



CHELTENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Council

Monday, 19 June 2017

2.30 pm

Council Chamber - Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Klara Sudbury (Chairman), Bernard Fisher (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Colin Hay, Rowena Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Karl Holey, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Chris Nelson, Tony Oliver, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Chris Ryder, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Roger Whyborn, Max Wilkinson, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

A Moment of Reflection

(to be led by the Mayor's Chaplain-Rev. Dr Adam Dunning)

This will be of an inclusive nature. All Members are welcome to participate but need not do so.

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES Councillors Clucas, Harman and Holliday	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING Minutes of the meetings held on 24 April 2017 and 15 May 2017.	(Pages 3 - 10)
4.	COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR	
5.	COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL	
6.	TO RECEIVE PETITIONS	
7.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 13 June.	
8.	MEMBER QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Tuesday 13 June.	

9.	WEST CHELTENHAM (JCS) PETITION Report of the Leader	(Pages 11 - 26)
10.	REVENUES AND BENEFITS MANAGEMENT RESTRUCTURE Report of the Cabinet Member Corporate Services	(Pages 27 - 30)
11.	NOTICES OF MOTION	
12.	ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION	
13.	<p>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 -EXEMPT INFORMATION The Council is recommended to approve the following resolution:-</p> <p>“That in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:</p> <p>Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p>	
14.	EXEMPT MINUTES Exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2017	(Pages 31 - 48)

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937

Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Pat Pratley
Head of Paid Service

Council

Monday, 24th April, 2017

6.00 - 10.00 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Chris Ryder (Chairman), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Bernard Fisher, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Colin Hay, Rowena Hay, Karl Hobley, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Chris Nelson, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Roger Whyborn, Max Wilkinson and David Willingham

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillors Clucas, Oliver, Williams, Bickerton and Parsons and Councillors Mason and Savage would be late.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Stennett declared a prejudicial, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 11 (Treasury Management Matter) as a Director of Gloucestershire Airport Limited's Board.

Councillor Colin Hay declared a non-prejudicial, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 11 (Treasury Management Matter) as a member of the Gloucestershire Pension Committee.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

It was noted that the minutes had been amended to include reference to the comment made regarding the need amend some of the language and terminology used within the document. This was shown at the third bullet point:

- Members welcomed the opportunity for the public to be consulted but urged that the language be adjusted prior to consultation.

Having raised Autism Awareness Week, Councillor Willingham believed that Councillor Clucas had agreed to add the 2018 date to the Corporate Strategy. The Mayor believed that it had been decided that there were lots of events that would be close to individual members hearts and that it had been stated that it would not be possible to include them all. In the absence of Councillor Clucas, it was agreed that the minutes would be agreed subject to a discussion with Councillor Clucas.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 27 March 2017 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor informed Members that in her year of Office, as Mayor she had become President of Cheltenham in Bloom (CIB), and as Members would be aware she was already Chair of CIB. It was with great pleasure that she had been able to invite five gentlemen who had formerly worked at Cheltenham Borough Council, three latterly for UBICO, into the Mayor's Parlour for a cup of tea and cake. They were now retiring from their Green Space Development roles and collectively they had given the council just under 200 years' service. Mr Eric Jones, the council's mower man in and around the towns Parks & Gardens had served 50 years, so it was fitting that the CIB committee who had worked closely over many years with these officers, were able to present them with a leaving thank you gift with a letter from the Mayor. Their expertise would be missed.

Prescot Bike Festival had been a great occasion attended by the Mayor along with Deputy Mayor and families. Councillor Colin Hay had played host to them for much of their visit as they were celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the 'Free Wheeler's Blood Bike Group', Councillor Hay is a member of this team who all achieve great voluntary work across the County and surrounding areas, helping to save lives.

The Mayor thanked all those who had supported her events this past year, while fund raising for her two charities, CCP - County Community Projects along with St. Vincent's & St. George's Association, and the total amount raised would be announced on 15th May at Mayor making.

The Mayor informed Council that she would be attending Dancing Ken Hanks Funeral Service on behalf of the Town on 26th April. Her consort Mr Ryder and Deputy Mayor would also be in attendance.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader altered members to the fact that Community Pride Fund would be launched later in the week.

6. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been received.

8. MEMBER QUESTIONS

The 17 member questions which had been received all related to the exempt item (Treasury Management Matter) and were therefore taken after Agenda Item 10, in exempt session.

9. ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION

There were no urgent matters requiring a decision.

10. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 -EXEMPT INFORMATION

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:

Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

Paragraph 5; Paragraph 5; Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

11. TREASURY MANAGEMENT MATTER

Member questions were taken immediately before this item.

The rules of debate were suspended to facilitate presentations from two consultants, before the Leader introduced the report, as circulated with the agenda.

