be party political. He also pointed out the use of highlighting within press releases.

In response, Cllr Hawthorne explained that the Council’s press team carried out a professional job; they responded to enquiries and defended County Council policy. The press team would also contact the relevant divisional councillor for comment on releases.

Question 27 – Cllr Jones asked the Cabinet Member whether there was a ‘plan B’ if the savings in the looked after children budget for out of county placements were not achieved.

Cllr McLain stated that there would likely be additional pressure on looked after children budgets and that he could expand further during the budget item later on the agenda.

Question 29 – Referring to Trading Standards, Cllr Jones asked whether the Cabinet Member was concerned regarding the reduction in gathering evidence through inspections.
Cllr Windsor Clive stated that having made savings there was no evidence of a problem but he would keep monitoring the service.

Question 31 – Cllr Sheppard stated that she was aware of the need for hostels and supported them but was concerned about a lack of consultation with the public on the locations. She asked whether local members could be advised on locations so they could inform the public.

Cllr McLain responded that he was aware of the sensitivities in this area and was happy to discuss this further with Cllr Sheppard.

Question 32 – Cllr Sheppard asked for it to be made clear to service users that it was a contribution being requested for some Wellbeing Services. She requested that explanatory information be provided to all service users.

Cllr Noble stated that she would discuss this further with Cllr Sheppard.

Question 34 – Cllr Sheppard asked for extra effort to be undertaken either by the Council or the Police and Crime Commissioner to encourage the Crown Prosecution Service to resolve the ongoing situation with the Coroner’s Service. She said that the Coroner’s Service staff had been carrying out an excellent job in difficult circumstances.

Cllr Windsor Clive stated that it was right to encourage the Police and Crime Commissioner to move this towards a conclusion.

17. PETITIONS

No petitions were presented.

18. MOTIONS

Motion 680

The Monitoring Officer was asked to give advice on the involvement of members of the Planning Committee in the debate on the motion.

The Monitoring Officer stated that members did not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Javelin Park application through their membership of the committee. It was important, however, that committee members maintained and demonstrated an open mind relating to the application. She advised committee members and any members who could be involved as substitutes to consider whether they should participate in the debate and vote.
After a short adjournment, the members of the Planning Committee and members who could be involved as substitutes left the council chamber. The members who left the chamber were:

Cllrs Andrewartha, Awford, Booth, Burgess, Cooksley, Dr Cordwell, Glastonbury, Hale, Jones, Lunnon, Morgan, Oostuysen, Parsons, Quaile, Shurmer, Vernon Smith, Sudbury, Tipper, Thornton, Tracey, Vines and Wheeler

Cllr Hilton moved and Cllr Collins seconded the following motion:

This Council notes the report on residual waste capacity published by Eunomia on 30 November 2012.

The report indicates that the UK now has 7 million tonnes more consented residual waste treatment capacity than there is residual waste requiring treatment.

This Council therefore calls on the Cabinet to cancel the project to build a massive waste incinerator in Gloucestershire. Noting that the proposed incinerator has surplus capacity for the county’s own residual household waste treatment requirement.

Cllr Hilton stated that it was clear that there was over-capacity in the UK and he questioned the sense in committing £0.5 billion to an incinerator in Gloucestershire. The plant proposed for Gloucestershire would have capacity for 190,000 tonnes when it was clear that the actual level of waste would be around 125,000 tonnes. He also believed that over the 25 years of the contract it would become possible to recycle a wider range of products thereby allowing recycling rates to be significantly increased. He noted that the mechanical biological treatment facility at Avonmouth already had capacity for 200 tonnes of waste and with planning permission could treat up to 300 tonnes. This might provide an opportunity for the treatment of the residual waste from Gloucestershire. The contract at Avonmouth was over 9 years and was costing £25 million.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Collins expressed concern at the way that the Council had responded to a recent report from GlosVAIN. He said that the people of Gloucestershire did not want a huge incinerator to dispose of their waste. He noted that there was clear over capacity in the market and new technologies were being developed to treat waste in a cheaper and more environmentally friendly way.

