



COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, 13 September 2017 at 10am

Shire Hall, Gloucester

Present:

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Rachel Smith
Cllr Robert Bird	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Cllr Vernon Smith
Cllr Richard Boyles	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin	Cllr Lynden Stowe
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Dr Andrew Miller	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Chris Coleman	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Cllr Dr John Cordwell	Cllr Nigel Moor	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Kevin Cromwell	Cllr David Norman MBE	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Brian Oosthuysen	Cllr Eva Ward
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Shaun Parsons (Chairman)	Cllr Simon Wheeler
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Sajid Patel	Cllr Kathy Williams
Cllr Andrew Gravells (Vice- Chairman)	Cllr Loraine Patrick	Cllr Lesley Williams MBE
Cllr Kate Haigh	Cllr John Payne	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Alan Preest	Cllr Roger Wilson
Cllr Tim Harman	Cllr Keith Rippington	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Nigel Robbins OBE	
Cllr Mark Hawthorne MBE	Cllr Brian Robinson	

Apologies: Councillors Stephen Hirst, Graham Morgan, Pam Tracey MBE and Jack Williams

Honorary Aldermen Bill Hobman, Terry Parker, John Sewell and Gordon Shurmer

55. MINUTES

The minutes of the Ordinary Meeting and the two Extraordinary Meetings held on 28 June 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

57. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Know Your Place West of England Partnership
Officers from Gloucestershire Archives would be present at lunchtime to provide information on a new online resource that provided historic maps and linked data from the Historic Environment Record for Gloucestershire and neighbouring areas.
- b) Members' ICT
The Chairman informed members that ICT staff would be available at lunchtime to help members with any ICT queries.

58. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Three public questions had been received. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1 – Diana Ray asked whether the County Council accepted that despite the policies in place, wildflower on verges was decreasing leading to a lower number of butterflies and other valued species.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that the Council worked closely with the bio-diversity plan and that he would ask officers to provide her with a written response.

Question 2 – Diana Ray suggested that the work carried out on verges did not match the policy. She asked whether the Council was aware that its own guidance notes were not being followed consistently by contractors. She emphasised the need for performance indicators that could be monitored.

Cllr Vernon Smith stated that he agreed that there was a need to follow the guidance and action plans and thanked the member of the public for raising the issues. He asked that she provide him with details of where she felt there were failings and he would ask officers to look into it.

Question 3 – Diana Ray informed members that Dorset had a more targeted approach around maintaining verges and she asked whether the Council could investigate how Dorset had achieved actual improvement on the ground.

Cllr Vernon Smith stated that he was really interested in how Dorset was working and was keen to see the details. He would ask officers to speak to Dorset.

Three oral questions were received:

Peter Clark stated that the Government had announced a 2% pay rise for the Police and a 1.7% pay rise for prison officers. He stated that the Government was looking to give further advice to pay bodies. Officer pay squeezed amounting to an effective loss of earnings of over £3,000 from 2010 to 2017.

He asked if Gloucestershire County Council was planning pay rises for its own employees? He believed that social workers, home care and other vital staff in local government had borne the brunt of austerity.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne explained that there was a motion on the agenda where this would be part of the discussion. He stated that the Government was looking to give further advice to pay bodies. Officer pay was something that continued to be looked at across the sector by the Council and the Local Government Association.

Carol Kambites explained that she had been told that the electrical connection to the Javelin Park incinerator would be taken down Stonehouse High Street, causing disruption to residents, traders and motorists, despite an alternative route being available

She asked that, given that the decision had been made on the grounds of a cost calculation by UBB, had the Council seen a breakdown of the calculation and did it include the cost of the contract over-running? Secondly, did councillors believe that the people and traders of Stonehouse should be compensated for the disruption?

Cllr Nigel Moor stated that the decisions had been made by UBB, but that he would take up the issues raised and provide a written response.

Sarah Lunnon asked whether the Leader of Council believed that the County Council had a duty to be open and transparent with the public.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that the Council looked to deliver the best outcomes for local residents providing them with all the facts available. He also stated that the Council had a responsibility to challenge back when individuals were providing false information.

Sarah Lunnon explained that Cllr Ray Theodoulou had been quoted in Resources Magazine saying that one of R4C's complaints was that the Javelin Park project was too cheap and that it was predatory pricing. She asked whether the councillor understood that the pricing of the contract dis-incentivised recycling.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou stated that there had been a procurement process, comparing numerous ways of disposing of waste. R4C was not one of the companies who submitted a bid. It was still the ambition to reach 70% recycling for the whole County.

