



MINUTES OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, 27 March 2019 at 10am

VENUE: Shire Hall, Gloucester

Present:

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

Apologies: Cllr Bernard Fisher

Honorary Aldermen Bill Crowther, Bill Hobman, Terry Parker, Gordon Shurmer and Mike Williams

13. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2019 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

15. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Charity cricket game

The Chairman advised that a cricket game between councillors and staff was being held on Thursday, 9 May 2019 to raise funds for the Chairman's Charity, the Oncology Ward at Cheltenham General Hospital. The 20/20 game would start at 6pm at the Wagon Works Ground in Tuffley Avenue, Gloucester. Councillor Saj Patel had kindly volunteered to lead the councillor team and spectators were welcome to come along. The Chairman asked if members were unable to attend that they consider supporting the event by sending a cheque to the Chairman payable to 'Focus', the Hospital Cancer Charity.

b) Dunrossil Centre

Unfortunately the official opening of the Dunrossil Centre at Gloucestershire Archives, scheduled for 3 April 2019, had been postponed until further notice. This was because the building work at Gloucestershire Archives and the Heritage Hub had been delayed following the unexpected departure of the principal contractor, Lakehouse, before completing the job.

c) Gloucestershire County Council Highways

Officers from the Council's Highways Commissioning Team and representatives from their delivery partners would be on the Council Chamber landing over the lunch period to provide information on the new highways operating arrangements.

d) A417 'Missing Link'

Representatives from Highways England would be on the Council Chamber landing over the lunch period to provide information on their proposals.

e) National Star College

The Chairman congratulated the National Star College on winning the British Council International Award and the TES Specialist College of the Year Award. The awards ceremony took place on 22 March 2019 at Grosvenor House Hotel in London's Park Lane.

f) Churchdown Division by-election

Following the sad passing of Cllr Jack Williams, the by-election would be held on 2 May 2019, the same day as the Tewkesbury Borough Council election.

g) Cllr Keith Rippington

The Chairman welcomed back Cllr Keith Rippington back to the Council following the stroke he had suffered just before Christmas. Cllr Rippington thanked everyone for their good well messages and the support he had received while he had been away.

16. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Six questions had been received. A copy of the answers was circulated and is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

Question 1 – Sian Wyn-Jones asked whether the Cabinet Member accepted that carbon emission reduction could have been achieved to the same or even greater amount if lower kelvin LED lights had been selectively used at lower lumen levels which could have been switched off during part of the night. In addition, she cited the code of practice for the design of road lighting in that the daytime appearance of any installation in a conservation area should relate to the surroundings, providing details of the criteria that should be taken into account in the design. She asked for an explanation of how the best fit approach met the requirements under the code.

In response, Cllr Vernon Smith stated that these were technical questions and he would ask officers to respond. He emphasised that the Council followed national best practice. If there was a specific issue over a particular light, officers would be keen to look at it and adjust where appropriate.

Question 2 - Sian Wyn-Jones asked how the Cabinet Member could justify the statement that light trespass could be contained using shielding. She asked whether he was happy to work with residents who had complained in October 2018 about light trespass into their homes from LED street lights. She stated that these residents were still waiting to be contacted and the lights in question had not been shielded.

Cllr Vernon Smith apologised if residents had not been contacted; it had been his understanding that they had been. He stated that all lights could be controlled electronically. Officers could look at various issues and the different types of shielding. He would ensure officers got in touch.

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

Question 3 – Sian Wyn-Jones stated that changing sodium street lights for LED lights was not a like for like change. Horseshoe bat colonies roost and forage in the quarries and fields in Minchinhampton, and were on the list of European Protected Species. She noted that the Council had worked with Bristol University to understand the potential impacts on bats, she asked whether Dr Emma Stone who was a part of the university team had confirmed that a thorough EIA was not necessary?

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that LED street lighting was supported by numerous environmental organisations. Regarding the specific conversations with individuals on this issue he would need to speak to officers and get back to the member of the public.

Question 4 – Sian Wyn-Jones asked that with respect to the latest phase of the rollout, in failing to give households notice with information as to how to complain if they suffered light trespass, did the Cabinet Member accept that he had let these residents down?

Cllr Vernon Smith responded that he disagreed and that the contractor had followed national best practice. Every household had been written to and residents could get in contact if there were any issues.

Question 5 – Sian Wyn-Jones stated that best practice in other authorities had meant a specific policy for conservation areas and/or a different rollout in these and in heritage areas. She added that the British standard code of practice referred to pre-dated the rollout. She asked would the Council please rethink the street lighting policy in conservation areas?

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that the Council follow national best practice and provided details of significant work being undertaken to reduce CO₂ emissions.

