



MINUTES OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, 23 March 2016 at 10am

Shire Hall, Gloucester

Present

Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Tony Hicks	Cllr Nigel Robbins
Cllr Dorcas Binns	Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Brian Robinson
Cllr Rob Bird	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Cllr Vernon Smith
Cllr Tony Blackburn	Cllr Barry Kirby	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Richard Leppington	Cllr Mike Sztymiak
Cllr Jason Bullingham	Cllr Sarah Lunnon	Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Cllr Chris Coleman	Cllr Steve Lydon	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Dr John Cordwell	Cllr Steve McHale	Cllr Pam Tracey
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Paul McLain	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Paul McMahon	Cllr Stan Waddington
Cllr Jasminder Gill	Cllr Tracy Millard	Cllr Simon Wheeler
Cllr Andrew Gravells	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Cllr Kathy Williams
Cllr Colin Guyton	Cllr Nigel Moor	Cllr Lesley Williams
Cllr Tim Harman	Cllr Graham Morgan	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr Joe Harris	(Chairman)	Cllr Roger Wilson
Cllr Mark Hawthorne	Cllr Brian Oosthuysen	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive
Cllr Colin Hay (Vice-Chairman)	Cllr Shaun Parsons	
	Cllr Alan Preest	

Apologies: Councillors Dave Prince and Lynden Stowe

Honorary Aldermen Liz Boait, Bill Crowther, Barry Dare, Paul Drake, Chas Fellows, Bill Hobman, Terry Parker, John Sewell and Gordon Shurmer.

15. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2016 were confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to noting the following amendment to the penultimate paragraph on page 6:

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

‘On being **put** to the vote, the amendment was lost.’

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

17. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Terrorist atrocities in Turkey and Belgium
Members stood in silence as mark of respect to the victims of the terrorist attacks in Turkey and Belgium.
- b) Members’ ICT
Council officers would be in attendance at lunchtime to provide advice and assistance.
- c) Highways
Senior highways officers from Amey, the Council’s highways contractor, would be available immediately following the meeting to answer questions.
- d) Members versus officers cricket match
Cllr Paul McMahon advised that the match would be held at Tuffley Park on 12 July at 6pm.

18. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

No supplementary questions were asked.

19. CORPORATE PARENTING

Cllr Paul McLain, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and Strategic Commissioning, presented the Corporate Parenting report. He encouraged members to visit the display stands highlighting the Council services associated with children in care.

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

Responding to members, Cllr McLain stated that on some occasions it was necessary to place children in care outside the county as a result of family arrangements or specialist needs. He undertook to provide Cllr Hay and Cllr McMahon with a more detailed briefing including information on the distances that children were placed away from their family homes.

A member expressed concern at the reduction in children centre provision at a time when the number of children in care was rising across the county. Cllr McLain explained that the Council was using every means possible to reduce the number of children coming into care. This included providing advice and support to vulnerable families as early as possible.

RESOLVED to note the report of the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and Strategic Commissioning.

20. PETITIONS

Cllr Nigel Moor presented a petition from Upper Rissington Parish Council to Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Leader of the Council, concerning the provision of faster broadband in the village.

Cllr Dorcas Binns presented a petition from Nailsworth Town Council to Cllr Paul McLain, Cabinet Member for Children and Families and Strategic Commissioning, relating to children's centres.

Cllr Brian Oosthuysen presented a petition to Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, regarding the condition of highways within his division, Rodborough.

21. MOTIONS

MOTION 765 - The Cotswold–Gloucestershire integrity motion

Proposed by Cllr Lesley Williams

Seconded by Cllr Barry Kirby

This Council believes that the Cotswolds is an integral part of Gloucestershire's heritage and a key part of its future as a county.

This Council believes that the Cotswolds benefits financially and culturally through its historic bond with the County of Gloucestershire. This Council also notes that Gloucestershire benefits with the Cotswolds being a key part of the county.

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

This Council asks that the Leader of Gloucestershire County Council write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to state this Council's unhappiness with this proposed change to Cotswold District Council.

