



## **72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

Cllr Tracy Millard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the motion on the Trade Union Bill (motion 762).

## **73. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

a) Paris terrorism attacks

The Chairman reported that the flag at Shire Hall had been flown at half-mast and a minute's silence had been observed on 14 November.

b) Gwyn Morgan

The Chairman advised that Gwyn Morgan, member of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel, had sadly passed away. His funeral would be held in Tetbury on 3 December at 12.30pm.

c) Blackfriars development

Following the resolution of Council at the last meeting (motion 752), an article setting out the latest position had been published in Members' Matters at the request of Cllr Barry Kirby, the mover of the original motion.

d) Magna Carta

The Chairman thanked officers from the Archives Service for their efforts in organising the event for councillors on 24 November.

e) Craig Drew

The Chairman congratulated rally co-driver Craig Drew from Bream on winning five consecutive Rally America National Championships alongside David Higgins. The pair had won all eight events in the championship in 2015 and were the first crew to achieve that for nearly 30 years.

f) Danny Kent

The Vice-chairman congratulated motorcycle racer Danny Kent from Tetbury on winning the Moto3 World Championship. He said that Danny was the first British World Champion motorcycle racer since Barry Sheen.

g) Bus service consultation

Council officers would be in attendance on the Council Chamber landing during lunch to answer questions about the latest round of consultation on local bus services.

#### **74. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Twelve public questions had been received ahead of the meeting.

Question 6 – David Crawley on behalf of Pam Hillier.

Pam Hillier wished it to be noted that the original question should not have included the following line: 'The B4066 is rapidly disintegrating and Alkington Lane is unfit for purpose.'

David Crawley stated that the proper solution benefits residents and commercial organisations, current and future, as well as developers. This was obvious to the County Council in 1981 when the cost of the final stage of the bypass was estimated at £715,000, for completion in 1985, suggested to be £2.5 million today with inflation. The paper 'Investing in Roads: Pricing, Costs and New Capacity' by Archer and Glaister, Dept of Civil Engineering, Imperial College, London (November 2006) gave average costs (2003) of 2.13 £M/km for a two lane bypass.

The two routes considered were just 2.5km long - suggesting a cost of between £5million and £6 million.

He asked if details could be shared for the route that had been considered to reach a cost of £15m. He also asked whether the County Council and Stroud District Council would meet with businesses in Sharpness to discuss how to solve the problem.

In response, Cllr Will Windsor-Clive confirmed that he would provide further details.

#### **75. PETITIONS**

Cllr Brian Tipper presented a petition to Cllr Will Windsor Clive, the Cabinet Member for Fire, Planning and Infrastructure, on the traffic situation on the B4066 through Berkeley Heath and Mobley and on Alkington Lane, Berkeley.

Cllr Jeremy Hilton presented a petition to Cllr Nigel Moor, Chairman of the Planning Committee, relating to a planning application by Allstone Company for a facility to crush and screen inert waste materials to secondary aggregates.

#### **76. CORPORATE PARENTING**

Cllr Paul McLain, the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and Strategic Commissioning, presented a report updating members on the latest position. He said that the next meeting of the Corporate Parenting Group would be held on 3 December and not 9 December as indicated in the report.

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

Answering questions, he stated that there was some frustration about the judiciary's approach to adoption and he hoped that this could be addressed in the future. He recognised that there were real problems around the recruitment and retention of children's social workers. He welcomed the recent work undertaken by a scrutiny task group to address this issue.

Cllr McLain thanked those members who had attended the Peter Lang Children's Trust awards evening for children in care on 1 December. A member said that children in care often had not had the best start in life and she noted how important it was for members to attend events which recognised their achievements.

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

## **77. MOTIONS**

At the Council briefing, indicative times for each motion had been agreed taking account of the overall time limit of 2 hours for motions allowed in the Constitution.

### **Motion 758 – Minerals Local Plan**

*Proposed by Cllr Sarah Lunnon*

*Seconded by Cllr Mike Sztymiak*

Cllrs Lunnon and Sztymiak requested that the motion be amended as indicated below (see shaded text):

In response to the predicted consequences of even higher levels of greenhouse gases (GHGs), this Council will seek to ensure that its Mineral Local Plan will require any new application for the extraction of hydro-carbons to demonstrate the Climate Change impact of the extraction and the end use of the hydro-carbons.