Sarah Lunnon asked that given the benefits of regular cardio-vascular exercise on mental and physical health, would the Cabinet Member take the opportunity of UBB working on the B4008 from Stonehouse to Javelin Park and install an off road cycle track?

Cllr Vernon Smith stated that health and fitness was very important. Members could use their highways local money to upgrade cycle tracks. He said that he was always an advocate of choosing healthy options. He would ask officers to take a look and provide a response.

Sarah Lunnon asked whether the Cabinet Member could confirm that the constructed access way from the Bloom's car park access road, through a hedge and into Javelin Park was part of the public highway.

Cllr Vernon Smith would provide a response in writing.

59. PETITIONS

Cllr Chris Coleman informed members that he had received an e-petition calling upon the County Council to install a safe informal crossing point on St George's Road, Cheltenham in the vicinity of the Underwood Surgery and Jenner Court. He requested that the petition be forwarded to Cllr Vernon Smith, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, following the meeting.

60. CORPORATE PARENTING

Cllr Richard Boyles, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, presented the report. He stated that there were currently 638 children in care in the county and the number was steadily rising in common with other areas. He was anxious above all else to ensure that the right placement at the right time was provided for every child who needed a placement away from home.

In terms of the Ofsted report, he said that an improvement plan would be presented to the Cabinet on 18 September 2017. An Improvement Board with cross party representation had held its first meeting. Essex County Council had been appointed as the Council's improvement partner. Updates were being provided to members through overview and scrutiny. He recognised that some thought needed to be given on how the Council should engage with members of the public.

Answering questions, Cllr Boyles stated that John Goldup, Chairman of the Improvement Board, was pleased with progress and he accepted that there were legacy issues to deal with in some areas before the Council could move forward. He confirmed that there was a protocol for members to be informed of incidents in their own areas. He said that he would ask the Director of Children's Services to inform members.

Cllr Boyles stated that the breakdown of the children in care numbers included in the report was inaccurate. He said that of the 249 children placed in external provision, 139 were with independent fostering agencies, 60 were in children's residential care and a further 50 were predominantly in supported living. He noted that 72 of the 249 children were accommodated outside the county.

In terms of the increase in the number of children in care, he explained that this was a result of a combination of factors including new working practices and a rise in the incidence of mental health illnesses.

Referring to children's social workers, he said that there were currently 42 vacancies and all but 17 were filled by agency staff.

A member asked how many members had signed the Corporate Parenting Pledge. Cllr Boyles undertook to provide the information following the meeting.

RESOLVED to note the report.

61. MOTIONS

Motion 797 – Care staff and the National Minimum Wage

Those councillors who had declared a disclosable pecuniary interest on the interest sheet in the council chamber left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The Monitoring Officer advised that it was the individual responsibility of members to declare any interest they had in matters being considered at the meeting. She explained that members were required to declare disclosable pecuniary interests by law. Disclosable pecuniary interests related to the financial interests of the member and their wife, husband or partner. Members with disclosable pecuniary interests were required to leave the chamber but for personal interests they could remain in the chamber, take part in the debate and vote.

Cllr David Brown proposed and Cllr Iain Dobie seconded the following motion:

This Council praises the work of all care staff across Gloucestershire either employed directly by this Council or through an independent care provider.

This Council notes the National Minimum Wage (NMW) is a right, not a privilege, which all UK workers are entitled to unless covered by a specific exemption.

This Council is concerned that there are still a minority of workers (namely care staff working for independent care providers) that may well be contracted by this Council delivering care who still do not receive their full NMW entitlement.

This Council agrees that under-payment of the NMW – whether as an intentional act or as a result of ignorance or error - is unacceptable.

This Council welcomes a full review of the employment practices of all those care providers being used by this council to ensure that all care staff are paid at or above hourly NMW rates.

This Council requests the findings of this review to be brought back to this Council in the form of a report with recommendations for member discussion by the end of the year.

In moving the motion, Cllr Brown stated that the national minimum wage for care staff was a legal right. He noted that the Care Act 2014 required local authorities to seek evidence that care staff were being remunerated at a level that enabled an effective work force to be maintained. Research in 2013-14 indicated that 160,000

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

care staff were losing an average of £800 each year because they were not paid for travelling time.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Dobie said that the Council's duty of care did not end when outside providers were employed to deliver services on its behalf. He believed that the way that Cleeve Link operated before it collapsed was exploitative as staff were not paid travelling time between appointments. He was concerned at the impact on vulnerable people and was anxious that a similar situation did not arise again.