The Cabinet Project Champion for Waste, Cllr Waddington, stated that the Eunomia report was based on outdated figures. Comparisons had been made between the growth of waste and the increase in the number of waste treatment facilities and the
information had been used in a way that the report author had expressly warned against. He noted that waste arisings were increasing again in Gloucestershire and the predicted levels of residual waste did take account of a significant increase in recycling rates. He said that the merchant plants in Avonmouth and Severnside which had received planning permission were intended to partly fulfil the requirements of the West of England Waste Core Strategy. A High Court ruling indicated that these plants would not offer capacity for treating waste from Gloucestershire. A mechanical biological treatment facility was not appropriate for Gloucestershire’s needs. The size of the residual waste facility proposed for Javelin Park was designed to meet the needs of the county and not other areas. He believed that the project, the business case and the predictions regarding future waste arisings were all sound.

Speaking strongly in support of the motion, a member believed that the cost of paying landfill tax at £79 peronne would be £375 million over 25 years compared to £0.5 billion for an incinerator. He noted that Urbaser Balfour Beaty were constructing a mechanical biological treatment facility in Essex and he questioned why waste could not be treated in that way in Gloucestershire. Another member stated that the 70 per cent target for recycling should be higher. He believed that waste should be seen as a resource and an incinerator was not the best way to treat the county’s waste.

A member noted that residual waste was now likely to be closer to 125,000 tonnes per annum rather than 195,000 tonnes. He said that it was clear that the facility proposed at Javelin Park was a merchant plant designed to treat waste from elsewhere. He did not believe that committing to a contract for 25 years was the right approach and failed to offer the flexibility required.

Other members spoke strongly against the motion and stated that it was important to find a way of dealing with the county’s residual waste. They questioned how it would be handled if it was not treated in an incinerator or sent to landfill. No other tried and tested solutions had been put forward and the level of residual waste was currently rising. The recycling target of 70 per cent was ambitious and Cheltenham Borough Council had already indicated that it would be ambitious to suggest a figure of 60 per cent. They believed that waste should be seen as a resource. The residual waste facility proposed offered the opportunity to produce energy and the potential to generate residual heat for homes and businesses.

On being put to the vote, the motion was lost.
19. POLICY AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK - REPORT OF THE CABINET

The Leader of the Council, Cllr Mark Hawthorne, presented the recommendation from the Cabinet meeting on 6 February 2013. He said that 2013-14 was the third budget of the ‘Meeting the Challenge’ Programme. The programme would achieve £114 million in savings to reflect reductions in funding from central government and increasing demand for services, particularly from the most vulnerable people. Adult social care spending to meet the needs of vulnerable people represented around half of the Council’s budget. Whilst other local authorities had been reducing spending in this area, the Council had invested an additional £4 million over the last three years.

He stated that the Council was continuing to invest in jobs and growth. He referred to the Grow Gloucestershire campaign to kick start the local economy and help young people back to work, support for the doubling of the Kemble to Swindon railway line, the first time buyers’ scheme, the rural broadband project and the ‘Yes to Jobs’ website to encourage young people to take up apprenticeships. He said that the 2013-14 budget would provide a further £1 million for the first time buyers’ scheme and investment in a new business loan scheme through the government backed ‘Full Circle’ scheme which would result in around £1.4 million being made available to local businesses.

He reported that £29 million had been invested in flooding since 2007 and he noted that this had paid dividends in recent months by protecting 500 homes that would have otherwise been flooded. He confirmed that the Council would continue to invest in flood prevention in 2013-14.

Cllr Hawthorne declared that for the third year running the council tax was being frozen. He noted that £100 million in savings had already been achieved, many ahead of target. The headcount had been reduced by 1,500, 80 offices had been closed across the county and the number of councillors would be reduced from 63 to 53 from May 2013.

He presented the following additions to the Cabinet recommendation on pages 25 and 26 of the agenda pack:

   a) To move £3 million from forecast underspends to pay for additional road repairs. This was in addition to the £2.1 million announced in November and December 2012.
   b) To move £1 million from the Transformation Reserve to fund a package of measures to promote adoption.
Cllr Theodoulou, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change, seconded the amended recommendation from the Cabinet and spoke in support of the proposals.