Question 6 - Ms Senior asked how the Cabinet Member felt that the expansion of the A417 would help to reduce CO₂ emissions.

Cllr Nigel Moor was unable to answer the question due to a public disturbance and the meeting was adjourned.

17. CORPORATE PARENTING

Cllr Richard Boyles, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, presented the report. He paid tribute to the Ambassadors for Vulnerable Children and Young People for all the work in promoting the voice of children in care and care leavers

Two members highlighted the role of councillors as corporate parents and urged all members to take the time to show they cared by attending events with children in care. They noted that a new Corporate Parenting Pledge had been developed by the Corporate Parenting Group and they hoped that all members would sign-up to it.

RESOLVED to note the Corporate Parenting report.

18. PETITIONS

Cllr Kate Haigh presented a petition to Cllr Vernon Smith, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, relating to traffic calming and road safety in Matson.

19. MOTIONS

Motion 830 – Statutory Youth Service

Cllr Steve Robinson proposed and Cllr Lesley Williams seconded the following motion:

This Council notes:

- *Youth work is a distinct educational process offering young people safe spaces to explore their identity, experience decision-making, increase their confidence, develop inter-personal skills and think through the consequences of their actions. This leads to better informed choices, changes in activity and improved outcomes for young people.*
- *Cuts to youth services have devastated the lives of young people by damaging community cohesion, making it harder to stay in formal education, and having a negative impact on their health and wellbeing. 83% of youth workers say the cuts have had an effect on crime and anti-social behaviour.*
- *Youth work as a profession has been eroded and undermined through funding cuts and market reforms, and that overall spending on youth services in England has fallen by £737m (62%) since 2010.*

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

This Council believes:

- *Youth services should be made statutory, recognising the important role universal youth work plays in supporting young people to realise their potential.*
- *There should be a mandated national body with dedicated ring-fenced funding to oversee youth service provision across England.*

This Council therefore resolves to:

Write to the six Gloucestershire MPs to ask them to support and campaign for statutory youth services.

In proposing the motion, Cllr Robinson stated that young people were the country's future and he believed that they had been badly let down as a result of the County Council downgrading its Youth Service to a targeted offering through Prospects. He noted that Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London, was investing significant sums into youth services in the capital as a preventative measure to address concerns around violent crime, anti-social behaviour and wider mental health issues. He recognised that there were lots of organisations across the county trying to do their bit but he said that there was no overall coordination which meant that some of the most vulnerable young people did not get the services they needed.

Cllr Richard Boyles, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, highlighted the success of the services currently provided by the Council. He said that there were 17 youth workers who worked with a range of organisations across the county to deliver targeted support. The approach was tailored to meet the needs of different areas and individuals and involved project and activity based work, anti-social behaviour groups and one to one sessions. He noted that 150 hours of detached work had been provided in the last quarter to address particular issues identified by the Police. He referred to a range of activities that were taking place in Stonehouse.

Liberal Democrat Group members believed that young people were being forgotten and they spoke in support of the motion to provide a statutory youth service. They noted that young people had felt the brunt of cuts to services since austerity measures were introduced. The County Council had largely withdrawn its services and funding pressures on schools meant that they were providing less support for extra-curricular activities. They recognised that a national service needed to be redesigned to meet modern needs and should not be compared with the service provided 10-15 years ago that was delivered through youth centres.

Social mobility for young people in the Cotswolds was rated as the worst in the country. With a lack of central funding, youth club volunteers in Cirencester were having to spend more time fund raising than providing activities for young people. Residents wanted more things for young people to do in Cirencester and a recent survey showed strong support for increasing the town council's precept to provide extra money for youth activities.

Conservative Group members strongly objected to a universal service believing that the targeted approach currently provided by the Council was the right one. They said that the universal service that the Council used to provide was expensive and failed to reach the most vulnerable people. In 2009, it was estimated that it was costing the Council £160 per hour to deliver youth support with 20% of that relating to running and maintaining buildings. Only 8,000 children were being reached across the county and most children were opting to use locally run facilities.

Members noted that they could use funds from the Growing our Communities Fund to support particular activities in their own divisions. Individual members referred to particular projects that they had supported through the Growing our Communities Fund and the earlier Active Together and Children's Activity Fund schemes. They believed that local communities were best placed to deliver what young people wanted and, through its targeted approach, the Council was able to deliver services where they were most needed. They recognised that there were important wider issues to address, including knife crime, that were the responsibility of the Police and the Courts including more stop and search activity, tackling drugs and weak sentences.

Cllr Roger Wilson, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Commissioning, referred to the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board with two of its seven priorities relating directly to young people: Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and the 'best start in life'. He said that the best approach was to focus on individual communities and the most vulnerable young people.

