



## MINUTES OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

**DATE: Wednesday 8 September 2021 TIME: 10.00 am**

**VENUE: Oxstalls Indoor Tennis Centre - Oxstalls Indoor Tennis Centre**

### Present

#### Membership:

Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin	Cllr Rebecca Halifax	Cllr Sajid Patel
Cllr Phil Awford	Cllr Tim Harman	Cllr Alan Preest (Chair)
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Mark Hawthorne MBE	Cllr Philip Robinson
Cllr Paul Baker	Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr Steve Robinson
Cllr John Bloxsom	Cllr Alex Hegenbarth	Cllr Vernon Smith
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Lisa Spivey
Cllr Alastair Chambers	Cllr Stephen Hirst (Vice-Chair)	Cllr Lynden Stowe
Cllr Cate Cody	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Cllr Wendy Thomas
Cllr Linda Cohen	Cllr Nick Housden	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr Nick Housden	Cllr Chloe Turner
Cllr David Drew	Cllr Beki Hoyland	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Ben Evans	Cllr Mark Mackenzie-Charrington	Cllr Roger Whyborn
Cllr Stephan Fifield	Cllr Chris McFarling	Cllr Kathy Williams
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Dr Andrew Miller	Cllr Susan Williams
Cllr Andrew Gravells MBE	Cllr Graham Morgan	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr David Gray	Cllr Dominic Morris	Cllr Dr David Willingham
Cllr Terry Hale	Cllr Gill Moseley	
	Cllr David Norman MBE	

Apologies: Cllr Joe Harris and Cllr Emma Nelson  
Honorary Aldermen Bill Crowther, Terry Parker and Gordon Shurmer

### 30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

### 31. MINUTES

Subject to amending the attendance records on the minutes to include Cllr Jeremy Hilton, the minutes for both the Ordinary Meeting and Extraordinary Meeting held on 30 June 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### 32. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Olympics and Paralympics 2021

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

The Chair congratulated the Olympians and Paralympians from Gloucestershire who took part in the Olympics and Paralympics in Tokyo. Special mention was made of Charlotte Dujardin who had been granted the title of Honorary Freewoman of the District by the Forest of Dean District Council following her success at the Olympics.

b) Emergency Services Day

The Council would be flying the Emergency Services Day flag over Shire Hall on 9 September 2021.

c) Municipal Journal and Local Government Chronicle awards

Trevone House, the Council's new-style accommodation for young care leavers, had been shortlisted for two prestigious national awards. The Council was a finalist in the 'Innovation in Children's Services' category at the Municipal Journal Local Government Achievement Awards. It had also been shortlisted in the 'Children's Services' category at the Local Government Chronicle Awards.

d) Fire evacuation procedure and meeting protocols

Simon Harper, Head of Democratic Services, informed members of the arrangements for the meeting.

e) Collection of items for Afghan refugees

Cllr Sue Williams was collecting items for GARAS.

f) Imogen Ainslie

The Chair formally welcomed Imogen as the new Conservative Political Assistant. This was her first Council meeting since starting the role in July.

### **33. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

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

Question 1 – Alick Miskin expressed his view of the need for a 20mph speed limit in areas within Rodborough. He asked with no funding for traffic calming or proper pavements, how could the Council encourage residents to stop using cars?

Cllr Vernon Smith responded by providing assurances that the County Council took road safety seriously and was always looking to improve. 20mph speed limits were just one item in the tool kit to reduce speeds and make roads safer. Environment Scrutiny would be looking at these issues at its meeting tomorrow and he would be happy to talk to Mr Miskin on any specific issues in his area.

### **34. PETITIONS**

Cllr Paul Hodgkinson presented Cllr Vernon Smith, Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, with a petition calling for a weight limit to be installed in Bourton-on-the-Water due to the increasing disruption due to heavy goods vehicles.

Cllr Nick Housden presented Cllr Tim Harman, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities, with a petition calling for the 'old Library' on Elm Road in Stonehouse to be brought back into use by the community.

Cllr David Willingham presented Cllr David Norman, Cabinet Member for Public Protection, Parking and Libraries, with a petition calling for a safe road crossing near Edinburgh Place, Cheltenham into the King George V Playing Field.

### **35. CORPORATE PARENTING**

Cllr Stephen Davies, Cabinet Member for Children's Safeguarding and Early Years, presented the Corporate Parenting report.

The report updated members on the activity of the Corporate Parenting Group. In particular, at its last meeting, the Group relaunched the One Page Profile; considered the Independent Reviewing Officer (IRO) Annual Report 2020/21; and received the Fostering Service Annual Report 202/21.

It was understood that there had been significant growth in the Children in Care population, and therefore caseloads had remained high due to this increase in demand. The 'Language that Cares' campaign had been launched focusing on the language used to communicate with and about care experienced children and young people. Additionally, a fast track assessment had now been introduced to address the decline in foster carer enquiries across the County.