A member said that he supported a freeze in council tax and the amendments proposed to the Cabinet recommendation. He noted that the freeze to council tax had been made possible as a result of the Coalition Government providing a specific grant to local authorities across the country. He expressed concern, however, that funds were being wasted because of bad decisions. He referred to the costs of £200,000 incurred on the libraries judicial review which could have been avoided and the £0.5 billion committed to the residual waste facility over 25 years.

Another member said that Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service had gone from strength to strength with four new fire stations now operational. The new stations would significantly improve response times to incidents. He noted that the Council would shortly have the first self-funded Registration Service in the country.

On being put to the vote, the following additions to the Cabinet recommendation were supported:

a) To move £3 million from forecast underspends to pay for additional road repairs.

b) To move £1 million from the Transformation Reserve to fund a package of measures to promote adoption.

Cllr Andrewartha presented the following amendment:

The Liberal Democrats propose to amend the Administration’s budget as per the details set out below:

We support the decision to freeze the council tax for the forthcoming financial year. We also agree with the four priority areas namely:

- Getting our own house in order
- Protecting vulnerable people
- Supporting active communities
- Building a sustainable county

However, we not only believe that with £124 million held in balances and reserves the county has surplus resources available to improve services, boost the economy and create jobs, we also believe that the balances are not constructed in such a way to illustrate either the financial risks we face or the service risk the most vulnerable in our society face.
We therefore propose the use of surplus reserves to invest in the following projects:

a) £5 million in addition to the £3 million already announced for road repairs thus helping to build a sustainable county.

b) £300,000 to double the funding available for district councils to help them support youth activities in active communities.

c) £250,000 to double the funding available for the Community Infrastructure Grant Scheme to further support active communities and protect vulnerable people.

d) £250,000 for grants for youth projects offering sport, drama or music to support active youth activities and strengthening the sport and cultural base as part of building a sustainable county.

e) £1 million ‘invest to save’ in modern technology and green energy both to give a financial return and contribute towards a sustainable county.

f) To use our land assets to work with the district councils and the Local Enterprise Partnerships to provide freehold employment sites to help grow and attract employment throughout the county. This is a cost neutral proposal that will possibly delay the disposal of land but will not only see a financial return but will result in a growing employment base within an expanding economy.

The total cost is £6.8 million made up as follows:
£1.2 million from balances thus reducing balances to £18.521 million (£24,000 more than balances at 31 March 2012) and £5.6 million taken from the Transformation Reserve.

The net result on total usable reserves will be a reduction of £6.8 million (5.5 per cent) to £116.495 million. In addition the reserves should be amended such that both the financial risks the Council faces and the service risk the most vulnerable in our society face are protected as much as practicable in these turbulent times. Reserves would be changed such that a new earmarked reserve of £2 million was created to minimise the risk in the area of vulnerable children and adults (the ‘Care Reserve’). This would be financed by a further reduction in the Transformation Reserve resulting in that reserve being reduced to £4.781 million.

Cllr Hilton seconded the amendment.

After a short adjournment, the Leader of the Council responded to the amendment. He noted that the budget put forward by the Cabinet had been developed over many months in consultation with residents and he did not support a last minute raid on reserves. He believed that the proposals were ill thought out as reserves
were set aside for specific purposes and there was a danger that vulnerable people might be put at risk.

Cllr Hilton said that the Transformation Reserve was not set aside for a specific purpose and it was sensible to use it in the way proposed. He believed that it was hypocritical of the Leader of the Council to suggest that the Liberal Democrat amendment was ill thought out when he was suggesting the use of reserves himself. He stated that the consultation undertaken by the Council indicated that road maintenance was a priority. In overall terms, he noted that the current level of reserves amounted to 29 per cent of the Council’s budget.

Other members spoke strongly in support of the amendment believing that it represented a sensible and constructive use of Council reserves. They noted that the Rt Hon Eric Pickles MP, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, was encouraging local authorities to use their reserves to support local communities. They expressed serious concern that the Council was withdrawing services and expecting other organisations, including parish and town councils, to provide alternative funding.