This Council recommends that the extraction will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the extraction and the end use of the hydro-carbons will not lead to higher levels of GHGs present in the atmosphere and so can be defined as Sustainable Development as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The motion also seeks to exclude all heritage free-mining across the Forest of Dean and the county from these changes.

NB. In preparing this amendment the definition of Sustainable Development is that used in the report of the Brundtland Commission for the United Nations, 'Our Common Future' 1987 - that 'Sustainable Development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

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

In moving the motion, Cllr Lunnon stated that it was important that everyone realised that the damage caused by higher levels of greenhouse gases were irreversible. She was anxious that credible alternatives were in place and that opportunities were taken to support emerging technology. Local firms should be encouraged to grasp businesses opportunities provided by the low carbon economy.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Sztymiak believed that the Council should show its commitment to the low carbon economy. He said that there was evidence to suggest that fracking increased emissions of methane gas. He recognised that it was possible that the extraction process could provide an opportunity for carbon storage underground but more detailed analysis and testing was required.

Cllr Nigel Moor, Chair of the Planning Committee, reminded members that all councils were required to follow national planning policy guidance. He stated that it was essential that individual applications were assessed in a clear and transparent way. If the motion was supported, the Council would be going against national planning policy guidance and was likely to be subject to legal challenge.

A member said that, although he was sympathetic to the intent of the motion, he would not support it as he believed that it was premature. He noted that the members of the Environment and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be examining issues relating to fracking early in the New Year. He recognised that the Council needed to put in place clear policies and procedures relating to fracking.

Another member advised that the amended motion would protect free mining which was an important part of the industrial heritage of the Forest of Dean. He was anxious, however, that local residents were protected from the harmful impacts of fracking.

A member noted the complexities of the Minerals Local Plan and the risk of legal challenge if the Council failed to follow the right process.

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

**Motion 759 – Ambulance response times**

*Proposed by Cllr Paul Hodgkinson*

*Seconded by Cllr Joe Harris*

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

This Council notes that on Wednesday 28 May 2014, a motion concerning ambulance response times was brought to this chamber and received unanimous cross-party support.

This Council is still increasingly concerned about the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust's (SWASFT) continued failure to meet their 75% target in responding to the most urgent calls within 8 minutes.

This Council acknowledges that the issue of ambulance performance is being monitored by both the Council's Health and Care Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) and the South Western Ambulance Service Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, but wants to see once again significant improvement in the response times in those districts that are failing to reach the 75% target.

This Council therefore asks both the Leader and the Chief Executive to write to the CEO of SWASFT noting the letter written back in May 2014 and asking for specific actions which will take place so that response times are significantly improved especially in the following four districts - Forest of Dean, the Cotswolds, Tewkesbury and Stroud.

This Council also requests that the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee explores the option of creating a county-wide ambulance service rather than a regional one, with recommendations produced for full Council to debate.

In moving the motion, Cllr Hodgkinson expressed serious concern that there had been no improvement in ambulance response times since the last motion considered by the Council in May 2014. He said that performance, particularly in the more rural areas, was dreadful and had fallen significantly over the last year. In September 2015 the ambulance service had responded to only 30.8% of RED1 calls in the Cotswold District within the national 8 minute target. In September 2014, the figure was 53%. Performance in other rural parts of Gloucestershire including the Forest of Dean and Stroud Districts was also very poor and was falling.

He commended the work of paramedics and other ambulance staff but said that more resources were required on the ground. He believed that it was time to look at the potential for an ambulance service in Gloucestershire linked closely to the Police and the Fire and Rescue Service. Such a move would fit well with the devolution proposals currently being considered for Gloucestershire.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Harris stated that it was literally a matter of life and death and urgent steps needed to be taken to address the problems. He paid tribute to the efforts of ambulance staff but he said that there were simply not

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

enough ambulances and crews available on the ground. He noted that 10 years ago, before the merger to form the Great Western Ambulance Service, the Gloucestershire Ambulance Service was recognised as high performing with first rate training of staff and initiatives such as the Tri-Service Centre.

Cllr Iain Dobie, Chair of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, advised members that his committee was scrutinising ambulance response times on a regular basis. He said that members had visited one of the ambulance control centres and a number had travelled on ambulances as observers. He recognised that the South Western Ambulance Service demonstrated best practice in a number of areas but he supported the motion which would allow his committee to examine the issues in more detail.