Members were asked to complete One Page Profiles which could be shared with Children in Care. Council would be updated on progress with these at future meetings.

One member queried why there were more children in care now than 7 years ago. In response, Cllr Davies acknowledged that there were a number of causes, including as a result from previous problems with the service. There had also been a post-Covid increase in cases, and it was an issue that was being addressed.

Following a query as to whether members should be DBS checked, it was explained that it was not mandatory and that the role of members was not to engage one on one with young people without the involvement of Children's Services.

One member asked what the response would be to the issues raised in the IRO report, which included too many unplanned voluntary care admissions in an open-ended timescale, and too many changes of social worker experienced by children in care. The Cabinet Member explained that the service was on a journey and that there were still areas to improve. Measures were being introduced to address these issues, including the introduction of the social workers university which provided training, particularly for newly qualified social workers.

A further question was asked as to whether there was an understanding of the population of children in care placed in Gloucestershire from out of County, to which it was explained that the responsibility for these children remained with the originating local authority.

Several members queried whether this report to Council reflected the true position of children's services performance, and whether the report to Council needed to be more transparent. In response, Cllr Davies acknowledged that the service was not where it wanted to be and that it was on a journey of improvement; Children's Services was subject to scrutiny through the Improvement Board and Children's Scrutiny Committee, both of which receive extensive, detailed reports on performance. This report to Council tried to highlight the most pertinent and relevant points affecting Children in Care. Nevertheless the report would be looked at to ensure that it was comprehensive.

## **36. MOTIONS**

### **Motion 880 - Call to scrap the Government's Planning White Paper**

Cllr Paul Hodgkinson proposed and Cllr Paul Baker seconded the motion included on the agenda.

Cllr Hodgkinson stated that the failure to build a sufficient number of houses had long been an issue. It was important to build houses in the right places, particularly to benefit young people and their families. He stated that he had hoped that the proposals would make a positive difference but that they actually made things worse. Councils have approved a significant number of housing applications where none of the houses have been built; developers were land banking instead. The proposals also did not sufficiently reference the climate change emergency.

He further stated that there was already an affordability crisis in this county. What was needed were good quality sustainable buildings. Whilst it looked like there might be a back bench revolt on this issue, this could not be relied upon and it was therefore important for this council to engage with this issue.

Cllr Baker stated that he was a Cheltenham Borough Council planning committee member. The climate change emergency must be central to planning applications. The White Paper was a developer's charter, supporting land banking; the white paper had been widely derided. He questioned whether the government was brave

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

enough to tackle this issue. It would be important to reduce flood risks, add to biodiversity, and be carbon neutral in future developments.

Some members stated that the planning system did need reforming but that this white paper was not the way to do it. It was commented that an environmentalist had not been involved in the development of the white paper.

Cllr David Gray proposed the following amendment, Cllr Mark Hawthorne seconded the amendment: -

*The Council notes:*

- *The significant concerns expressed by communities, **MPs and Councils** including at the recent by-election in Chesham and Amersham, over the **Conservative** over the Government's Planning Reforms.*
- *The concessions already made to Conservative backbench MPs over concerns about the impact of planning deregulation on home counties.*
- *Local resident concerns about their reduced ability to object to building works under Permitted Development Rights which have been extended under this Government.*
- *Widespread concern and condemnation of the Planning White Paper proposals across Local Government, the Planning and Architecture Sector and organisations concerned with protecting green spaces and heritage.*
- ***That districts are the primary planning authorities, and that under current legislation the County Council is only responsible for Minerals and Waste Planning***
- ***That there is a real need to deliver more homes in our county, so that future generations can enjoy the security of owning their own homes***

*The Council is concerned that:*

- *The Government is not using the Planning White Paper to improve environmental outcomes from planning and building standards fast enough. This is at odds with the declaration of a climate emergency by many local authorities, including Gloucestershire County Council.*
- *Government proposals to deregulate planning will water down the rights of residents to influence development where they live.*
- *The Government's proposals will put at risk the character of Gloucestershire's city, towns and villages.*
- ***The Government hasn't addressed the need for a stronger strategic spatial planning approach, especially in two-tier area, to ensure we deliver sustainable communities.***

*The Council believes that:*

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

- Residents have the right to a say over developments that will change the area they live in.
- Local councils, in consultation with their businesses and residents, are best placed to understand the issues in their area and respond with a housing strategy tailored to that area.