A motion without notice was proposed and seconded under procedure rule 12.1.13 to refer the subject of the motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, without further debate.

On being put to the vote, the motion was defeated.

A member stated that an earlier review undertaken by the Council had highlighted the importance of training as well as adequate pay.

Cllr Roger Wilson, the Cabinet Member for Vulnerable Adults and Commissioning, stated that he agreed with the principles of the motion. He recognised that it was important that training took place before care staff started work. He was aware that staff were expected to pay deposits for their uniforms and pay for DBS checks before starting employment with some providers. He believed that the motion should be referred to scrutiny to allow a review to be undertaken.

A member requested that the motion be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to allow employment issues to be considered with health-related issues referred to the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee where appropriate.

A motion without notice was proposed and seconded under procedure rule 12.1.13 to refer the subject of the motion to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee with health specific issues referred to the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.

On being put to the vote, the following resolution received unanimous support.

RESOLVED *that the motion be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee with health specific issues referred to the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.*

Motion 799 - Public sector pay

Those councillors who had declared a discloseable pecuniary interest on the interest sheet in the council chamber left the meeting for the consideration of this item.

Cllr Brian Oosthuysen and Cllr Kate Haigh indicated that they wished to amend the motion that they had submitted in light of national developments regarding the public sector pay cap (see the changes highlighted below).

This Council recognises the important contribution that public sector workers contribute to our communities.

The Council particularly acknowledges the vital work of our emergency services, both in Gloucestershire and across the country, especially in the light of recent tragedies where emergency services have gone above and beyond.

~~*The Council believes that asking public sector workers to continue to accept declining living standards and differentials is not fair or justifiable. Every worker deserves fair pay.*~~

This Council resolves to write to the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and Gloucestershire's 6 MPs to ensure that public sector pay local government pay increases are fully funded by government in order that services are not affected by the lifting of the cap.

In moving the motion, Cllr Oosthuysen stated that recent events across the country had demonstrated the dedication of public sector staff. He said that it was shameful that some staff in the public sector were so poorly paid that they could not afford to go on holiday or buy presents for their children at Christmas. He believed that the pay cap across all areas of the public sector should end without delay.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change, agreed that salaries of public sector staff should reflect the importance of their work. He noted that public sector workers were usually on a pay spine and were able to move up on an incremental basis in addition to any pay rise. The Council was also making a 22% pension contribution for all employees.

A member noted that there were 5 million public sector workers across the UK and between 2005 and 2015 their average hourly earnings had fallen by 3% in real terms. The Consumer Price Index for inflation had now reached 2.9%, largely as a result of Brexit and the falling value of sterling. He said that the recent pay rises

announced for the Police and the Prison Service were one-off increases that were non-pensionable with an expectation that they would be funded through savings.

Another member stated that public sector staff along with other people across the country were benefiting from historically low interest rates and reduced mortgage payments. The Council paid the National Living Wage and personal tax allowances had risen resulting in significant increases in people's take home pay. He said that salary increases needed to be paid for by savings elsewhere.

Other members called for investment in local government staff to ensure that good quality staff could be recruited and retained. The pressure of work and poor pay was resulting in a recruitment crisis in some areas.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, the Leader of the Council, put on record his thanks for the dedication of Council staff. He recognised that the Council would not be able to deliver the quality of services that it did without the hard work of its staff. He said that it was clear that national pay policy was shifting but it would be up to each sector to negotiate pay settlements. For local government, the pay settlement was negotiated nationally through the Local Government Association and employment organisations. He noted that each 1% pay rise cost the Council £1.3 million. He was anxious that the Government provided additional funding to meet the costs of pay rises including the associated pension contributions.

Cllr Haigh, the seconder of the motion, had reserved her right to speak until the end of the debate. She said that she was pleased at the support for the motion across the chamber. She noted that many local government staff had reached the top of their pay spine and had not received annual pay increments for a number of years. She stated that some public sector workers could not afford mortgages and relied on social housing and private rented accommodation. She was concerned that services would fail if the Government expected pay rises to be funded from savings.

RESOLVED that

This Council recognises the important contribution that public sector workers contribute to our communities.