This Council asks that the Leader of Cotswold District Council presents their proposals for the Cotswold–West Oxfordshire unitary authority at the June 2016 County Council meeting.

In moving the motion, Cllr Lesley Williams expressed serious concern at the proposal by fellow county councillor and Leader of Cotswold District Council, Cllr Lynden Stowe, to tear the county apart. She said that regardless of what changes were placed upon local government in the future, Gloucestershire was greater than the sum of its parts and it needed to stay together.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Barry Kirby was anxious that the county was not broken-up. He questioned the logic of the proposal and believed that it was driven by politics and revenge as a result of the Prime Minister falling out with a senior politician in Oxfordshire. It was apparent that members of Cotswold District Council had been kept as much in the dark about the proposal as the public. He expressed serious concern that significant sums of public money were being used to draw up the proposals. He noted that the Leader of Cotswold District Council had not attended the meetings of Leadership Gloucestershire when the devolution proposals had been drawn up, and he called upon him to resign immediately.

Members spoke strongly against the break-up of Gloucestershire. They referred to the damage to the county's devolution bid and the serious impact on public services. These did not just relate to the County Council but to other public bodies including the NHS, Police and the Local Enterprise Partnership. There would be a major impact on the A417 loop which was not seen as a priority in Oxfordshire. There was no mandate from the public for breaking up the county and members called for no more public money to be wasted on the proposal.

Members believed that the proposal did not stack-up. It would create a unitary authority with a population of only 200,000 and that was acknowledged as being too small to run services efficiently. There were 106 county-wide contracts of more than £1 million which would need to be reviewed or renegotiated if the county was broken-up.

A member referred to the impact on the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service (GFRS) which was part of the county council. If Cotswold broke away a fire service could not be run for that area and alternative arrangements would need to be put in place. GFRS would not remain viable over a smaller area so would need to merge

with a neighbouring area. Currently, GFRS shared back office with other County Council departments and the Chief Fire Officer was responsible for managing a range of other services including ICT, Trading Standards, the Road Safety Partnership, Registration and Emergency Planning.

Cllr Iain Dobie, Chair of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, referred to the potential impact on the health and social care system of Cotswold breaking away from the county. He said that Gloucestershire was one of the best performing areas nationally in terms of delayed transfers of care (commonly referred to as 'bed blocking'). By comparison, Oxfordshire was one of the worst performing areas and this could have a serious impact on residents of the Cotswold area when they were being discharged from Gloucester Royal Hospital and Cheltenham General Hospital.

Cllr Joe Harris, a member of Cotswold District Council, said that it had been a disgraceful process. The proposal had been put forward by the Leader of Cotswold District Council without any engagement with others, including fellow district councillors. He stated that the people of the Cotswolds did not relate to the West Oxfordshire area and their links were to Gloucestershire.

Cllr Shaun Parsons, also a member of Cotswold District Council, explained that the Cotswolds looked towards Gloucestershire and the Vale. He could see no value in the merger of Cotswold and West Oxfordshire to form a unitary authority. He said that it was apparent that there was a lack of understanding about the services provided by the County Council. He noted that the annual budget for Cotswold District Council amounted to around £11 million compared to a budget of over £400 million for Gloucestershire County Council. He believed that the wider debate on the proposal provided an opportunity to inform the public about the range and complexity of the services provided by the County Council.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Leader of the Council, stated that the campaign would be won in the towns and villages of the Cotswolds by allowing local people to have a voice. The key tests for devolution were that it should improve the delivery of services, recognise the interests of local people and secure effective and efficient local government. He believed that the proposal clearly did not meet these tests. Gloucestershire with the benefits of coterminous boundaries for the delivery of public services was well placed to take devolution forward. By working together Gloucestershire could deliver better services for its residents.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou, a member of Cotswold District Council, recognised that joint working at district council level between Cotswold and West Oxfordshire had been effective but that did not mean that county-wide services should be delivered in the same way.