The Council calls for the Leader of the Council to write to the Government ~~to scrap its Planning White Paper and instead ask that the White Paper is amended to:~~

- ~~Undertake a wholesale review of Permitted Development Rights.~~
- ~~Introduce rules which enable local areas to achieve much higher environmental standards in planning.~~
- ~~Make the Planning Inspectorate more accountable to local people.~~
- ~~Implement stronger controls to ensure Ministers making decisions on planning applications are not connected either financially or personally with the developers or related parties to the application.~~
- **Include a mechanism to ensure proper Strategic Spatial Planning, with county councils fully involved**
- **Ensure that County Councils are involved in the setting and apportionment of s106/CIL, to ensure sufficient funding for key infrastructure such as schools and roads**
- **Commit to delivering County Deals that address the funding gap in infrastructure deliver, ensuring a “infrastructure lead” development framework as promised in the 2019 Conservative Manifesto**
- **Include a series of environmental standards to which new developments must comply with to ensure that local and national Net Zero Carbon Emission targets are achieved.**

Cllr Gray stated that the amendment eliminated the political pejorative references but retained the substantive elements. The White Paper was part of the process to get to a new planning system; he trusted the parliamentary process. In November 2020 the Leader of the Council had written to all Gloucestershire MPs regarding the council's concerns with regard to the White Paper's proposals.

Cllr Hawthorne, as seconder, reserved his right to speak. The amendment had not been shared with opposition members ahead of the meeting. The meeting therefore adjourned for 15 minutes to enable all members to consider the detail of the amendment.

The meeting resumed at 11:17.

A member raised a point of order, and asked for advice from the Monitoring Officer on the wording of this amendment as the member thought that the wording of the

amendment was contrary to the motion, and sought to change the purpose of the motion.

The Monitoring Officer informed the meeting that the member was correct that an amendment must not be contrary to the motion, and could not completely change the motion. However his view was that the amendment did not entirely reverse the motion. Members had already acknowledged that the planning system needed reform. The principle in standing orders was that council should be able to express its view on a matter, and that he was content that the debate on this matter should proceed.

The meeting was informed that all parties had reached an agreement having amended the wording to amendment and tabled the changes as below: -

*The Council notes:*

- *The significant concerns expressed by communities, **MPs and Councils** including at the recent by-election in Chesham and Amersham, over the Conservative **over the** Government's Planning Reforms.*
- *The concessions already made to Conservative backbench MPs over concerns about the impact of planning deregulation on home counties.*
- *Local resident concerns about their reduced ability to object to building works under Permitted Development Rights which have been extended under this Government.*
- *Widespread concern and condemnation of the Planning White Paper proposals across Local Government, the Planning and Architecture Sector and organisations concerned with protecting green spaces and heritage.*
- ***That districts are the primary planning authorities, and that under current legislation the County Council is only responsible for Minerals and Waste Planning.***
- ***That there is a real need to deliver more homes in our county, so that future generations can enjoy the security of owning their own homes***

*The Council is concerned that:*

- *The Government is not using the Planning White Paper to improve environmental outcomes from planning and building standards fast enough. This is at odds with the declaration of a climate emergency by many local authorities, including Gloucestershire County Council.*
- *Government proposals to deregulate planning will water down the rights of residents to influence development where they live.*
- *The Government's proposals will put at risk the character of Gloucestershire's city, towns and villages.*

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

- **The Government hasn't addressed the need for a stronger strategic spatial planning approach, especially in two-tier area, to ensure we deliver sustainable communities**

The Council believes that:

- Residents have the right to a say over developments that will change the area they live in.
- Local councils, in consultation with their businesses and residents, are best placed to understand the issues in their area and respond with a housing strategy tailored to that area.

The Council calls for the Leader of the Council to write to the Government to ~~scrap its Planning White Paper and instead~~ **ask that the White Paper is amended to:**

- ~~Undertake a wholesale review of Permitted Development Rights.~~
- ~~Introduce rules which enable local areas to achieve much higher environmental standards in planning~~
- ~~Make the Planning Inspectorate more accountable to local people~~
- Implement stronger controls to ensure **individuals** making decisions on planning applications are not connected either financially or personally with the developers or related parties to the application.
- **Include a mechanism to ensure proper Strategic Spatial Planning, with county councils fully involved**
- **Ensure that County Councils are involved in the setting and apportionment of s106/CIL, to ensure sufficient funding for key infrastructure such as schools and roads**
- **Include a series of environmental standards to which new developments must comply with to ensure that local and national Net Zero Carbon Emission targets are achieved and biodiversity standards are protected.**

Having reached agreement this amendment therefore became the substantive motion.

Cllr Hawthorne, seconder, stated that he was glad that all parties could come to an agreement on this matter. Everyone recognised that the planning system was not working across the country, and that there was a real need to deliver the right housing in a sustainable manner.

Cllr Hodgkinson stated that he was glad that the amended motion had reached agreement; it was important that local people had their say in planning applications.

On being put to the vote it was



**RESOLVED** that

The Council notes:

- The concerns expressed by communities, MPs and Councils over the Government's Planning Reforms.
- That districts are the primary planning authorities, and that under current legislation the County Council is only responsible for Minerals and Waste Planning
- That there is a real need to deliver more homes in our county, so that future generations can enjoy the security of owning their own homes.