Labour Group members stressed that a statutory universal service did not mean 'one size fits all' across the county. In the same way that the NHS operated a universal health service, the approach would be tailored to meet the particular needs of communities. They were concerned that austerity and falling standards of living left some families living hand to mouth. In some instances members had used money from their Growing Communities Fund to provide food and drinks for children attending a play scheme. They recognised the work of volunteers in local communities, but lack of funding made it difficult for some schemes to continue. A statutory service would provide the support to allow community-based activities to flourish.

Green Group members strongly supported a universal service. They said that it was not about buildings but providing a range of provision to meet different needs. They were perplexed that the Council was pushing the ACEs initiative but was resisting a universal youth service. They noted that a youth service needed to provide support and advice for young people and not simply be activity based.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Lesley Williams reiterated the message that a universal service did not mean 'one size fits all'. She noted the value of a youth service in providing young people who were living in difficult family circumstances somewhere to go. She believed that it was critically important that support was in place for young people who were not reached by existing services. She said that she was struggling to understand why the Conservative Group members were not supporting the motion.

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

In summing up, Cllr Steve Robinson stated that the youth service had been decimated since the austerity measures had been introduced and it was now coming back to bite local communities. He recognised the value of local youth groups, noting that Nailsworth Town Council was putting £46,000 into youth activities, but he believed that a statutory service would provide the coordination and support to ensure that young people were reached in every part of the county.

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

Motion 831 – Highways

In moving the motion on the agenda, Cllr Vernon Smith, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, referred to the Council's £150 million investment programme in Gloucestershire roads over five years. He said that 165 schemes that had been completed over the last year and he thanked staff and delivery partners for their efforts in delivering such a complex programme of work. He made special mention of Mark Darlow-Joy and Dave Hicks from the Council and asked them to pass on members' thanks to their teams. In 2018-19, 100,000 tonnes of tarmac had been laid as part of £26 million worth of resurfacing schemes. The schemes had been delivered on time with minimal disruption to local residents and road users.

Conservative Group members congratulated the Cabinet Member, staff and delivery partners in transforming the Gloucestershire road network for the benefit of local people. Beyond the £150 million five year programme, other critical infrastructure improvements were being delivered including the schemes at Over, Elmbridge Court and Arle Court bus lane. Highways England had chosen a preferred route for the A417 Missing Link and other major projects including the SW bypass improvements, Crosskeys roundabout and M5 Junction 10 were due to start or were being planned.

They believed that it was right and proper to celebrate the Council's success after years of criticism by opposition groups on the state of the roads. Highways were the number one issue raised on the doorsteps. The Conservative Group had made a pledge to deliver a £150 million investment in highways in their 2017 election manifesto and they were now delivering on that promise. Individual members referred to particular schemes within their own divisions and noted the benefits to local residents.

During the course of the debate, Cllr Kate Haigh proposed that, under Council procedure rule 11.1.10, the motion be put as there did not appear to be any opposition to the motion. She believed that it was unnecessary for members to spend such a lengthy period talking about highway schemes in their own areas.

In responding, Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Leader of the Council, spoke against the motion being put. He said that highways were an issue close to all members' hearts and he believed that members should have an opportunity to express their views. He noted that a number of members from the opposition groups had indicated their intention to speak but had not yet had an opportunity.

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

On being put to the vote, the procedural motion that the motion be put was defeated.

Opposition members recognised the good work carried out by highways staff but they noted that there were many examples of Council staff undertaking excellent work in other areas such as Adult Social Care and Children's Services. Referring to highways, they noted that there were occasions when the work undertaken was not up to the standard expected. Cllr Joe Harris drew the Cabinet Member's attention to a recent incident in Cirencester. Cllr Jeremy Hilton stated that Horton Road in Gloucester was in a dreadful state and he asked the Cabinet Member to advise him when it would be resurfaced.

Opposition members had a wider concern that the motion was just about patting ourselves on the back when people in Gloucestershire expected the Council to be debating issues where action was needed. They were concerned that the length of time spent by the Conservative Group debating roads would mean that there would be little or no time to consider the other motions on the agenda which covered important issues like school funding and education.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Matt Babbage noted how complex the logistics were in planning and delivering such a big programme of road improvements. The Council was only in year one of its £150 million programme over five years but the benefits of the investment were already evident to the public. He thanked Council staff and delivery partners for all their efforts.

In summing up, Cllr Smith thanked members for their supportive comments. He stated that through financial prudence in recent years the Council had been able to make an enormous financial commitment to improve the highway network. He said that it was not just about resurfacing but also about all the other work that Council staff and delivery partners were carrying out for the benefit of local people.