The Council particularly acknowledges the vital work of our emergency services, both in Gloucestershire and across the country, especially in the light of recent tragedies where emergency services have gone above and beyond.

Every worker deserves fair pay.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

This Council resolves to write to the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and Gloucestershire's 6 MPs to ensure that local government pay increases are fully funded by government in order that services are not affected by the lifting of the cap.

Motion 798 - Gloucestershire flood and community resilience

Cllr Kate Haigh proposed and Cllr Lesley Williams seconded the following motion:

This Council recognises that 10 years has passed since the 2007 Gloucestershire floods. In the aftermath of the flood a scrutiny document was produced and a number of flood alleviation works were funded. Now is an appropriate time for this Council to review that report and to consider where further works are needed, and if we are still following best practice. We also ask that any report examines the 1% flood levy specifically looking at how it was used, and what its future is.

This Council also recognises that our resilient communities were a key factor in our response to the emergency. Building such resilience takes time, resources and effort; therefore this Council agrees to review all outstanding resilience procedures to determine the capacity of our communities in the face of future crises.

This Council further believes that the benefits of having the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service embedded in the authority were proven 10 years ago asks that the report also considers how this can be capitalised on in the future.

This Council asks that all reports on this matter are referred to the relevant scrutiny committee for recommendations and then brought back to a meeting of the Council no later than 31 May 2018.

In moving the motion, Cllr Haigh noted the huge community effort from local authority staff, the emergency services and the public sector in responding to the Summer floods in 2007. She questioned whether the same level of response could be provided following the changes to services and reductions in staffing that had taken place across the public sector since 2007. She said that with the increase in frequency of severe weather events the Council needed to be reassured that the public sector could cope.

A number of members spoke of the work that had been undertaken in partnership with other organisations, such as the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water, Thames Water, district councils and parish and town councils, to prevent flooding and improve the resilience of local communities. The Council was viewed

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

nationally as an exemplar in responding to flooding. The flood levy on the council tax had proved successful with £12 of investment for every £1 raised by the Council. The Council was represented on regional and national flood organisations and had strongly influenced the Pitt Review. Severn Trent Water alone had invested more than £30 million since 2007 in flood prevention and improving water supply infrastructure.

A member requested a briefing for all councillors on the role of the Council as the lead flood authority. He said that there was often confusion on who was responsible for particular activities and he believed that a briefing would be useful, particularly for new councillors.

A motion without notice was proposed and seconded under procedure rule 12.1.10 that the question be put. The Chairman noted that a number of members had indicated that they still wished to speak and he believed that they should have an opportunity to have their say. He therefore allowed the debate to continue.

A number of other members spoke of the flood prevention measures that had been undertaken in their areas. They noted that many houses in the county would have flooded since 2007 if the work had not been undertaken. They were proud of the response of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service and its preparedness to deal with future events. £77 million had been spent across the county by various agencies with 2,500 houses protected from flooding. New schemes were underway to protect more houses.

A motion without notice was proposed and seconded under procedure rule 12.1.13 to refer the subject of the motion to the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that the motion be referred to the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Motion 800 - Adoption and promotion of electric vehicles

There was insufficient time to consider the following motion proposed by Cllr Rachel Smith and seconded by Cllr Iain Dobie:

This Council notes the great importance of good air quality to public health and wellbeing in Gloucestershire. Poor air quality not only contributes to 40,000

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

premature deaths in the UK every year, but also limits uptake of cycling, and reduces pedestrian numbers - harming wider public health goals.

This Council notes that a leading cause of air pollution is vehicle emissions. This Council further notes that air quality monitoring is a district responsibility, but that air quality issues need a co-ordinated approach between all local authorities in order to reduce unnecessary deaths from poor air quality, as well as work together to cut our carbon emissions.

Councillors agree that more can be done through this authority to combat poor air quality, and welcome the formation of an air quality task group. Recognising the urgency of the problem of both air pollution and carbon emissions, this Council:

- a) Commits to moving to electric or low emission options wherever possible for all direct or indirectly operated council vehicles at the earliest opportunity.*
- b) Commits to establishing a working group to develop a strategy to (i) replace the GCC fleet of vehicles wherever possible with electric or low emissions vehicles; and (ii) establish principles for use in procurement to encourage use of electric or low emissions vehicles by council contractors.*
- c) Commits to engaging with district councils and other relevant stakeholders to promote adoption of electric and low emission vehicles, including through identifying schemes, funding and other incentives for provision of publicly accessible EV charging points, and EV charging points in new housing developments.*

Motion 801 - Votes at 16

There was insufficient time to consider the following motion proposed by Cllr Paul Hodgkinson and seconded by Cllr Klara Sudbury:

This Council notes that currently 1.5 million 16 and 17 year olds are denied the vote in public elections in the UK.