The Council is concerned that:

- The Government is not using the Planning White Paper to improve environmental outcomes from planning and building standards fast enough. This is at odds with the declaration of a climate emergency by many local authorities, including Gloucestershire County Council.
- The Government hasn't addressed the need for a stronger strategic spatial planning approach, especially in two-tier area, to ensure we deliver sustainable communities

The Council believes that:

- Residents have the right to a say over developments that will change the area they live in.
- Local councils, in consultation with their businesses and residents, are best placed to understand the issues in their area and respond with a housing strategy tailored to that area.

The Council calls for the Leader of the Council to write to the Government ask that the White Paper is amended to:

- Implement stronger controls to ensure individuals making decisions on planning applications are not connected either financially or personally with the developers or related parties to the application.
- Include a mechanism to ensure proper Strategic Spatial Planning, with county councils fully involved
- Ensure that County Councils are involved in the setting and apportionment of s106/CIL, to ensure sufficient funding for key infrastructure such as schools and roads

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

- Include a series of environmental standards to which new developments must comply with to ensure that local and national Net Zero Carbon Emission targets are achieved and biodiversity standards are protected.

### **Motion 881 - Tackling poverty and deprivation in Gloucestershire**

Cllr David Willingham proposed and Cllr Jeremy Hilton seconded the motion included on the agenda.

Cllr Willingham stated that this was an important issue that should be of concern to everyone irrespective of their background. The term of office of the council was 4 years, but a strategy should go up to 2030 in reality, it was important to demand better for the whole county. As the upper tier local authority the council had the resources to lead on this issue, and the council's boundaries were also co-terminus with key organisations. Work needed to be done with communities, not for or to them. It would also be important to identify and tackle deprivation in rural areas. It would be important to be able to monitor progress.

Cllr Hilton stated that it would be important to improve the most deprived areas. He was of the view that a strategy was a better method than the Health and Wellbeing Board to drive this matter forward.

Cllr Tim Harman informed the meeting that he proposed an amendment, seconded by Cllr Philip Robinson: -

*This Council notes that despite Gloucestershire being a relatively affluent county, based upon the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation for England, there are 12 areas in the 10 per cent most deprived areas. These areas account for 19,415 people which is 3.1 per cent of the county's population.*

*This Council further notes that some areas have been in the 10 per cent most deprived areas in the 2010, 2015 and 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation, suggesting that there are structural or long-term issues and that the communities in those areas need more sustained support and investment.*

*This Council is deeply concerned about the causes of poverty and deprivation, the detrimental effects this has on individuals, communities and upon the prospects of future generations.*

~~*This Council notes that working on its own, it is unlikely to be able to tackle these issues, but that other local authorities have set-up multi-agency partnership groups, and produced 'Tackling Poverty' strategy documents.*~~

*Therefore, the Council resolves to:*

- ~~*Create a multi-agency 'Gloucestershire Tackling Deprivation and Poverty Strategy Group' that is tasked with performing needs assessments and producing the 'Gloucestershire Tackling Deprivation and Poverty Strategy*~~

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

~~2022-2030'. This should include stakeholders from the six district authorities, the Police, Health, and other stakeholders as appropriate.~~

- **Take a holistic approach to poverty by looking at the wider causes of inequalities not just material deprivation.**
- **Bring regular progress report on the progress of the Health and Wellbeing Board's 7 strategic priorities to Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee which has the ability to refer on to Cabinet to enact recommendations – and subsequently to full council.**
- **Host a “Build Back Better – Levelling up in Gloucestershire” Conference, inviting all interested partners and community groups from across the county promote and identify how we can maximise the Government's Levelling Up Agenda in delivering real change for communities in Gloucestershire**
- ~~Set a target that it will invest and work with partners and stakeholders with the objective of making continuous progress towards getting and keeping all parts of Gloucestershire out of the 10 per cent most deprived parts of England in subsequent Indices of Multiple Deprivation.~~
- ~~Bring regular progress reports to Corporate Overview and Scrutiny which has the ability to refer on to Cabinet to enact the recommendations – and subsequently to full Council~~

Cllr Harman believed that the amendment strengthened the motion, and that the conference would deliver positive outcomes.

Cllr P Robinson stated that the motion seemed to be about creating a talking shop, and that the relevant organisations were already members of the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board. He also stated that this issue also cut across the work of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee. He informed the meeting that the Conservative group felt strongly about poverty and the importance of levelling up, which was about sharing the affluence. The proposed conference would be about listening to communities.

Two Conservative members shared the work that was being undertaken in their divisions to tackle poverty and deprivation. They stated that tackling poverty and deprivation was a priority for this council.

Other members commented that initiatives have been put in place but nothing changed, and that removing the need for targets was not helpful. That to say that the Conservatives were leading the way on tackling poverty was incorrect. It was stated that without a Liberal Democrat member on the Health and Wellbeing Board, they could not accept this amendment, and questioned whether the proposer and seconder of the motion would be invited to help set the agenda for the conference or would the Conservatives go ahead themselves.

Other members stated that what had been proposed was too narrow, and also agreed that in the past initiatives had been tried and had not worked. This was due

to the work being decided by experts and imposed on the community. It would be important to break this cycle.