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

Another member stated that there had been tensions between Oxfordshire County Council and the districts within the county for many years and these had now come to a head. He did not believe, however, that the Cotswold area should form part of the solution to difficulties being encountered in another county.

Cllr Nigel Robbins, a member of Cotswold District Council, spoke strongly against the proposal. He believed that it would in effect create a 'gated community' for wealthy and prosperous people.

Cllr Chris Coleman, a Cabinet Member at Cheltenham Borough Council, stated that the Chief Executive of Cotswold and West Oxfordshire had repeatedly told Cheltenham members about the importance of trust in developing the 20:20 Partnership between Cotswold, West Oxfordshire, Forest of Dean and Cheltenham. He was seriously concerned about the way in which the unitary proposal had been put forward and he said that he was calling for a review of the governance of the 20:20 process at Cheltenham Borough Council.

A number of members believed that the Leader of Cotswold District Council should make a presentation to county councillors to explain why he had put forward the proposals.

Cllr Williams and Cllr Kirby accepted the following amendment proposed by Cllr Hawthorne and Cllr Theodoulou (refer to the scored through and shaded text):

This Council believes that the Cotswolds is an integral part of Gloucestershire's heritage and a key part of its future as a county.

This Council believes that the Cotswolds benefits financially and culturally through its historic bond with the County of Gloucestershire. This Council also notes that Gloucestershire benefits with the Cotswolds being a key part of the county.

This Council asks that the Leader of Gloucestershire County Council write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to state this Council's unhappiness with this proposed change to Cotswold District Council.

~~*This Council asks that the Leader of Cotswold District Council presents their proposals for the Cotswold – West Oxfordshire unitary authority at the June 2016 County Council meeting.*~~

This Council agrees to hold a members' seminar to discuss the proposals once they are available in detail. This would be open to the public.

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

In summing up, Cllr Lesley Williams stated that everyone should stand together and unite against the proposal. She hoped that Cllr Lynden Stowe in his role as Leader of Cotswold District Council would attend the seminar, which would be open to members of the public.

On being put to a recorded vote, it was

RESOLVED that

This Council believes that the Cotswolds is an integral part of Gloucestershire's heritage and a key part of its future as a county.

This Council believes that the Cotswolds benefits financially and culturally through its historic bond with the County of Gloucestershire. This Council also notes that Gloucestershire benefits with the Cotswolds being a key part of the county.

This Council asks that the Leader of Gloucestershire County Council write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to state this Council's unhappiness with this proposed change to Cotswold District Council.

This Council agrees to hold a members' seminar to discuss the proposals once they are available in detail. This would be open to the public.

The voting was as follows:

For (49): Cllrs Phil Awford, Dorcas Binns, Rob Bird, Tony Blackburn, David Brown, Jason Bullingham, Chris Coleman, Dr John Cordwell, Iain Dobie, Bernard Fisher, Jasminder Gill, Andrew Gravells, Colin Guyton, Tim Harman, Joe Harris, Mark Hawthorne, Colin Hay, Tony Hicks, Jeremy Hilton, Paul Hodgkinson, Barry Kirby, Sarah Lunnon, Steve Lydon, Steve McHale, Paul McLain, Paul McMahan, Tracy Millard, Patrick Molyneux, Nigel Moor, Graham Morgan, Brian Oosthuysen, Shaun Parsons, Alan Preest, Nigel Robbins, Brian Robinson, Vernon Smith, Klara Sudbury, Mike Sztymiak, Ray Theodoulou, Brian Tipper, Pam Tracey, Robert Vines, Stan Waddington, Simon Wheeler, Kathy Williams, Lesley Williams, Suzanne Williams, Roger Wilson and Will Windsor-Clive.

Against (0)

Abstentions (1): Cllr Richard Leppington

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

MOTION 766 - Improving highway tree maintenance

Proposed by Cllr Klara Sudbury

Seconded by Cllr Bernie Fisher

This Council notes that there are approximately 8,000 trees on highway land in Cheltenham alone, and many more right across the county.