On being put to a recorded vote, it was

RESOLVED to support the motion below:

Over the past year the Highways Department has delivered for and on behalf of all the members here a huge milestone of nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million m² of resurfacing (103 Gloucester rugby pitches) or 100 km of new road surfacing, over a 100,000 tonnes of tarmac, or 5,000 lorry loads. A tremendous achievement in the £150m Highway investment programme.

Top schemes over £400,000 each that have been resurfaced include. There are 165 other schemes to be delivered this financial year.

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

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <i>A4173/A46 Stroud to Pitchcombe - Stage 1</i> | <i>£840,000</i> |
| <i>A429 Toddtenham Jct to Aston Magna Jct</i> | <i>£680,000</i> |
| <i>A436 Severn Springs to Kilkenny</i> | <i>£596,000</i> |
| <i>A40 London Road Andoversford</i> | <i>£515,000</i> |
| <i>A417 St Oswalds Road Gloucester - East Bound Only</i> | <i>£498,000</i> |
| <i>A48 Heartland Hill to Walmore Hill Chaxhill - SCRIM</i> | <i>£497,000</i> |
| <i>B4066 Berkeley Heath</i> | <i>£472,000</i> |
| <i>A4136 Nailbridge to Plump Hill</i> | <i>£462,000</i> |
| <i>A4173/A46 Stroud to Pitchcombe - Stage 2</i> | <i>£454,000</i> |
| <i>B4215 Malswick Mill, Newent</i> | <i>£444,000</i> |
| <i>B4634 Old Gloucester Rd Staverton (C82 Jct to M5 Bridge)</i> | <i>£426,000</i> |
| <i>A417 Over Causeway Gloucester (Town Ham)</i> | <i>£407,000</i> |

The A road network has received a significant investment and its clear to everyone there has been an improvement in condition that can only enhance the economic and quality of life for the residents and businesses of Gloucestershire. Many of us have received congratulatory emails from our constituents on the excellent work done.

This has been a huge delivery task that has been conducted with tremendous professionalism and dedication, with remarkably little disruption to the running of the County.

The Council wishes to express its thanks to the Highways Department and its suppliers for making this possible.

The voting was as follows:

For (31): Cllrs Carole Allaway Martin, Phil Awford, Matt Babbage, Rob Bird, Richard Boyles, Kevin Cromwell, Stephen Davies, Andrew Gravells, Terry Hale, Tim Harman, Mark Hawthorne, Stephen Hirst, Dr Andrew Miller, Patrick Molyneux, Nigel Moor, Dave Norman, Shaun Parsons, Sajid Patel, Loraine Patrick, Alan Preest, Keith Rippington, Brian Robinson, Vernon Smith, Lynden Stowe, Ray Theodoulou, Brian Tipper, Pam Tracey, Robert Vines, Kathy Williams, Roger Wilson and Will Windsor Clive

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

Against (14): Cllrs David Brown, Chris Coleman, Dr John Cordwell, Iain Dobie, Joe Harris, Colin Hay, Jeremy Hilton, Paul Hodgkinson, Nigel Robbins, Rachel Smith, Klara Sudbury, Eva Ward, Simon Wheeler and Suzanne Williams

Abstentions (6): Cllrs Kate Haigh, Graham Morgan, Brian Oosthuysen, John Payne, Steve Robinson and Lesley Williams

Motion 832 – Fairer funding for Gloucestershire Schools

In proposing the motion on the agenda, Cllr Paul Hodgkinson stated that school funding was in such a desperate state that teachers had marched on Westminster and head teachers were writing to parents asking for money. He noted that pleas for funding to Gloucestershire MPs had not resulted in any action. He said that this was not a normal situation and it was important that the Council did all that it could to lobby for extra funding. He noted that some schools, notably the Cotswold School and Balcarras Academy, were surviving on less than the minimum funding of £4,800 per pupil. The reductions in funding were resulting in bigger class sizes, less subject choices, insufficient money for building maintenance and a reduction in the number of places for children with special educational needs and disability (SEND). He stated that it was important to put a spotlight on properly funding schools in Gloucestershire and not leave schools to beg for money.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Colin Hay stated that Gloucestershire ranked 130 out of 149 counties for the lowest level of funding per pupil. Referring to the high needs budget, he noted that the '1 in 40' rule had been introduced to replace '1 in 75' which had a severe impact on those schools which were most inclusive. One school had lost £84,000 in funding as a result of the change and another school had made headlines by indicating that it would be restricting its SEND intake. He said that it was blatantly clear to everyone that the Government needs to provide fairer funding for Gloucestershire Schools.