Cllr Willingham stated that he was disappointed by what had been removed from the motion, in particular the lack of oversight, and no needs assessment. The Conservatives had been in power for 16 years and nothing has improved. He stated that the disdain for communities was palpable, and that he could not accept the amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

Cllr Willingham stated that the motion had been watered down so much it showed that there was no commitment from the Conservatives to tackle this issue. People would go cold and hungry.

Another member stated that the Conservatives would listen to communities when taking this work forward.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote. It was therefore

**RESOLVED that**

This Council notes that despite Gloucestershire being a relatively affluent county, based upon the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation for England, there are 12 areas in the 10 per cent most deprived areas. These areas account for 19,415 people which is 3.1 per cent of the county's population.

This Council further notes that some areas have been in the 10 per cent most deprived areas in the 2010, 2015 and 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation, suggesting that there are structural or long-term issues and that the communities in those areas need more sustained support and investment.

This Council is deeply concerned about the causes of poverty and deprivation, the detrimental effects this has on individuals, communities and upon the prospects of future generations.

Therefore, the Council resolves to:

- Take a holistic approach to poverty by looking at the wider causes of inequalities not just material deprivation.
- Bring regular progress report on the progress of the Health and Wellbeing Board's 7 strategic priorities to Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee which has the ability to refer on to Cabinet to enact recommendations – and subsequently to full council.
- Host a "Build Back Better – Levelling up in Gloucestershire" Conference, inviting all interested partners and community groups from across the county

promote and identify how we can maximise the Government's Levelling Up Agenda in delivering real change for communities in Gloucestershire

### **Motion 882 – Keeping the lifeline**

Cllr David Drew proposed and Cllr John Bloxsom seconded the motion included on the agenda.

Cllr Drew stated that from 6 October 2021 people would lose out on the £20 Universal Credit Uplift. Over 100 organisations had now joined together to ask the government not to make this cut. This would particularly affect single person households; people would struggle to make ends meet. This uplift was put in place because of Covid-19 and this has not gone away. People would have to make difficult choices. This would make a difference across divisions of the council, and he asked that the council make a clear statement on this matter.

Some members stated that the numbers in a Joseph Rowntree Foundation report relating to Gloucestershire were a concern, and that they could not in all conscience not vote for this motion.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne proposed, and Cllr Dave Norman seconded, an amendment to the motion: -

*This Council is deeply concerned **about** that the **long-term financial effects of the COVID-19 pandemic**. ~~cut of £20 a week to Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit, scheduled for 6 October, will impose the biggest overnight cut to the basic rate of social security since the modern welfare state began. This cut will create serious financial hardship to thousands of people in Gloucestershire, including children and families supported by this authority, some of whom will be driven into poverty as a result including an estimated 6 out of 10 of all single parent families.~~*

*The uplift **to Universal Credit** made in March 2020 recognised both the **immediate need to address challenges caused by the** economic impact of the pandemic and that ~~payments levels were not adequate to protect families when they need it. As calls are made to 'level up' and 'build back better', it would make no sense at all to weaken social security support by cutting £20 per week from Universal Credit and Working Tax Credit this October.~~*

*This Council calls on Government to ~~keep this lifeline and give families the stability they need by protecting them, not cutting them adrift~~ **develop a long-term plan to support those financially affected by the pandemic - particularly through the Plan for Jobs**. The Council resolves to write to all Members of Parliament representing Gloucestershire constituencies to ~~raise these concerns about the impact of this cut on Gloucestershire and to ask that they make representations to the Chancellor and Ministers~~ **ensure that there is support for people as we Build Back Better out of the pandemic**.*

Cllr Hawthorne stated that it was important to recognise that the £20 was part of a wider package of support that had been put in place by the Chancellor at the start

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

of the pandemic - £400m which protected businesses and the most vulnerable in society. As the country moved forward it would be important to look at this in the round and consider what areas should be focussed on. It was important to look at investing in communities, for example through levelling up and the Kickstart initiatives. We could not focus on one aspect of the overall £400m lifeline, but rather needed to recover and invest in the future.

Cllr Norman stated that no government could continue to fund at the same level as March 2020. It was important to help people back into employment. He thanked officers across the county who have continued to work with residents through the pandemic. He also stated that this had been a part of an overall £400m package of help.

Cllr Bloxson stated that this cut represented the biggest single drop in benefit income since 2010; there would be a particular impact on certain occupation groups. He referred to a Child Poverty Action Group report about the impact of austerity on certain professions since 2010.

Another member stated that the debate demonstrated why he had spent his life fighting Conservatism. He said that the Conservatives say they were working hard to address poverty and then announce the withdrawal of £20 per week.

Other members stated that they would not take any lessons from opposition members; that it was the Conservatives that have lifted people out of poverty rather than just writing cheques. It was about helping people out of poverty. It was about sustainability not handouts.