A member questioned how the extra investment in roads had been evaluated. The amendment suggested that £5 million be simply added to the extra £3 million announced by the Administration. He said that it was not just about spending extra money but looking at the way highways maintenance was carried out in the county. The ‘fix first time’ and ‘impact day’ highway initiatives in Gloucestershire were recognised nationally as best practice.

Other members stated that roads in the county were in desperately poor condition. They believed that spending money now would prevent roads deteriorating which would result in far more costly repairs in the future.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was not supported.

Parts a), b) and c) were each voted on in turn and parts d), e) and f) were taken together.

Speaking in support of the substantive motion, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change stated in a climate of reduced government funding the Council’s values were clear. It was living within its means, reducing debt, focusing on vulnerable people, improving the local infrastructure, helping first time buyers, providing job opportunities and helping communities to help themselves. He noted that additional funds were being made available for priority areas such as flood prevention and road maintenance. The proposed 2013-14 budget identified savings of £35 million
making a total of £100 million over the last three years. He believed that the Council’s finances were in good shape and reserves were adequate.

A member expressed serious concern that there were not adequate safeguards for users of day centres when they were closed. He recognised that whilst the transfer of services to community groups had worked well in some areas, he questioned what action would be taken where it was not a success and communities were losing services. He also expressed concern that there was no reference to the flood alleviation levy in the budget papers. He believed that it was important for the Council to be upfront about the charges it was levying.

Another member said that she was concerned about the withdrawal of important services to the public not only at a local level, but also at a national level. She referred to local cuts to libraries, the poor condition of the county’s roads, the reduction in police officers and cuts in funding for the voluntary sector, the Arts, the Music Service and sports.

**RESOLVED**


2. That, having considered the additional consultation responses and the Public Sector Equality Duty Assessment, approval is given to the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the revenue and capital budgets for 2013/14, council tax for each valuation band, and to issue precepts on each district collection fund as set out below:

**Gloucestershire County Council 2013/14 budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original 2012/13 reworked Budget</td>
<td>425,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>7,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and spending increases</td>
<td>12,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Reductions</td>
<td>-35,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding Public Health)</td>
<td>409,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>21,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All)</td>
<td>430,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Formula Grant</td>
<td>159,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Freeze Grant (2012/13 and 2013/14)</td>
<td>8,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Public Health Grant 9,055
NHS Funding 1,819
New Homes Bonus 664
One off Transitional Grant 5,400
Education Single Grant 1,247
Education Statutory Responsibility Grant

Total to be precepted (Council Tax Requirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax base Total</th>
<th>Total precept £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>38,425.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold</td>
<td>36,200.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>25,973.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester City</td>
<td>34,394.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud</td>
<td>40,187.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>29,712.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 That the net one-off increase of £557,000 received in the final Financial Settlement for 2013/14 is used for additional debt redemption.

4 a) That approval is given to the Capital programme set out in Annex 9 of the MTFS

b) That approval is given to the Operational Boundary and Authorised Limits of borrowing, as set out in the Treasury Management Strategy, at Annex 10 in the MTFS as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Boundary</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised Limits</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Noting that the authorised limit for 2013/14 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003
d) That the approval is given to the Prudential Indicators for Treasury Management set out in Annex 10 of the MTFS for

(i) Upper limit of fixed interest rate exposure of £450 million of net outstanding principal sums
(ii) Upper limit of variable rate exposure of £200 million of net outstanding principal sums
(iii) the maturity structure of borrowings as set out in Annex 10
(iv) the upper limit for principal sums invested for more than 364 days of £30 million

e) That approval is given to the Treasury Management Strategy set out in Annex 10 of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

5 That approval is given to the Risk Management Strategy set out in Annex 11 of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

6 Regarding the 2012-13 forecast underspend:
   a) To move £3 million from forecast underspends to pay for additional road repairs in 2013-14.
   b) To move £1 million from the Transformation Reserve to fund a package of measures to promote adoption in 2013-14.

20. CABINET DECISION STATEMENT

RESOLVED that the Cabinet Decision Statement for the decisions taken on 7 January 2013 be noted.

21. INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENT

RESOLVED that the Individual Cabinet Member Decision Statement for the decision taken on 28 January 2013 be noted.

22. REVIEW OF LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - RECOMMENDATION FROM THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT

The Cabinet Member for Economy and Environment presented a recommendation to delay the review of the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan 3 by one year to 2014-15

The Government was proposing that future funding for local major transport schemes was devolved to new Local Transport Bodies (LTB), based on the current Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas. The LTB would become responsible for
prioritising major scheme funding, based on a set of eligibility and value for money criteria. The LTBs would be responsible for establishing a programme of local major scheme priorities for delivery beyond 2015. The advent of this body required the Council to consider its effect on the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP).

The current LTP3, published in 2011, proposes full reviews in 2013-14 and 2018-19. This would mean a full review taking place after just 3 years, while local authorities were previously only required to review their LTPs every 5 years. While local transport authorities had a statutory obligation to produce and review LTPs and policies under the Local Transport Act 2008, there was currently no statutory requirement about the timing of these reviews. The Department for Transport Guidance on Local Transport Plans stated that “(...) local transport authorities may replace their plans as they see fit”. Reviewing the LTP3 in 2014-15 would allow the Council to consider the evidence collected as part of the local major transport scheme prioritisation process and therefore make the review of the LTP3 more effective and efficient.

**RESOLVED** that the review of the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan 3 be delayed to 2014-15.

23. CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee, Cllr Hawthorne, presented the recommendations from the Constitution Committee held on 5 February 2013.

a) Independent Remuneration Panel

Members thanked William Alexander, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel, and fellow members of the panel for their work in assessing allowances on behalf of the Council.

A member said that it was privilege to represent the people of Gloucestershire but he questioned whether a basic allowance of £8,800 reflected the complexity and demanding nature of the role. He believed that such an allowance was unlikely to be adequate for younger people to consider becoming a councillor. He recognised the time commitment and responsibility for Cabinet members and the Leader of the Council. He felt that the special responsibility allowances for these positions should be reviewed in the new Council.

A number of members noted the distance that members representing rural divisions needed to travel to attend parish and town council meetings. With a reduced number of members from May 2013 and larger divisions, the
distances travelled by some members would increase significantly. There was agreement across the council chamber that the Independent Remuneration Panel should look at this area in more detail with a view to making a recommendation early in the new Council.

**RESOLVED**

i) That no change be made to the basic allowance for 2013-14.

ii) That the level of special responsibility allowances in the scheme remain unchanged for 2013-14.

iii) That the Council revert to the Inland Revenue’s authorised mileage allowance rate current at the time with effect from 1 April 2013.

iv) To request the Independent Remuneration Panel to provide more information on the payment of travelling allowances for journeys to and from parish and town council meetings within their division. This should include comparative information from other local authorities and an estimate of the potential costs.

v) That councillors should not be given the opportunity to join the Local Government Pension Scheme based on the basic allowance.

b) **Employee Code of Conduct**

**RESOLVED** that the Council adopts the revised Employee Code of Conduct attached at Annex B to the report.

c) **Changes to the Constitution**

**RESOLVED** that the amendments to Procedural Standing Order 27.1 as set out in Annex C to the report be approved.

24. **SCRUTINY REPORT**

In the absence of Cllr Garnham, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Cllr Andrewartha, the Vice-chairman of the committee, presented the report.

Members were pleased that action had been taken following concerns raised at the last meeting regarding the response of Thames Water to flooding incidents in the Cotswold area. They requested that a copy of the letter that had been sent to the Chief Executive of Thames Water be circulated to all members.

Answering a question, Cllr McMillan, Chairman of the Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, advised that a briefing had been held on 19
February 2013 for political group leaders across the seven councils on the Emergency Care Services Review. He noted that an engagement exercise with the public and stakeholders was now underway and information was available to all elected members.

Referring to the highways budget, a member said that he was still waiting for more detailed information following the meeting of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 January 2013.

**RESOLVED** that the scrutiny report be noted.

**CHAIRPERSON**

The meeting ended at 3pm