Other members spoke in support of the motion. They recognised that the geography of the county made it difficult to meet targets for response times. The number of RED1 calls in the most rural parts of the Cotswolds were very low so the performance figures could be misleading. They noted, however, that efforts made by the ambulance service, including an additional ambulance stationed in Cirencester, had failed to address the problems.

A member was particularly concerned that ambulance response times in the North Cotswolds were amongst the poorest in the country. He called for a change in leadership of the ambulance service with efforts being made to harness capacity within the Police and the Fire and Rescue Services.

Another member noted that funding had been cut for health services and ambulance services were under inordinate pressure. He stated that it was about outcomes for patients and not simply response time targets. He said that the Police and Fire and Rescue Service were not subject to the same targets.

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

***RESOLVED that***

*This Council notes that on Wednesday 28 May 2014, a motion concerning ambulance response times was brought to this chamber and received unanimous cross-party support.*

*This Council is still increasingly concerned about the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust's (SWASFT) continued failure to meet their 75% target in responding to the most urgent calls within 8 minutes.*

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

*This Council acknowledges that the issue of ambulance performance is being monitored by both the Council's Health and Care Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) and the South Western Ambulance Service Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, but wants to see once again significant improvement in the response times in those districts that are failing to reach the 75% target.*

*This Council therefore asks both the Leader and the Chief Executive to write to the CEO of SWASFT noting the letter written back in May 2014 and asking for specific actions which will take place so that response times are significantly improved especially in the following four districts - Forest of Dean, the Cotswolds, Tewkesbury and Stroud.*

*This Council also requests that the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee explores the option of creating a county-wide ambulance service rather than a regional one, with recommendations produced for full Council to debate.*

#### **Motion 761 – Female sanitary products**

*Proposed by Cllr Lesley Williams*

*Seconded by Cllr Barry Kirby*

Cllr Williams and Kirby accepted a suggestion by Cllr Dorcas Binns that the motion be amended as follows (see shaded text):

This Council notes that there is a 'Tampon Tax' (5% VAT charge) on female sanitary products, which currently being classified as a luxury item.

This Council believes that this tax has no place in our modern society.

This Council recognises that the UK Government have no power to reduce the VAT on these products any further, but this Council does note that Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament can work with the European Commission and other Member States to change this.

This Council welcomes the decision by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to campaign for the EU to change the law in this area, and his commitment, until that happens, for all funds raised by the tax to be used to support women's charities.

This Council requests that the Leader of the Council writes to all MEPs in the South West and Gibraltar, Gloucestershire's six MPs, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rt Hon George Osborne MP, welcoming this change and urging them to negotiate with European representatives to reduce the VAT charge to 0% on all female sanitary products. The Council also requests the Leader to write to the

European Commission, calling on them to change their policy and allow zero rating of female sanitary products.

The Council also requests that the Leader of the Council share any responses from Government with members.

In moving the motion, Cllr Williams stated that it was important that a strong message was sent to the European Parliament that the VAT charge on female sanitary products was wholly unacceptable. She said that women's issues were society's issues and it was clear that there were equality issues that still needed to be addressed.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Kirby was pleased that the Chancellor had recognised that this was an issue that needed to be tackled. He felt uncomfortable about donating the funds raised to women's charities. He questioned what would happen when legislative changes were made and VAT funding was no longer available. He expressed concern that significant sums would be given to organisations who provided support to victims of domestic violence. He said that these were vital services that should receive mainstream funding from the Government and not rely on charitable donations.

Some members believed that the Chancellor had taken a positive step by ensuring that the funds raised by VAT on sanitary products were directed towards women's charities. They said that he had made it clear that he wished to get VAT withdrawn at the earliest opportunity.

Other members expressed concern that charitable donations were being used to support vital services for women that should receive mainstream funding.