Some members stated that the amendment was vague and bland and took away from the meaning of the motion. Yesterday again saw the hammering of the of the lower paid by the increase in national insurance, and that they did not trust the Conservatives to look after the lower paid.

Others stated that this was always meant to be a lifeline to support people through the pandemic. They were committed to tackling poverty by helping people get a better life.

Cllr Drew stated that he could not accept the amendment; that there was something wrong with a system that allowed motions to be filleted. It was important to listen to constituents about the impact of poverty to really understand what it meant.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried and became the substantive motion.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote. It was therefore

**RESOLVED** that

This Council is concerned about the long-term financial effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The uplift to Universal Credit made in March 2020 recognised the immediate need to address challenges caused by the economic impact of the pandemic.

This Council calls on Government to develop a long-term plan to support those financially affected by the pandemic - particularly through the Plan for Jobs. The Council resolves to write to all Members of Parliament representing Gloucestershire constituencies to ensure that there is support for people as we Build Back Better out of the pandemic.

### **Motion 883 – Partnership between Local Government and National Government for urgent action on climate change**

Cllr Chris McFarling proposed and Cllr John Bloxsom seconded the motion included on the agenda.

Cllr McFarling stated that climate change was the greatest threat to our generation; the United Nations had just announced that we were at a code red for humanity. We did not know when the next extreme weather event would hit us. It was important to remember that we were all in this together. A national local task force would ensure that we were engaged with this work; help to shape the market to best meet the needs of communities.

Cllr Bloxsom stated that the bulk of emissions needed to be reduced within this decade. The current level of emissions could see record temperatures broken and sea level rises by the end of this century. The big issue now was climate delay; COP26 was the best hope for a breakthrough.

Cllr David Gray proposed an amendment to the motion, seconded by Cllr Hawthorne: -

*In 2018, at the Conference of the Parties (COP24), the UK Government signed up to having 'domestic institutional arrangements, public participation and engagement with local communities', so localities can play their part in delivering the UK's 'Nationally Determined Contributions' in the Paris Climate Agreement.*

*In May 2021, Alok Sharma MP, President of COP26, cited collaboration as a key objective of the climate summit.*

*"Governments, business and civil society (including local government) need to work together to transform the ways we power our homes and businesses, grow our food, develop infrastructure and move ourselves and goods around".*

~~*Despite these agreements and statements, there is still no formal relationship allowing a joint partnership working between Local and National Government on climate action.*~~

~~*On 15th May 2019 (<https://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=23573>), this Council welcomed and endorsed on behalf of Gloucestershire the declaration of a climate change emergency by parliament on behalf of the UK, and called for*~~

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

~~“Central Government to provide additional powers and resources to support local and national action towards this 2030 target”. This call remains materially unmet.~~

~~The increased frequency of record breaking flooding and then prolonged heatwaves causing catastrophic forest fires in Europe is evidence that climate change is accelerating at pace. The latest IPCC report, released in August 2021, states that global warming will exceed the hoped for 1.5% (and indeed the far more damaging 2%) during the 21st century, without urgent and deep reductions in carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gas emissions.~~

~~This Council therefore resolves to notes:~~

- ~~• Add our voice in this the year of COP26, to calls by the Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport & others for a joint local & national government Task Force to plan action to reach ‘net zero’ emissions, urgently. Such a partnership can set appropriate regulations, benchmarks and targets and create the much needed long-term funding mechanisms to enable local communities and economies to decarbonise whilst remaining resilient and sustainable.~~
- ~~• Write to Alok Sharma MP, President for COP26, the Prime Minister and the Leadership Board of the LGA informing them of our support for a joint Local/National Government Climate Change Partnership Taskforce, and asking for one to be established as soon as possible.~~
- That the LGA has established a cross-party Climate Change Task Group, jointly chaired by Nick Forbes (Labour Leader of Newcastle) and Izzi Seccombe (Conservative Leader of Warwickshire County Council)**
- That the LGA has secured commitment to be involved at COP26, both in the Green area and Blue Zone.**

**This council therefore resolves to ask the Leader of the Council to write to Alok Sharma MP supporting the LGA’s key asks of COP26 as set out below:**

- Formal representation of local government: We ask for a dedicated chapter for subnational governments in the official agreement reached at COP26, recognising the importance of subnational actors in co-designing and delivering climate action and ensuring local government is politically and financially empowered to meet that ambition.**
- Commitment in NDCs: Commitment to empowering local government should be reflected in the updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).**

Cllr Gray stated that he recognised that the motives behind the motion were well intentioned, however, he believed that the motion as it stood had been overtaken by events. The LGA had already given its support to this agenda, and had also secured a commitment that it would participate in COP26. This council was very



active in reducing waste, and there was good news with regard to the tree planting. The amendment promoted and encouraged partnership working.