Cllr Richard Boyles, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, recognised the funding pressures being suffered by Gloucestershire schools. He said that the Council had been part of the F40 schools group that was lobbying hard for fairer school funding. He noted that there had been a significant increase in funding since 2015 but he accepted that there were inflationary pressures faced by schools. He advised that the change from '1 in 75' to '1 in 40' for high needs had not resulted in a cut in funding.

Cllr Boyles proposed the following amendment (see highlighted text):

This Council notes that:

- Nearly 20 schools in Gloucestershire are not receiving the minimum funding, as guaranteed by the Conservative Government's National Funding Formula (NFF), while many are only fractionally above this.
- That, whilst overall funding for Gloucestershire schools has increased by over £58 million, or 15% since 2015, many schools are concerned that this has not covered their costs. Between 2015 and 2020 Gloucestershire's schools are predicted to have lost more than £11 million in real terms funding, an average of approximately £147 per pupil.
- The change in the '1 in 75' rule (devised to compensate schools that attract a disproportionate number of children with high needs), to '1 in 40' has removed a further £1.9 million of funding from Gloucestershire's schools was suggested to the Council by the Schools Forum and does not remove any funding from Gloucestershire schools.

This Council also notes that:

- That in 2017, after more than 20 years lobbying by this Council, the Government agreed to introduce a national funding formula for schools, although this will now not be implemented until 2021.
- Schools are struggling to maintain the standard of education with the level of cuts faced.
- Costs have risen significantly, with staffing costs increasing by over 20 per cent.
- NFF minimum figures have been described as "not enough to run a school"
- Some schools are cutting the number of special needs pupils accepted in an attempt to plug the funding gap. It is illegal for any school to attempt to cut the number of special needs pupils.

The Council therefore resolves to:

- Call for the County Council Leader to make representations to the national government, calling for:
 - A recognition of the harm that school cuts are having on the standard of education the challenges that Gloucestershire schools face.
 - Recognition that the NFF minimums are not enough to run a school
 - The 2019 Spending Review to address the issue of school funding, such that all schools receive in excess of the minimum funding as guaranteed by the National Funding Formula, as well as fully funding the High Needs Block suitable funding.
 - Commit to reverting to the '1 in 40' rule as and when additional money becomes available.
 - A commitment to continuing to take the advice of the Schools Forum in reaching future spending decisions.

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

In seconding the amendment, Cllr Lynden Stowe recognised that schools in Gloucestershire, particularly secondary schools, delivered a tremendous amount of added value despite low funding levels compared with other parts of the country. He said that the Council had been lobbying hard for an increase to funding and encouraged everyone to get involved in the campaign for better funding for Gloucestershire schools. He stated that school funding would be considered as part of the Government's upcoming local government funding review.

The amendment was accepted by Cllr Hodgkinson and Cllr Hay and incorporated within the substantive motion.

Other members welcomed the cross-party lobbying that was taking place. Bournside Academy and Leckhampton Primary School were among the 20 schools in the county not receiving the minimum funding per pupil. Particular concern was raised around Belmont Special School which had seen a significant rise in the number of pupils but no increase in funding. Overall, school funding had been cut in real terms by 20% in 2010 and it was important that members presented a united front in lobbying for a fair settlement for Gloucestershire schools.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, the Leader of the Council, noted the importance of lobbying on factual information around the national funding formula. He recognised particular concerns around SEND funding but he said that schools should work together so that the needs of all children were considered. He was disappointed that secondary heads had not taken up an offer to meet with a Government Education Minister.

In summing up, Cllr Hodgkinson paid tribute to teachers for the inspiring work they were doing with the limited resources available to them. He said that there was clearly a crisis of funding with increases failing to keep up with inflation. He believed that it was important for the Council to stand up for Gloucestershire's schools and children.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion received unanimous support.

RESOLVED that

This Council notes that:

- *Nearly 20 schools in Gloucestershire are not receiving the minimum funding, as guaranteed by the Conservative Government's National Funding Formula (NFF), while many are only fractionally above this.*
- *That, whilst overall funding for Gloucestershire schools has increased by over £58 million, or 15% since 2015, many schools are concerned that this has not covered their costs. Between 2015 and 2020 Gloucestershire's*

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

schools are predicted to have lost more than £11 million in real terms funding, an average of approximately £147 per pupil.