It is understood, that the highways contract with Amey is under review and that Liberal Democrats have already asked the Cabinet Member to consider improving highway tree maintenance.

This Council asks the Cabinet Member to report back to the Highways Advisory Group on measures to improve the County Council's tree maintenance programme, before reporting back to full Council with a positive action plan.

In moving the motion, Cllr Klara Sudbury noted the value of urban trees in towns such as Cheltenham. Trees benefited the local environment but it was important that they were maintained properly and stumps were removed as necessary. Residents expected trees to be cut back when necessary and removed and replaced if they became too big. She said that through lack of maintenance trees were causing damage to houses and roots were breaking through pavements. Although she had encountered difficulties in getting work on trees undertaken, she was pleased that officers had responded promptly to a request for a tree to be planted in a green area in her division.

It was noted that there were 8,000 trees in Cheltenham and 3,000 trees in Gloucester. Members were concerned that they were not being kept informed of tree maintenance activities within their divisions. Work was often undertaken with no reference to the local member. The problems were compounded by confusion over who was responsible for tree maintenance in some localities.

Cllr Joe Harris referred to the problems that had been caused in Cirencester with tree stumps left that were not only unsightly but also dangerous. He was particularly concerned about a particular stump outside a school in Victoria Road in Cirencester which had still not been taken out a year after the tree had been removed. He placed on record his thanks to two residents of the town, David Ryan-Ainslie and Monika Benz, who had campaigned for trees to be replaced in the town.

A member noted that trees were an important part of sustainable urban drainage schemes (SUDS) and said that their role should not be overlooked in flood management.

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

Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, stated that the main responsibility of the highways authority was safety of the road network. He believed that there might be opportunities through the devolution process to work with the district councils on tree maintenance. He said that members could use their Highways Local funding for tree maintenance. He noted that tree stumps were a particular problem and extensive work was often required to remove larger stumps as there was a danger of damage to underground cables and pipes.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Bernard Fisher stated that some of the trees in Cheltenham were more than 200 years old. He said that they were of great value to urban environments: cleaning the air, purifying water and providing shelter for roads. He believed that if the trees in the town were maintained better their life could be extended. He was concerned that some highway officers did not seem to recognise their value and opposed the planting of new trees.

After a short adjournment, Cllr Sudbury and Cllr Fisher accepted the following amendment to the final paragraph of the motion:

This Council asks the Cabinet Member to report back to the Highways Advisory Group on measures to improve the County Council's tree maintenance programme, before reporting back to the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee with a positive action plan.

In summing up, Cllr Sudbury said that she had tried to use some of her Highways Local funding to get work undertaken on trees in her division but had been advised that she could not use it for that purpose. She was anxious that this was looked into further. She believed that the Highways Advisory Group was well placed to undertake a review of highway trees maintenance. She stated that she had reluctantly accepted the amendment for the action plan to go back to the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee. She requested that members representing divisions in Cheltenham be invited to go along to the meeting when the action plan was presented.

On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

That this Council notes that there are approximately 8,000 trees on highway land in Cheltenham alone, and many more right across the county.

It is understood, that the highways contract with Amey is under review and that Liberal Democrats have already asked the Cabinet Member to consider improving highway tree maintenance.

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

That this Council asks the Cabinet Member to report back to the Highways Advisory Group on measures to improve the County Council's tree maintenance programme, before reporting back to the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee with a positive action plan.

MOTION 767 – Sugar and Obesity Strategy

The following motion was withdrawn by the proposer and seconder, Cllr Steve Lydon and Cllr Lesley Williams.

This Council expresses its dismay that the Government have added a further delay to enacting its childhood obesity report.

This Council is also aware that it does not include recommendations for a 'sugar tax', which has been proven to reduce the rates of obesity in children.

This Council is alarmed by the rate of childhood obesity across the County, and will write to the Secretary of State to urge them not to delay releasing the childhood obesity report, and to reconsider the 'sugar tax'.