The matter was debated, with members explaining why they would or would not be supporting the recommendations.

Upon a vote it was

RESOLVED that the recommendations, as set out in the report, be approved.

Chris Ryder
Chairman

Council

Monday, 15th May, 2017

5.00 - 5.20 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Chris Ryder (Chairman), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Bernard Fisher, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Colin Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Rowena Hay, Karl Hobley, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Chris Nelson, Tony Oliver, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Roger Whyborn, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Wilkinson and Thornton had given their apologies.

Presentation of the Wellbeing Charter Award

The Mayor provided a brief background to the Wellbeing Charter before presenting the award to Barbara Cole and Tracy Brown.

She explained that the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning group funded 40 organisations in Gloucestershire to gain the Workplace wellbeing charter and Cheltenham borough council are one of the first organisations to achieve this.

The Workplace Wellbeing Charter is an opportunity for employers to demonstrate their commitment to the health and well-being of their workforce, whilst providing employers with an easy and clear guide on how to make workplaces a supportive and productive environment in which employees can flourish. These standards reflect best practice and are endorsed nationally by Public Health England. The Charter takes a holistic approach that includes leadership, culture and communication, as well as health & wellbeing topics such as physical activity, alcohol and mental health. The framework promotes rounded discussions between employer and employees about health, safety and wellbeing.

Many strengths and areas of good practice arose during the course of this accreditation. It was clear that CBC has fully integrated policies and procedures and that these had been cascaded to all employees; evidence showed that employees are engaged at the start of employment about the ethos of the organisation and the support that is available. All those interviewed expressed how much they appreciate their job and role. They all spoke highly of their line management and how well supported they are; but more importantly, how

appreciated they felt. This indicates that Cheltenham Borough Council values their employees and understands that the employees are the biggest asset of the organisation.

2. ELECTION OF THE MAYOR (CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL) FOR 2017-2018

The outgoing Mayor, Chris Ryder, called on Councillor Flynn to move the motion proposing Councillor Klara Sudbury as Mayor.

Councillor Klara Sudbury was proposed for the office of Mayor by Councillor Flynn and seconded by Councillor Walklett.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that Councillor Klara Sudbury be, and is hereby, elected Mayor of the Borough of Cheltenham and Council chairman for the ensuing year.

The Head of Paid Service invited the Mayor to sign a Declaration of Acceptance of Office of Council chairman for the ensuing municipal year 2017-18.

Councillor Klara Sudbury took the chair.

3. ELECTION OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR 2017-18

Councillor Coleman proposed Councillor Bernard Fisher for the office of Deputy Mayor, seconded by Councillor Clucas.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that Councillor Bernard Fisher be, and is hereby, elected Deputy Mayor of the Borough of Cheltenham and Council vice-chairman for the ensuing year.

The Head of Paid Service invited the Deputy Mayor to sign a Declaration of Acceptance of Office of Council vice-chairman for the ensuing municipal year 2017-18.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Hegenbarth and congratulated him on his election.

6. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader congratulated the Mayor on her election and wished her well for the ensuing year and took the opportunity to thank Councillor Ryder for her year as Chair of Council and representing the borough at both charity and civic events.

He welcomed Councillor Hegenbarth and announced that he would replace Councillor Sudbury on Planning Committee and fill the vacancy on Overview and Scrutiny Committee following the departure of Dan Much.

The Mayor invited Councillor Harman, as Leader of the Conservative group to announce any committee changes.

Councillor Harman announced that he would replace Councillor Nelson on the Cheltenham Development Task Force and that Councillor Babbage would replace Councillor Nelson as Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Working Group.

7. COUNCIL DIARY 2017-18

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services introduced the Council Diary for September 2017 to August 2018. He acknowledged that there had been some discussion regarding the timings of day time meetings and reiterated that if smaller individual groups wished to change the time of their meetings, they were welcome to do so.

In the very unlikely event that a second budget meeting was required (February 2018) it would be fixed for a date and time when as many members as possible could attend.

Members were reminded that the diary would no longer be printed but was instead available in summary form, as a Filofax insert, as well as being available to download electronically from the website and that this facility allowed the user to download selected committees.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the draft Council Diary of meetings for September 2017 to August 2018 be approved.

8. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

9. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were none.

10. ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION

There were no urgent items requiring a decision.