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

**RESOLVED that**

*This Council believes that this tax has no place in our modern society.*

*This Council recognises that the UK Government have no power to reduce the VAT on these products any further, but this Council does note that Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament can work with the European Commission and other Member States to change this.*

*This Council welcomes the decision by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to campaign for the EU to change the law in this area, and his commitment, until that happens, for all funds raised by the tax to be used to support women's charities.*

*This Council requests that the Leader of the Council writes to all MEPs in the South West and Gibraltar, Gloucestershire's six MPs, and the Chancellor of the*

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

*Exchequer, Rt Hon George Osborne MP, welcoming this change and urging them to negotiate with European representatives to reduce the VAT charge to 0% on all female sanitary products. The Council also requests the Leader to write to the European Commission, calling on them to change their policy and allow zero rating of female sanitary products.*

*The Council also requests that the Leader of the Council share any responses from Government with members.*

### **Motion 762 – Trade Union Bill**

*Proposed by Cllr Steve Lydon*

*Seconded by Cllr Lesley Williams*

That this Council recognises the positive contribution that trade unions and trade union members make in our workplaces across Gloucestershire. This Council values the constructive relationship that we have with our trade unions and we recognise their commitment, and the commitment of all our staff, to the delivery of outstanding quality public services.

This Council notes with concern that the Trade Union Bill, which is currently being proposed by the Government, would affect this Council's relationship with our trade unions and our workforce as a whole. This Council rejects this Bill's attack on local democracy and the attack on our right to manage our own affairs.

This Council is clear that facility time, negotiated and agreed by us and our trade unions to suit our own specific needs, has a valuable role to play in the creation of good quality and responsive local services. Facility time should not be determined or controlled by Government in London.

This Council is happy with the arrangements we currently have in place for deducting trade union membership subscriptions through our payroll. We see this as an important part of our positive industrial relations; it is both cost neutral and easy to administer system whilst providing critical support to our staff. This system is an administrative matter for the Council and should not be interfered with by the UK Government.

This Council further resolves to seek to continue its own locally agreed industrial relations strategy and will take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy with regard to facility time and the management of union subscription fees.

This Council resolves to support the campaign against the unnecessary, anti-democratic and bureaucratic Trade Union Bill and will write to; the Secretary of

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

State for Business, Innovation and Skills, the Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP, and to all of Gloucestershire's MPs to express the Council's motion and to encourage them to vote against this Bill.

Responding to a member's request, the Monitoring Officer set out the position regarding disclosable pecuniary interests. Cllr Tracy Millard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest and left the Council Chamber for the consideration of the item.

In moving the motion, Cllr Lydon stated that the Trade Union Bill was an attack on the basic rights of people to receive support at work, to picket and to take industrial action. Facility time was critical for trade union representatives to support staff in their workplace. This provided significant benefits for the management of organisations as it allowed issues to be resolved before they became more serious and took up a great deal of time. He failed to see why organisations should not be able to continue to collect union subscriptions locally if there was a will to do that.

A member referred to the areas that had been addressed by trade unions over the years. These included sick leave, weekend and evening work, health and safety, equal pay and military leave. He believed that it was vital that taking strike action remained a right for employees as an avenue of last resort.

Some members spoke in support of the motion believing that it was important not to erode employees' rights any further. They expressed concern that electronic voting was still not allowed for union members when there were established procedures in place for this type of voting through the Electoral Reform Society.

Other members spoke against the motion. They referred to the mutual respect and productive relationship between the Council and trade unions. They did not believe that this relationship would be affected by the Trade Union Bill. The Bill did not seek to withdraw facility time but simply required the amount of time provided to be published.

One member recognised the value of trade unions but he said that changes were needed to prevent a minority of people disadvantaging others through their actions.

*On being put to the vote, there was a equality of votes for and against the motion. The Chairman did not exercise his casting vote so the motion fell.*

The Chairman explained that, under an informal protocol agreed between the political groups, the Chairman was discouraged from using his casting vote if it resulted in a change to the status quo.

**Motion 763 – Constitution change**

*Proposed by Cllr Jeremy Hilton*

*Seconded by Cllr Iain Dobie*

This Council expresses deep concern over the Cabinet's decision on 11 November 2015 to approve a £17 million one-off financial contribution to the residual waste project, funded from revenue reserves.

This Council believes that redirections of such significant sums should be approved by all members of this Council.

The Council therefore recommends that the Constitution Committee considers changes to standing orders and reports back to full Council at the earliest opportunity.

In moving the motion, Cllr Hilton expressed concern that £17 million of capital funding had been transferred to the residual waste project by the Cabinet without reference to the Council. He believed that the matter should be considered by the Constitution Committee to ensure that a proper procedure was put in place should a similar situation arise in future.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Dobie stated that the Cabinet needed to recognise that there was no overall control at the Council and should not be transferring significant sums without the approval of Council. He believed that it was a dangerous precedent and action should be taken to safeguard the democratic process.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne moved and Cllr Shaun Parsons seconded that the matter be referred to the Constitution Committee for more detailed discussion.