22. MEMBERS QUESTIONS

Question 1 – Cllr Iain Dobie noted the response which outlined that there were currently no or very few viable alternatives to diesel. He asked whether advantage could be taken of new technology which provided electric vans at competitive prices. He commended the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office for committing to buy electric alternatives for the Police vehicle fleet..

Cllr Vernon Smith responded by stating that as alternative technologies developed he would be keen to listen to proposals, but that he did not feel that there were suitable alternatives currently available for heavy duty vehicles.

Question 8 – Cllr Barry Kirby noted that the responses to his previous questions around how Gloucestershire County Council services could be delivered to the Cotswold had explained that the Council had not seen detailed proposals. He questioned how the Cabinet Member had been able to provide the information for his answer on highways in the Cotswold.

Cllr Vernon Smith explained that his answer had come from past highways information. Cllr Mark Hawthorne outlined that the answers to the previous questions were due to the Council having not received the detail from Cotswold District Council.

Question 15 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked for the Cabinet Member’s views on the direction from Government to form academies and expressed his concerns around the availability of local secondary school places and the local authority not having oversight of school improvement and catchment areas.

In response, Cllr Paul McLain explained that the local authority did not currently have many of the controls outlined by Cllr Dobie and that there would still be oversight of school based planning. In relation to concerns around secondary school places, he stated that the extra demand for places from the Leckhampton development could be met from the expansion of existing schools in the area.

Question 16 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked whether, if parents in the area of the Leckhampton development wished to set up a free school, would the Council make some of its land available if approached?

Cllr Paul McLain replied that if parents wished to set up a free school, this was a conversation with central government. For any secondary school to be successful a five form entry was needed and he suggested that realistically there was not the demand in the area to meet that.

Question 19 - Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked whether the Council had provided oversight of the school’s Supply Mutual Scheme. He questioned when officers had been informed of the deficit in the scheme and what action had been taken.

Cllr Paul McLain explained that the scheme was run by schools for schools and that the Council provided an administration role. The Schools Forum had been informed of the likely deficit in the previous year and individual schools had been notified in February 2016. He acknowledged that individual schools could have been notified earlier.

Question 21 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson suggested that some schools had lost confidence in the Council due to the issue of the schools Supply Mutual Scheme and he asked how the member would address that.

In response Cllr McLain stated that he was surprised by the member’s suggestion and that the deficit was being subsidised by an amount from Dedicated Schools Grant. This equated to a small amount per school. He suggested that the deficit had arisen due to larger schools withdrawing from the scheme. He was happy to speak to schools on an individual basis.

Question 26 – Cllr Paul McMahon asked for the Cabinet Member’s view on the potential for care providers using zero hour contracts to avoid paying the living wage.

Cllr Dorcas Binns stated that care providers carried out a good service and that many provided information on their staff structure.

Question 28 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked if the Leader could confirm that there were no planned consultations or pre-consultations on changing how libraries operated.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that the County Library Service was always changing. He referred to the recent roll-out of wi-fi and he said that the Council would continue to look at new and innovative ways for the service to operate.

Question 29 – Cllr Lesley Williams thanked the member for the response and stated that it was good news that women breastfeeding would be supported for up to six months.

Question 30 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked whether broadband money for the Cotswold had been suspended and when and why this decision had been made.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that following the announcement from Cotswold regarding unitary discussions with West Oxfordshire, the Council had to reflect what impact this would have on initiatives that had been agreed with Cotswold. There was a commitment to broadband across Gloucestershire and there was a desire to continue to work with Cotswold on this. If at some point Cotswold was not part of Gloucestershire any Gloucestershire funding to Cotswold would cease.

Question 31 – Cllr Richard Leppington explained that some of his constituents had concerns about undue influence of freemasons and asked for the sake of transparency whether it was possible to change the register of interests for members to make it compulsory to declare such membership.

Cllr Nigel Robbins replied that group leaders in the past had been asked to encourage members to make declarations and that any change to the register of interests requirements would need to be requested through Constitution Committee.