Chairman

Cheltenham Borough Council

Council – 19 June 2017

A petition regarding West Cheltenham

REPORT OF THE LEADER

Accountable member	Councillor Jordan – Leader
Accountable officer	Tracey Crews – Director of Planning
Ward(s) affected	ALL
Key/Significant Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>The following petition, numbering 860 signatories, was received by Council on 27 March 2017.</p> <p>“We ask that you research the impact of the proposed development on the ‘Human Sensory Receptors’ within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden at the soonest possible opportunity to inform the JCS of such impact before the Planning Inspector’s hearings.”</p> <p>This report has been prepared in response to the receipt of the petition which has triggered a Council debate because it includes more than 750 signatories.</p> <p>Subsequent to the receipt of the petition on 27 March 2017, the West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group have made representations (including the presentation of a petition numbering 1044 signatories on behalf of the residents and families of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden) headed “West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation Change of Greenbelt Status”, to the Joint Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications consultation and this includes a request to the Joint Core Strategy Inspector to consider the impact of the proposed development on the “Human Sensory Receptors” within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden.</p>
Recommendation:	<p>To instruct officers to reference the petition (that has been submitted by West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group to the Joint Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications consultation) and strength of feeling behind it in their opening statement to the inspector at the commencement of the next set of Joint Core Strategy hearings.</p>

Financial implications	None arising specifically from this report. Contact officer: Myn Cotterill Myn.Cotterill@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 774958
Legal implications	<p>The petition presented to the Council on 27 March 2017 must be considered in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme made pursuant to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. The petition will be considered in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules varied in so far as necessary to comply with the attached Process.</p> <p>The land at West Cheltenham within Cheltenham Borough Council's boundaries is not designated for any development within the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review (2006), but forms part of a proposed urban extension including a 45 hectare Cyber Business Park and 1,100 houses at West Cheltenham. This allocation is included in the proposed Main Modifications to Joint Core Strategy which were agreed by the Council on 10 February 2017 and have been subject to public consultation between 27th February and Monday 10th April 2017.</p> <p>Contact officer: Cheryl Lester (OneLegal), cheryl.lester@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272013</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	No direct HR Implications arising from the report Contact officer: GO SS HR Manager, julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gcsx.gov.uk, 01242 264 355
Key risks	<p>Delay to the progress of the Joint Core Strategy examination and adoption of the plan means that the council will not have an up to date local plan for the area. The absence of the Joint Core Strategy could result in an uncoordinated approach to development, leading to inappropriate and incremental development being allowed on appeal that does not take account of cross boundary implications and requirements for supporting infrastructure, with the potential for adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>There are applications already submitted relating to strategic sites identified through the JCS and other major applications pending that are being hindered by delays in progressing the plan. It is therefore critical that the examination is advanced as quickly as possible, whilst considering the representations made at each stage of the process.</p> <p>The package of sites and policies identified through the JCS main modifications meets the objectively assessed housing and employment needs for Cheltenham Borough to 2031 (as set out in the Inspector's Interim Findings). The emerging strategic allocation at West Cheltenham forms a vital part of meeting these needs.</p>
Corporate and community plan Implications	The JCS supports and is referenced by the Corporate Strategy and wider community planning. The plan making process is open to all parties through the formal consultation processes and the forthcoming hearings.

<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>The JCS is being assessed through a sustainability appraisal process and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) which has considered the environmental, social and economic outputs of the Plan and ensures that development meets the needs of both present and future generations. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the JCS encompasses Strategic Environmental Assessment as required by EU Directive (2001/42/EC). In addition HRA has been undertaken as required under the European Directive 92/43/EEC on the "conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora for plans" that may have an impact on European (Natura 2000) Sites. The JCS Sustainability Appraisal as amended is available at www.gct-jcs.org</p>
<p>Property/Asset Implications</p>	<p>None arising specifically from this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Head of Property</p> <p>David.Roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264151</p>

1. Background - Content of petition received

- 1.1 The following petition, numbering 860 signatories, was received by Council on 27 March 2017.
- 1.2 “We ask that you research the impact of the proposed development on the ‘Human Sensory Receptors’ within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden at the soonest possible opportunity to inform the JCS of such impact before the Planning Inspector’s hearings.”
- 1.3 This report has been prepared in response to the receipt of the petition which has triggered a Council debate because it includes more than 750 signatories. Information is provided at Appendix 2 of this report which explains the process for dealing with petitions at Council that are to be subject to a Cheltenham Council debate.

2. Consideration of the proposal in the context of the emerging Joint Core Strategy

- 2.1 The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) has now reached 'Main Modifications' stage. These are changes to the 'Pre-Submission' (June 2014) version of the JCS that have been discussed at the hearings with the Inspector and reflect her interim findings. They have been considered and agreed by each of the three JCS Councils.
- 2.2 A fundamental part of the planning process, running alongside the development of the JCS, is the assessment of the likely effects on the environment, humans, animals and habitats of the proposals. Plans which do not adequately assess these impacts are unsound and would not be capable of adoption.
- 2.3 The JCS is being assessed through a sustainability appraisal process and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) which has considered the environmental, social and economic outputs of the Plan and ensures that development meets the needs of both present and future generations. The

Sustainability Appraisal supporting the JCS encompasses Strategic Environmental Assessment as required by EU Directive (2001/42/EC). In addition HRA has been undertaken as required under the European Directive 92/43/EEC on the "conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora for plans" that may have an impact on European (Natura 2000) Sites.