This Council recognises that 16 and 17 year olds are knowledgeable and passionate about the world in which they live and are as capable of engaging in the democratic system as any other citizen.

This Council believes people who can consent to medical treatment, work full-time, pay taxes, get married or enter a civil partnership and join the armed forces should also have the right to vote.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

This Council therefore requests the Leader of this Council to write to all six Gloucestershire MPs asking that a letter be written to county representatives of the Youth Parliament to express support in lowering the voting age to 16.

Motion 802 – Increase in the State Pension Age for Women

There was insufficient time to consider the following motion proposed by Cllr Eva Ward and seconded by Cllr Brian Oosthuysen:

This Council notes that 39,400 women in Gloucestershire born on or after 05 April 1951 have been adversely affected by increase in the State Pension Age (SPA) and that these women have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the SPA. The lack of appropriate notification has resulted in many women not being told about the changes until it was too late to make alternative arrangements.

The Council calls on the Government to reconsider transitional arrangements so that women do not live in hardship due to these State Pension Age changes and instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and all the Members of Parliament representing Gloucestershire seeking their support for action by the Government.

62. MEMBER QUESTIONS

Thirty six member questions had been received. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1 - Cllr Iain Dobie asked that the Leader ask Democratic Services to ensure they had alternative phone number and email address so all members could be updated in the event of issues such as the ICT disruption that had occurred.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that this had now been put in place. The previous ICT issues should not have occurred and work was underway to prevent similar incidents.

Question 2 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked how much working time had been lost by staff at Shire Hall and those working remotely due to the failure.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne explained that no officer had been tasked to do that analysis. The Blackberry Work outage had effected around 350 members and officers. Most staff had alternative access routes and the worse effected had been members.

Question 4 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked if the Cabinet Member could provide more information including a detailed breakdown on the £400k extra support to people with disabilities.

Cllr Roger Wilson stated that he would provide the member with the information. He explained that the vast majority was for continued provision for community drop in and support to carry out Hate Crime awareness sessions.

Question 7 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson explained that the member's answer which stated that the 'Old A40' was a priority site contradicted what he had heard from council officers. He asked for clarification as to what 'priority site' meant in terms of timescale.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that he understood the frustration of the member and residents. He explained that all landslips were classed as a priority and needed to be evaluated. New photographs of the site suggested that there was still movement of the soil, once that movement had stopped work would begin to resolve the issue.

Question 8 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson informed the member of some of the recommendations coming out of the A429 Task Group including asset management, signage, air quality monitoring and speed limits being reviewed. He asked for an update on what had happened in response.

Cllr Nigel Moor confirmed that an in depth study had been commissioned a number of months ago to report by the end of the year. This report would examine all of the issues brought forward by the group. He was happy to share the consultant's brief with the member. Cllr Moor also congratulated all those involved in the Tour of Britain leg in Gloucestershire.

Question 9 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson explained that as recently as February the Cabinet Member had said that he would extend a warm welcome to Donald Trump visiting the area, what had changed?

Cllr Lynden Stowe replied that the issuing of invites to heads of foreign states was a matter for the Royal Visits Committee.

Question 10 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what contingency plan was in place for the impact of Brexit and where this plan could be seen.

Cllr Lynden Stowe explained that he was not on the Brexit negotiation committee and that the outcome was unpredictable. He would continue to promote Gloucestershire as a great place to work, rest and play. He felt the Council was well positioned for the post Brexit economy.

Question 12 – Cllr Bernie Fisher provided detail of the issues around a new all-through school for children in North West Cheltenham. He expressed concern about the short supply of school places and asked for the Cabinet Member's response on what plans were in place.

Cllr Richard Boyles explained that development of the urban extension in North West Cheltenham would not be on stream in the anticipated time and that the Council was now looking at the South West area of Cheltenham.

Question 14 – Cllr Bernie Fisher asked if he could have the telephone number of the consortium spokesperson.

Cllr Richard Boyles replied that he would ask officers if that was possible.

Question 19 – Cllr Kate Haigh explained that her question related to a discussion at the OSMC meeting in June where there had been cross party support for a peer review of scrutiny. She asked why this had not been taken forward.