Question 32 – Cllr Sarah Lunn suggested that if Cotswold was to be a part of a new unitary then waste disposal would reside with that unitary. She asked what impact that would have on the Gloucestershire residual waste contract.

In response, Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that the contract included exclusive rights to Cotswold waste until 2044.

Question 33 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked for the Cabinet Member’s views on schools becoming academies and noted a number of good schools under the responsibility of the Council.

Cllr Paul McLain stated that the move to academies put greater responsibility and control into the hands of head teachers. He suggested that schools understood best about local issues. With regards to the services provided by local authorities he commented on the good service provided by the School Improvement Team and that he would not like to see that expertise lost. He felt there were opportunities for services to develop in different ways.

23. SCRUTINY REPORT

Cllr Brian Oosthuysen, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, presented the report. He said that scrutiny chairs had attended a charring skills session run at Shire Hall by John Cade from the Institute of Local Government Studies at Birmingham University. He was pleased that scrutiny at the Council was recognised nationally as best practice. There had been an opportunity at the session to start exploring the shape of scrutiny for devolution. This would be taken forward through discussion at Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee lead members and take on board the views of the districts and partner organisations.

Cllr Lesley Williams, Chair of the EU Referendum Scrutiny Task Group, advised that, although the group had been unable to complete its work in light of the earlier than anticipated referendum, useful information had been provided at the two evidence gathering sessions held. She hoped that there would be an opportunity to share this information wider with members.

Answering a question, Cllr Oosthuysen confirmed that scrutiny chairs were expected to present recommendations from their committee irrespective of their personal views.

Some concern was expressed that the information in the scrutiny report relating to the Forest of Dean scrutiny review did not reflect the recommendations in the task group report. Cllr Rob Bird, explained that the report before members only summarised discussion at the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee and did not in any way change the recommendations of the task group. The recommendations would be presented to the Cabinet in due course.

RESOLVED to note the scrutiny report.

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

24. INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENTS

***RESOLVED** to note the Statement of Individual Cabinet Member Decisions for the period 1 to 29 February 2016.*

25. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, Chair of the Appointments Committee, presented the recommendation from the meeting held on 7 March 2016 relating to the Pay Policy Statement for 2016-17.

Some members expressed concern that there were a number of outstanding issues as a result of national negotiations regarding pay and related matters. Cllr Hawthorne explained that the Council was legally required to publish its pay policy statement by 31 March each year. He said that the outstanding matters were the subject of ongoing negotiations and the Council could not influence that process. The changes would be reflected in the pay policy statement in due course.

***RESOLVED** to adopt the Pay Policy Statement for 2016-17.*

26. HIGHWAYS PERFORMANCE REPORT

A number of members expressed concern at the failure of Amey, the Council's highways contractor, to meet performance targets. They specifically referred to low levels of public, parish and member satisfaction, failure to complete winter salting routes on time, poor performance in resolving three month defects, lack of communication with members and delays in Highways Local projects.

Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, responded to the issues raised. He invited members to accompany him for a day so that he could show them the steps that were being taken to maintain and improve the network. He said that new technology and equipment would improve the way in which potholes were filled and provide a mechanism for larger areas to be resurfaced where there were a number of potholes in close proximity. Referring to winter salting routes, he explained that the failure to complete all the runs on time reflected changing weather conditions and the particular requirements of individual localities.

At the end of the debate, there was an exchange between Cllr Smith and Cllr Chris Coleman over attendance at the Cheltenham area highways meetings. Cllr Coleman asked Cllr Smith to withdraw a comment he had made about Cllr

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

Coleman's non-attendance at the meetings. Cllr Smith refused to withdraw the comment.

The Vice-chairman noted that the Cheltenham area highways meetings were held at Shire Hall and he called on officers to arrange them in Cheltenham to make it easier for local members to attend. He believed that this principle should be extended for other service areas at the Council too.

The Chairman noted that senior highways officers from the Council and Amey would be available after the meeting to answer detailed questions from members.

RESOLVED to note the highways performance report.

The meeting ended at 1.15pm

CHAIRMAN