- *The change in the '1 in 75' rule (devised to compensate schools that attract a disproportionate number of children with high needs), to '1 in 40' was suggested to the Council by the Schools Forum and does not remove any funding from Gloucestershire schools.*

This Council also notes that:

- *That in 2017, after more than 20 years lobbying by this Council, the Government agreed to introduce a national funding formula for schools, although this will now not be implemented until 2021.*
- *Costs have risen significantly, with staffing costs increasing by over 20 per cent.*
- *NFF minimum figures have been described as "not enough to run a school"*
- *It is illegal for any school to attempt to cut the number of special needs pupils.*

The Council therefore resolves to:

- *Call for the County Council Leader to make representations to the national government, calling for:*
 - *A recognition of the the challenges that Gloucestershire schools face.*
 - *Recognition that the NFF minimums are not enough to run a school*
 - *The 2019 Spending Review to address the issue of school funding, such that all schools receive suitable funding.*
 - *A commitment to continuing to take the advice of the Schools Forum in reaching future spending decisions.*

Motion 833 – Gloucester Crown Court

The following motion proposed Cllr Jeremy Hilton and seconded by Cllr Colin Hay was not considered as there was insufficient time within the two hour limit for motions.

This Council notes that Gloucester Crown Court is a grade II listed building, linked to Shire Hall, but that it is no longer fit for modern day criminal justice.

This Council agrees to write to the Justice Secretary at the Ministry of Justice requesting that a new Crown Court, to handle criminal cases, is built to serve the county of Gloucestershire.

This Council also agrees that a new Crown Court could be part of a new 21st Century justice centre, which may also contain magistrate and county courts.

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

Motion 835 – Council Education Trust

The following motion proposed Cllr Lesley Williams and seconded by Cllr Brian Oosthuysen was not considered as there was insufficient time within the two hour limit for motions.

This Council recognises that every child in Gloucestershire deserves the best education possible.

This Council recognises that the County has some schools that do give children an education that equips them for the best possible start in life. However this Council should also recognise that some schools do not meet the required standard to deliver a high quality education.

Gloucestershire County Council continues to play an important part in the education of all young people in the County.

This Council also recognises that it is Central Government's intention that all school should become academies or part of a multi academy trust.

I propose, there, that this Council considers creating a task and finish group to look at the possibility of forming an education trust which would allow schools to be part of the local authority.

Motion 836 – Parental leave for councillors

The following motion proposed Cllr Mark Hawthorne and seconded by Cllr Carole Allaway Martin was not considered as there was insufficient time within the two hour limit for motions.

This Council notes:

- *The under-representation of women at all levels of politics*
- *Nationally only 4% of councils have a policy on parental leave for councillors.*
- *That, whilst proper parental leave is important to all parents, it has been particularly highlighted as an issue affecting women's participation in local government.*

Consequently this Council resolves to task the Constitution Committee to develop policies and, if necessary, constitutional amendments, to give councillors similar rights to parental and adoptive leave as members of staff.

20. MEMBER QUESTIONS

Fourteen questions had been received. A copy of the answers was circulated and is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

Question 1 – Cllr David Brown asked what percentage of all firefighters had taken time off due to stress at work.

Cllr Dave Norman stated he was happy to do some further investigation of the figures with the new Chief Fire Officer. He explained that firefighters had to deal with sometimes very traumatic incidents which could affect them.

Question 2 – Cllr David Brown stated he was happy to wait for an answer relating to the number of employees who had logged a formal complaint about bullying or prejudice of any kind in the Fire and Rescue Service.

Cllr Dave Norman replied that he was disappointed that this information was not available and that he was putting in place processes to bring that forward. He would update Cllr Brown in due course.

Question 3 – Cllr Matt Babbage asked if the Cabinet Member would commit to holding the Traffic Regulation Committee considering Boots Corner in Cheltenham to allow the greatest number of people to access the meeting.

Cllr Nigel Moor stated that he was happy to accommodate this and would discuss with officers.

Question 4 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked whether the County was prepared for a No Deal Brexit.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that at the moment there was no idea about what the arrangements would be for leaving the EU and when that would take place. He suggested that there would be time once the detail was known to have discussions about how the County moved forward, but he stated that whatever the challenges and opportunities, Gloucestershire would be ready to meet them.

Question 5 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked the Leader if he would take the opportunity to inform members and the public of the discussions and decisions made in the Local Resilience Forum which met in private.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that he was not privy to those discussions.

Question 6 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what assurances could be given to families who had been falsely accused of Fabricated or Induced Illness (FII) by the County Council that they would be treated fairly in the future.

Cllr Richard Boyles replied that this was something he would raise with the Director of Children Services and would report back to Cllr Hodgkinson.

Question 7 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked whether the Council was admitting to have made mistakes with regards to FII.

Cllr Richard Boyles replied that this was a difficult area to manage and involved many different agencies who could make referrals. A report had outlined that 10 families had been affected but the Council was only aware of two. The County Council took a multiagency approach and the Council had put forward an offer to the Parent Carer Alliance to involve them in the process to ensure the Council's social workers were effectively trained on this issue.