Another member stated that this amendment was yet again about leaving the issue to others to sort out. The IPPC report stated that it was too late to hold down temperatures, and too late to hold back sea level rises. We have to act. The fact that the LGA was engaging on this matter did not stop us from coming up with suggestions and doing things ourselves. Farmers could do a lot to support this work; soil was a living organism. The member stated that we should be banging on the door of the Environment Agency. Others agreed and stated that we should take ownership of this issue, that the sands of time were running out, and that the motion was just asking for more political will. The amendment was watering down what was a mild mannered proposal.

However other members were of the view that the LGA was the right body to take this forward.

Cllr Hawthorne stated that opposition members had been talking about the need to do more, but the motion was about supporting COP26, which the Conservative group supported but were also of the view that the LGA was the body to engage with COP26.

Cllr McFarling stated that the ask was to create a task force between national and local government; create a conduit for funding and empowering. He was of the view that the motion had been eviscerated. He did however agree to accept the amendment.

Cllr Gray acknowledged that Cllr McFarling had accepted the amendment. He stated that the amendment was not about prevaricating or delay, but doing practical things as fast as possible.

The amendment having been accepted it then became the substantive motion.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED** that

In 2018, at the Conference of the Parties (COP24), the UK Government signed up to having 'domestic institutional arrangements, public participation and engagement with local communities', so localities can play their part in delivering the UK's 'Nationally Determined Contributions' in the Paris Climate Agreement.

In May 2021, Alok Sharma MP, President of COP26, cited collaboration as a key objective of the climate summit.

"Governments, business and civil society (including local government) need to work together to transform the ways we power our homes and businesses, grow our food, develop infrastructure and move ourselves and goods around".

This Council notes

- That the LGA has established a cross-party Climate Change Task Group, jointly chaired by Nick Forbes (Labour Leader of Newcastle) and Izzi Seccombe (Conservative Leader of Warwickshire County Council)
- That the LGA has secured commitment to be involved at COP26, both in the Green area and Blue Zone.

This council therefore resolves to ask the Leader of the Council to write to Alok Sharma MP supporting the LGA's key asks of COP26 as set out below:

- Formal representation of local government: We ask for a dedicated chapter for subnational governments in the official agreement reached at COP26, recognising the importance of subnational actors in co-designing and delivering climate action and ensuring local government is politically and financially empowered to meet that ambition.
- Commitment in NDCs: Commitment to empowering local government should be reflected in the updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

### **37. MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Forty five member questions had been received. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 6 – Cllr David Willingham asked whether in relation to the house fire on Arle Road there would be a review which would then be published?

Cllr Dave Norman replied that this was not the role of Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service. He advised the member to speak to cabinet colleagues.

Question 10 – Cllr Chris McFarling stated that it would take time for the trees to grow and so far no form of carbon capture had been cost effectively trialled, he asked what other forms of carbon sequestration were feasible in Gloucestershire to hit net zero?

Cllr David Gray replied that he would speak to the member outside the meeting on this complicated issue.

Question 11 – Cllr Chloe Turner asked what the data was there that related to customer satisfaction in Gloucestershire in addition to the national surveys referenced in the answer to the question.

Cllr David Gray would speak to the member after the meeting but outlined that this was the best data available.

Question 13 – Cllr Chloe Turner asked what the target was for Definitive Map Modification orders and whether it had been met in the last reporting period.

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

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that there was a meeting on 8 October with public rights of way officers to go through this in more detail. He put on record his thanks to the Commons and Rights of Way Team.

Question 16 – Cllr Cate Cody asked how much of the £321,757 grant was spent to make cycling easier in the Tewkesbury area?

Cllr David Gray replied he did not have the information immediately available and would come back to the member.

Question 19 – Cllr Cate Cody asked if the council could formally encourage members and staff to invest in non plastic reusable drinks bottle.

Question 20 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked if the Leader was aware of the media stories around a circuit breaker lockdown at the end of October and was he aware of any plans going forward?

Cllr Mark Hawthorne stated that there was no evidence of a lockdown at this time, there was continued focus of vaccine rollout and there would be further campaigns focusing on those that had not been vaccinated. He spoke about the focus on hospital numbers in decision making.

Question 21 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what had been delivered particularly for residents of Siddington and South Cerney.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that there were £58m worth of flood alleviation schemes and he would happily show the member the work being carried out on gully emptying and flood alleviation.

Question 22 – Cllr Roger Whyborn asked whether the S106 funding was driving the timescales and whether the focus was on the Hatherley Lane. He asked for some information to be fed back to himself and Borough members.

Cllr Dave Norman explained he would discuss with officers and ensure they were in contact with the member.

Question 23 – Cllr Roger Whyborn asked if members could be assured that the Streetworks team approach the work with higher care than the County Council carried out with its own highways repairs.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that he disagreed with criticism of the highways repairs and clarified that the street work team worked to a national standard.

Question 25 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked what the source of funding was for the cycling and footpath infrastructure schemes.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that there were various funding schemes and he would provide a written response.

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

Question 26 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked when the four outstanding school streets would be initiated?