***RESOLVED*** that motion 763 be referred to the next meeting of the Constitution Committee.

**78. MEMBER QUESTIONS**

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

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what the member would personally do to ensure that sub-leasing would not happen again at Keynes Country Park in order to protect it from property development in the area.

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

Cllr Theodoulou replied that he would discuss with interested members once proposals were put forward.

Question 2 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what the Council’s objectives were regarding Keynes Country Park.

In response Cllr Ray Theodoulou stated that there were a series of objectives which included a balance in development and local community interest as well as maintaining the conservation value of the park. He would share the list with the member.

Question 4 – Cllr Iain Dobie asked what plans were in place from the County Council to take the lead and replace the fleet of diesel-powered vehicles.

Cllr Will Windsor-Clive outlined that there was always a consideration of changes with regards to the fleet but that no specific plans were in place to take a lead on replacing them.

Question 5 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked whether the Leader was looking to gain an invite to Downing Street for their ‘policy shop’.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne explained that he did not seek an invitation.

Question 9 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked whether the Cabinet Member could provide a full list of joint premises with the Police.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou confirmed that he would provide the information.

Question 10 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked how many Gloucestershire County Council staff were involved in work towards the Police and Crime Plan.

In response, Cllr Will Windsor-Clive explained that many of the priorities were shared priorities and that he would look to provide the member with details of staffing.

Question 11 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked how the County Council measured the cost of contributing to the Police and Crime Plan.

Cllr Will Windsor-Clive explained that it was important to understand the outcomes and how contributing to the plan helped the Council with its priorities.

Question 12 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked whether the County Council had evaluated the potential R4C waste disposal plan.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou responded that R4C had not formally submitted a bid.

Question 13 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked whether if a robust proposition was proposed as an alternative to the residual waste project, even at this late stage, would it be considered?

Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that an open and transparent procurement process had been followed. The Council was not in a position to be considering alternative proposals at this late stage.

Question 14 – Cllr Barry Kirby asked for further confirmation that there was acceptance from ministers that the Police and Crime Commissioner having control of the Fire and Rescue Service was not appropriate.

In response, Cllr Will Windsor-Clive stated that whilst other areas might locally agree this move, it was not appropriate for Gloucestershire.

Question 20- Cllr Barry Kirby asked how the County Council and the LEP would be able to help small and medium sized business in Gloucestershire take advantage of the opportunity for a relationship with China?

Cllr Mark Hawthorne explained that this was something that still needed further work and that through the devolution debate there would be discussion around taking forward some of these opportunities. One such consideration would be for a dedicated area to help start up relationships between smaller businesses and China, including the extension of the Growth Hub.

Question 30 – Cllr Steve Lydon asked whether the Council had taken up the opportunity of financial support for the trip to China from UKTI.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied that GFirst had organised the trip and that he would need to check with them. Regarding UKTI he believed that their focus was around more urban areas and that there were real benefits to County Council areas building relationships with areas in China such as Wuhou.

Question 31 – Cllr Steve Lydon asked whether he was right to assume that local industry and other users would not benefit from the heat generated by the Javelin Park incinerator.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that this was an incorrect assumption, that energy from waste was part of the solution and that a feasibility study into heat would be undertaken in the new year.

Question 32 – Cllr Steve Lydon explained that he appreciated the work of highways local managers but asked what the impact would be of the undelivered schemes from the previous year on the current year's projects.

Cllr Vernon Smith explained that a number of projects were waiting on traffic regulations orders, but that the scheme was already on track for the current year to deliver on time.

Question 33 – Cllr Bill Whelan raised a specific incident that had occurred regarding a tree that had fallen down and he queried the best way to alert the member of such an incident.

Cllr Vernon Smith stated that he was happy to discuss the specifics of the incident and be informed of issues via email.

Question 35 – Cllr Chris Coleman asked when information on the specific incident referred to in his question on a tree stump on The Promenade in Cheltenham would be provided. He would like this shared with all Cheltenham members.

Cllr Vernon Smith explained that the information would be provided to the member and that while he appreciated the importance of making sure the stump was safe, prioritisation had been given to road safety. The councillor could use his highways local budget.