Question 8 – Cllr Rachel Smith stated that the county as a whole needed courageous leadership with regards to Climate Change and asked the Cabinet Member what three actions he would like to see the Council do further to the work it was already doing.

Cllr Nigel Moor explained that there was a Climate Change Summit on 21 May 2019 with a wide range of sectors and leaders involved. He would not try to anticipate the outcome of that summit.

Question 9 – Cllr Rachel Smith noted that Stroud District Council saved the Council £1.34m through its food waste collection service. She asked if the loss of that service would cost the County Council money.

Cllr Nigel Moor stated that this was a hypothetical question as he did not envisage a loss of that service. He replied that the Council valued the work that Stroud was doing but needed to investigate the inconsistency in payments per tonnage of waste across the districts. A meeting with officers and representatives of Stroud District Council had been arranged and no decisions had been taken.

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

Question 11 – Cllr Rachel Smith asked whether an assessment of ash trees would include public rights of way and schools etc.

Cllr Vernon Smith stated that he would confirm the position with officers and get back to Cllr Smith.

Question 13 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked if the Cabinet Member would commit to providing the figures around the percentage of the highways budget used for footpaths and cycleways.

In response, Cllr Vernon Smith stated that he was keen to have a percentage but it would take a significant amount of officer time to break down the figures. He had asked the Lead Commissioner to look at what detail could be provided.

Question 14 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked whether the Cabinet Member would commit to a frequency of reporting on figures for cycleways and footpaths.

Cllr Vernon Smith explained that he could not commit to a frequency but had asked officers to look at the issue.

21. SCRUTINY

21.1 Scrutiny review

Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, presented the report including an addendum summarising the debate at the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) on 22 March 2019. He believed that the review had been thorough with three workshops facilitated by the Centre for Public Scrutiny and discussions at OSMC and lead member meetings.

He recognised that there remained different views across the groups but he believed that the committee structure included in the addendum offered the best compromise. The heavy workload of the existing Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee and the complexity of the governance arrangements around a joint Environment with Economic Growth meant that it was probably better to retain separate committees. He said that a Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee would replace OSMC and would have a more forward-looking agenda and would no longer receive reports from the other scrutiny committees. He suggested that it was likely to meet less frequently.

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

The integration of Health and Adult Social Care remained important but under the current scrutiny arrangements it was evident that Adult Social Care, the Council's biggest area of spend, was getting little coverage. The separation of Health and Adult Social Care would provide an opportunity to provide proper scrutiny of both areas. It was noted that two joint meetings would be held each year specifically to consider issues around the integration agenda.

Members recognised that the most important aspect of scrutiny was culture with parity of esteem between the executive and non-executive sides of the Council. Members themselves had to put in the effort to ensure that they were adequately prepared for meetings.

A number of members spoke in support of the proposed structure which included one more committee than the existing arrangements. Although they recognised the importance of the integration agenda, they were concerned that Health was overshadowing major Social Care issues such as the Adult Single Programme. They believed that this put the Council in a vulnerable position as the Council's biggest area of spend was not receiving sufficient scrutiny.

One member, although broadly supportive of the new arrangements, expressed concern that the parameters for the review had been changed at a late stage with a proposal to include an additional committee. She said that had members been aware of this earlier then a different structure could have been looked at.

Cllr Iain Dobie proposed that a Communities Scrutiny Committee be established to cover a range of community-based services including Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service. He stated that Health and Adult Social Care should remain together under the Health and Care Scrutiny Committee to reflect the national agenda towards greater integration. He spoke passionately in favour of retaining the committee as Health and Social Care was intrinsically linked and he believed that integrated scrutiny could not take place effectively across two committees. He said that with determined agenda management the concerns regarding the lack of scrutiny of Adult Social Care could be addressed.

Councillor David Brown seconded Cllr Dobie's proposal. Another member expressed support for the proposal, noting that meetings of the Health and Care Scrutiny Committee could be held more frequently to allow specific areas relating to Adult Social Care to be scrutinised.

On being put to the vote, the proposal moved by Cllr Dobie and seconded by Cllr Brown was not supported.

Members thanked Democratic Services for their work in supporting the scrutiny review including organising the workshops. They recognised that the proposed structure was not ideal for everyone but the extra scrutiny committee would allow some of the weakness in the current structure to be addressed. This included the scrutiny of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service alongside Adult Social Care. Questions were raised on whether it was necessary for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to include the other scrutiny chairs amongst its membership. Although the proposal to appoint vice-chairs from opposition groups was supported, some concern was raised that all of the chairs would be drawn from the controlling group. The Communities and Local Government Select Committee inquiry into local government scrutiny had identified the value of opposition chairs.