Cllr David Gray replied that he would provide a written response

Question 27 – Cllr Ben Evans stated that he welcomed the outcome of the budget amendment for early years and asked why members hadn't received communication on this good news.

Cllr Stephen Davies replied that this was additional information on the work that had taken place that he thought would interest the member.

Question 29 – Cllr Colin Hay asked what steps were being taken to get the funding for the socially distanced due to Covid Council meetings from government.

Cllr Lynden Stowe replied that there was a cost to democracy and that he was satisfied in the way government had approached funding Covid issues.

Question 32 – Cllr David Willingham asked for assurances that the DMMO applications issue was highlighted as a risk in the council's risk register and resources targeted at this backlog.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that he noted what the member said.

Question 34 – Cllr Paul Baker stated that his local highways money should be spent on other things than pavement repairs. He asked what central funding was available to support work of this nature.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that the councillor should speak to his local highways manager who could advise him on the rolling programme.

Question 36 – Cllr Paul Baker asked for more information on the pavement repairs in his area.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that the County Council had to focus on safety first. In ideal circumstances the Council would replace like for like in material but there could only be a generic supply for emergencies.

Question 37 – Cllr David Willingham asked if the leader could raise the issue on unlicensed e-scooters with the police and crime commissioner.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne replied he would do so but urged people to report issues direct.

Question 38 – Cllr Chris McFarling asked how the Residual Waste Incentive Scheme was shared across the county and how much was the budget?

Cllr David Gray replied that he would come back with the exact figures.

Question 42 – Cllr Becki Hoyland asked for confirmation of the percentage of LED streetlights that could be switched off?

Cllr David Gray replied that if that percentage was available he would provide it to the member.

Question 43 and 44– Cllr John Bloxsom asked why it wasn't checked that Wingmoor Farm had the necessary Planning permission for waste transfer during the due diligence process. He also asked whether work was being carried out on contingencies.

Cllr David Gray replied that he had not been there at the time of the due diligence process and that contingencies were being looked at..

Question 45 – Cllr Paul Hodgkinson asked when and how the issues with lighting of underpasses at Elmbridge Road were raised with Highways England.

Cllr Vernon Smith replied that this was most likely raised by letter and he would raise them again.

### **37.1 Scrutiny reports**

Cllr Phil Awford, Chair of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, presented the report which provided a summary of recent scrutiny activities.

It was understood that work plans were being developed by each scrutiny committee to address issues of relevance to residents of Gloucestershire; the new Fire and Rescue Scrutiny Committee had made a strong start looking at the challenges facing Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service; Cllr Andrew Gravells was welcomed back as Chair of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee which was looking at a range of issues including temporary service changes; and the Restoring our Rivers Task Group had been established.

One member expressed the view that the scrutiny report should be more comprehensive rather than listing the items on scrutiny committee agendas alongside links to the agenda papers.

Cllr Hilton, as Chair of the Fire and Rescue Service Committee, informed members of the success of the Committee's first meeting, and Cllr Gravells, as Chair of HOSC, reminded members that those sat on scrutiny committees could feed back to other members in their political group.

Members were reminded of the upcoming Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service Members Awareness Session taking place at Gloucester South Fire Station and SkillZone on 19 November 2021.

## **38. CABINET**

### **38.1 Cabinet Decision Statements**

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

One member asked whether the Cabinet Member for Finance and Change could make arrangements for members to see a log of applications and approvals for the Community Grants Scheme. The Cabinet Member replied that they would look into whether a system like this could be arranged.

One member asked for clarification as to what was being done to address the overspend as detailed in the Financial Monitoring Report received by Cabinet on 21 July 2021, as well as on the wording used to describe the decrease in funds in the capital programme.

Another member question was raised as to how the amount of carbon used to move food to specific sites was assessed in food waste contracts. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning replied that they would liaise with officers regarding the specifics.

In response to a further question on the procurement of low or zero carbon replacement fire engines, the Cabinet Member for Public Protection, Parking and Libraries explained that there was currently no electric fire appliance or emergency vehicle on the market.

Cllr Mark Hawthorne sought clarification as to the purpose of this item on the Council agenda and whether the Cabinet Decision Statements were for noting or discussion. The Monitoring Officer clarified that this item was for noting and not for questioning.

Several members queried the point of having this item on the Council agenda if members were not given the opportunity to ask questions. Cllr Hawthorne suggested that the issue be considered by the Constitution Committee.

Cllr Stephen Davies, Cabinet Member for Children's Safeguarding and Early Years, presented the recommendation from the Cabinet meeting on 21 July 2021 that Council approve Gloucestershire's Youth Justice Plan 2021/2022.

On being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** that the Youth Justice Plan 2021/22 be approved.

### **38.2 Individual Cabinet Member Decision Statements**

**RESOLVED** to note the Individual Cabinet Member Decision Statements for the period 1 June 2021 to 31 August 2021.

## **CHAIRPERSON**

Meeting concluded at 3.20 pm

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