Cllr Patrick Molyneux explained that in response to the Ofsted inspection, discussion emphasised the important role of scrutiny. The Head of Democratic Services had provided the committee with a presentation at the July meeting detailing the history of the scrutiny process and outcome of the previous review. The Ofsted report had not had any criticisms of the scrutiny process and it had not been felt necessary at this time to carry out another review of scrutiny.

Question 20 – Cllr Joe Harris asked the Cabinet Member how confident he was that the milestones within the Children's Improvement Plan could be achieved with the resources available.

In response Cllr Richard Boyles explained that he was confident that the plan would be developed and that it was important to retain staff to help the Council improve.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

The previous week he had signed off a bonus programme for social workers and it was important to have a look at what the Council was offering.

Question 21 – Cllr Joe Harris stated that it was important that all members were kept informed about what was happening in relation to the plan. He asked if the member could tell him how elected members would be kept up to date.

Cllr Richard Boyles replied that he would be drawing up specific ways in which members could engage and that he would be involving councillors from all groups in that discussion.

Question 22 - Cllr Jeremy Hilton stated that the reason for the £50 million difference in the total savings on waste disposal stated by the Leader over a two year period had been given as due to estimates of recycling changing amongst other factors, but had not been about the cancelling of the contract. He asked why this had not been cited as reason.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that forecasts would change as the project developed and depending at what part of the process we were in. He explained that members were aware of the financial damage of cancelling the contract and that the long term solution being provided would deliver long term savings.

Question 23 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked what the quantity of waste to be recycled would be.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that the tonnage had increased since the contract had been signed as there had been a huge amount of development with additional homes in the next 25 years. The Council would continue to work with district colleagues to improve recycling rates.

Question 24 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked what the actual savings were from the decision not to cancel the contract.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne asked the member to email him to clarify the exact information he was looking for.

Question 29 – Cllr Lesley Williams stated that the environmental impact assessment for the route cable between Javelin Park and Ryeford grid had been

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

approved by Gloucestershire County Council. She asked again what public consultation had been undertaken.

In response Cllr Nigel Moor stated that the questions should be directed to UBB and Western Power Distribution.

Question 31 – Cllr Rachel Smith stated that commercial confidentiality had to be weighed against public interest and she asked the member if he agreed that in the case of the up to date gate fee around the Residual Waste Project there was an overwhelming interest in its disclosure.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou replied that throughout the process that weighting had been considered.

Question 32 – Cllr Rachel Smith explained that she had received the attached annex which had been on pink paper. She asked how the public could have faith when the information was exempt.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that Gloucestershire County Council was an organisation that respected integrity and that some information was commercially sensitive and so on 'pink paper'.

Question 33 – Cllr Rachel Smith asked what the cash value saving would be of hitting the 70% recycling rate target.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou would provide a written response.

63. SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT (SHE) ANNUAL REPORT

The Chairman thanked the SHE Team for their dedication and hard work.

Cllr David Norman, member of the SHE Panel, presented the Safety, Health and Environment 2016-17 Annual Report. He paid tribute to Paul Cobb, SHE Manager, for his leadership of the team.

RESOLVED to note the SHE Annual Report for 2016-17.

64. SCRUTINY REPORT

Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, presented the report.

Cllr Molyneux stated that the Council had an excellent reputation for scrutiny and, following discussion at the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, there was no appetite for a peer review of scrutiny at the present time. He agreed, however, to keep the matter under review.

Cllr Dave Norman, Chairman of the Economic Growth Overview and Scrutiny Committee, said that the committee had not had any detailed discussions around Brexit but it would be picked up when particular issues were discussed. He stated that the committee would be holding meetings in the districts to allow local members to raise issues relating to economic development.

A member requested that consideration also be given to holding meetings of the Economic Growth Joint Committee in the districts.

Another member noted the importance of promoting Gloucestershire and he referred to how the recent Tour of Britain cycle race had showcased the county with people from across the World watching the television coverage. He said that it was not just about tourism but about attracting young people to live and work in the county.

RESOLVED to note the report.

65. CABINET DECISION STATEMENT

RESOLVED to note the Cabinet Decision Statements from the Cabinet meetings held on 19 June and 19 July 2017.

66. INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENTS

RESOLVED to note the Individual Cabinet Decision Statements for the period 1 June to 3 August 2017.

Signed: **CHAIRMAN**