A member noted the importance of effective work planning in ensuring that scrutiny agendas were not overloaded. He suggested that it might be useful to hold another workshop as part of embedding the new scrutiny structure. He said that the Audit and Governance Committee fulfilled a very different role to a scrutiny committee and he believed that it should no longer be included in the scrutiny family of committees in the Council Constitution.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin, Chair of the Health and Care Scrutiny Committee, stated that the scrutiny review had been well managed but she acknowledged that there was not universal agreement across the chamber on the best approach moving forward. She noted that the new arrangements would improve public engagement by providing an opportunity to trial public representations at the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. There were also plans to webcast meetings. She said that under the proposals, the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would also cover Children's Health which had previously fallen under the Children and Families Scrutiny Committee. She hoped that the new structure would allow more task groups to be established to undertake 'narrow and deep' reviews of particular issues.

In summing up, Cllr Molyneux thanked members for their contributions and reiterated the message about the importance of a good scrutiny culture. He said that good scrutiny was fundamental to the success of the Council. He noted that any changes to the current committee structure would be reviewed after 12 months.

RESOLVED

- a) *To adopt the scrutiny culture principles shown in section 3 of the report.*
- b) *To support the changes to working practices shown in section 4 of the report (including the formation of a Member Development Group).*

- c) To disband the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and create a Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The committee will continue to have a co-ordinating role in terms of the management of scrutiny resources and its membership will include the chairs of the other scrutiny committees. It will, however, no longer receive reports on the activities of other scrutiny committees and its call-in powers will be restricted to those areas within its terms of reference. It will promote a scrutiny culture at the Council and have a forward-looking proactive role. Its remit will include cross-cutting issues that are not covered by the other scrutiny committees. It will continue to take the lead on scrutiny of the Council's Budget and will take the lead on scrutiny of financial matters and performance. Vision 2050 is an emerging issue which in the longer term may be a topic of particular interest to this committee.*
- d) To create an Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee whose remit will cover Adult Social Care, Public Health, the Health and Wellbeing Board, Fire and Rescue, Libraries and Public Protection (including Trading Standards and collaboration between blue-light services). This will mean that there will be a Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) with district representation that can concentrate on the scrutiny of health issues including the emerging proposals through the Integrated Care Plan. Children's Health Services will fall within the remit of the committee. The close links between Health, Adult Social Care and Children's Services and the national agenda around health and care mean that joint briefings and task groups will be required from time to time involving health professionals.*
- e) To retain the Children and Families Scrutiny Committee and the Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee in their current formats.*
- f) To retain the Environment Scrutiny Committee, noting that Fire and Rescue, Libraries and Public Protection (including Trading Standards and collaboration between blue-light services) will now be part of the Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee.*
- a) To note that each scrutiny committee will have call-in powers for executive decisions that relate to its terms of reference. Voting on call-ins is restricted to County Council members.*
- b) To request each scrutiny committee appoint a vice-chair who will be drawn from a different political group to the chair. The appointments will be made at the same time as the scrutiny chairs (at the Annual Meeting of the Council).*

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

- c) *To authorise the Monitoring Officer to make the necessary changes to the Council's Constitution to reflect the new committee structure, call-ins, appointment of vice-chairs and working practices (where appropriate).*
- d) *To undertake a review of the new arrangements by 31 March 2020. This should include a review of resources to ensure that an appropriate level of officer support is provided.*

21.2 Scrutiny update

***RESOLVED** to note the report on recent scrutiny activities.*

22. CABINET DECISION STATEMENT

Cllr Rachel Smith asked that more information be provided on the proceeds that the Council received from individual asset disposals. She said that this information was not routinely available from the Land Registry.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou undertook to speak to officers about finding a mechanism to publish the information and to inform Cllr Smith of the outcome.

***RESOLVED** to note the Cabinet Decision Statement for the meeting held on 13 March 2019.*

23. CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENTS

***RESOLVED** to note the Cabinet Member Decision Statements for the period 1 to 28 February 2019.*

24. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Chair of the Appointments Committee, presented the recommendation from the Appointments Committee held on 5 February 2019 relating to the Pay Policy Statement. He noted that the Council was required to publish a Pay Policy Statement each year.

A member expressed concern that the minimum wage recommended by the Living Wage Foundation was higher than the figure included in the Pay Policy Statement.

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

Cllr Hawthorne stated that the Council had previously used the National Living Wage as a bridging measure before the National Minimum Wage was increased to its current level. He said that the member would have to submit a budget bid in future years if she wanted to pursue the issue.

Another member noted that the Council position regarding the gender pay gap looked positive and he questioned why it had not been highlighted. He believed that it was important to demonstrate when the Council was doing well in a particular area.

RESOLVED to approve the 2019-20 Pay Policy Statement (as amended).

CHAIRMAN

Date