Question 36 – Cllr Chris Coleman referred to a meeting he had attended and asked whether further financial support could be given to the Joint Waste Team to improve recycling rates if required.

Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that he had not been approached regarding the need for increased financial support in this area and that the Joint Waste Committee carried out a great deal of work and it had its own budget and business plan. He suggested that it might be useful to have a mechanism for the Joint Waste Committee to report to full Council.

Question 37 – Cllr Chris Coleman asked for further clarification regarding his answer and the budget that had been in place to deal with the disposal of abandoned vehicles.

In response Cllr Ray Theodoulou explained that payments had been made to districts but that the contract had now lapsed. There would be further consultation with districts as to how to move forward and where the responsibility lay.

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

Question 38 – Cllr Lesley Williams asked how often the air quality around Javelin Park would be tested and where that responsibility sat.

Ray Theodoulou explained that his understanding was that the monitoring of air quality rested with Stroud District Council.

**79. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT**

Cllr Brian Oosthuysen, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, presented the annual report. He believed that the report demonstrated the breadth and quality of scrutiny at the Council. He thanked the chairs of the overview and scrutiny committees and officers for the support that they provided to the scrutiny process.

***RESOLVED** to note the Annual Scrutiny Report for 2014-15.*

**80. SCRUTINY UPDATE - NOVEMBER 2015**

***RESOLVED** to note the scrutiny report for the November 2015 cycle of meetings.*

**81. GLOUCESTERSHIRE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION FUND ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15**

Cllr Ray Theodoulou, Chairman of the Pensions Committee, presented the Gloucestershire Local Government Pension Fund Annual Report for 2014-15.

He advised that the Gloucestershire Pension Fund was in the second quartile for performance nationally over the last year and was in the top quartile for performance over the previous three years. Pension administration costs were amongst the lowest in the country. In terms of changes, he said that a Pension Board was now in place with two employer representatives, two scheme representatives and an independent chair. The Government was encouraging pooling arrangements across local government pension funds and discussions were taking place with scheme managers in the South West.

A member referred to the Environment Agency (EA) Pension Fund which had reduced its carbon footprint by 40%. She said that the fund had disinvested in hydrocarbons and was investing in businesses that tackled climate change. The changes still allowed the scheme to meet its fiduciary duty to grow the fund for its members.

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

Another member congratulated the Pension Committee on growing the value of the fund from £1.1 billion to £1.7 billion since 2010. He said that the fund was doing well and he was anxious that any changes made to the management of the fund, including pooling, did not affect performance.

Cllr Theodoulou explained that the pension fund was managed by professional managers who had a duty to deliver the best returns possible. For that reason, the scheme could not be run in the same way as the EA Pension Fund. He assured members that no decisions had been reached on pooling and discussions were ongoing on the best approach.

Answering a further question, Cllr Theodoulou undertook to provide a written answer on whether the pension fund invested in either Amey or Urbaser Balfour Beatty.

***RESOLVED*** to approve the Gloucestershire Local Government Pension Fund Annual Report for 2014-15.

## **82. CABINET DECISION STATEMENT**

***RESOLVED*** to note the Cabinet Decision Statement for the meeting held on 11 November 2015.

## **83. INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION STATEMENT**

***RESOLVED*** to note the Individual Cabinet Member Decision Statements for the period 1 to 31 October 2015.

## **84. HIGHWAYS PERFORMANCE REPORT**

Consideration was given to the report that had been circulated with the agenda.

Answering questions, Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, was confident that Highways Local projects requested by members could be delivered. He offered to speak to members afterwards regarding performance against the bridge load capacity indicator and value for money in replacing lighting in Cirencester.

A member said that it would be helpful if Amey could indicate where funds had been committed but projects had not been delivered. He stated that it was frustrating for members, parish and town councils and residents when they were

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

unable to track progress. There was a need for better communication on progress and target dates for implementation.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

**85. DEVOLUTION**

Cllr Mark Hawthorne, the Leader of the Council, reported that the challenge session with the Rt Hon Greg Clark, the Secretary of State for Communities and Environment, had gone well. The feedback from senior civil servants was very positive. There would be a better understanding of how things would be taken forward following the meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire on 9 December 2016.

The meeting ended at 2.20pm

**CHAIRMAN**