- 2.4** The JCS sustainability appraisal has been the subject of examination hearings and continues to be updated, assessing changes in the plan. The framework uses a number of objectives and decision-aiding questions that include consideration of likely effects on health (No 14) and (air, light & noise) pollution (No 9) and inequalities/well-being (No 12). Each element of the emerging JCS, including potential strategic site allocations, was tested against this framework and the findings reported in the SA Reports. The latest Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Report was issued on the 6th of October 2016 and can be found here Page C41 details the assessment specifically for West Cheltenham: <http://www.gct-jcs.org/Documents/New-Evidence-Base-and-Associated-Documents/161006-SA-Addendum-Report-Final.pdf>
- 2.5** Through the Sustainability Appraisal, mitigation measures were identified for any potential significant negative effects found to ensure that there were no residual negative effects. This included site-specific requirements and development management polices to control and protect the health of people in and around the area.
- 2.6** On submission of an application for development of the strategic allocation at West Cheltenham an Environment Impact Assessment will also be required which will assess the impact of the specifics of the development proposal on human receptors.
- 2.7** This along with JCS policy SD15 'Health and Environmental Quality' will allow decision takers to ensure that effects on health and wellbeing are fully appraised when considering any application and conditions if required to mitigate any harm can be attached to any approval.
- 2.8** The JCS authorities have recently updated the West Cheltenham statement of common ground (SoCG). This sets out common ground between the Councils' environmental health team and Severn Trent on what needs to be done to control odour from the waste water treatment works in light of the development. The Council's team have also peer reviewed and found sound more detailed technical odour work which is also included. This can be found as JCS examination document EXAM 264
- 2.9** Throughout the Main Modifications process of the JCS the inclusion of the West Cheltenham emerging strategic allocation was discussed at length both through the examination, in hearing sessions and in JCS examination documents: The matter was then brought to Councils in late 2016.
- 2.10** At meetings of Council on the 18th of October 2016, the 10th of February 2017 and the 27th of March 2017 questions on the impacts of the West Cheltenham allocation were heard and answered.
- 2.11** Decisions to approve the proposed main modifications to the June 2014 JCS as those the Council endorses and considers necessary to make the JCS sound were made at Council on the 18th of October 2016 and again on the 10th of February 2017. These modifications included the greenbelt changes and allocation of developable and safeguarded land at West Cheltenham.
- 2.12** Along with the questions, answers and minutes of those meetings, key JCS examination evidence regarding the inclusion of West Cheltenham and the detailed appraisal of effects on health and wellbeing can be found at: <http://www.gct-jcs.org/PublicConsultation/Gloucester,-Cheltenham-and-Tewkesbury-Joint-Core-Strategy-Examination-Document-Library.aspx>
These are:
- The Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.(SA) linked to above

- JCS Green Belt papers EXAM 142 and EXAM 196 – describing the process by which the Greenbelt was assessed and the consideration of alternatives.
- EXAM 198 the earlier statement of common ground between the JCS authorities and the West Cheltenham Consortium (now updated by EXAM 264)
- EXAM 232 the Inspector’s interim findings – recommending the site for allocation and giving her reasons
- EXAM 259 Inspector’s “Note of Recommendations...” - explaining her finding that “exceptional circumstances exist for the release of this land from the Green Belt”

2.13 In accordance with the council resolution of the 10th of February 2017 and those of the other JCS authorities, the Proposed Main Modifications were published for consultation between 27th February and 10th April 2017.

2.14 During the consultation the JCS authorities received approximately 1200 individual comments from 258 individual respondents, including the West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group. The authorities also received 490 postcards regarding Leckhampton. A representation (made subsequent to the presentation of the petition to the Council on 27 March 2017) from the West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group (including the presentation of a petition numbering 1044 signatories on behalf of the residents and families of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden) headed “West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation Change of Greenbelt Status”, includes a request to the Joint Core Strategy Inspector to consider the impact of the proposed development on the “Human Sensory Receptors” within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden. All comments and responses to the JCS mentioned above including that petition have been sent in full to the inspector for her consideration.

3 Reasons for recommendations

3.1 The recommendation identifies an appropriate course of action as required by the Petition Scheme. Through the JCS examination the JCS Inspector has agreed that she will hear evidence on the proposed main modifications. .

Report author	Contact officer: Development Manager – Strategy, philip.stephenson@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264 379
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment 2. Process for dealing with petitions at Council 3. Copy of Petition and covering letter as presented to Council on 27 March 2017 4. Copy of Petition and covering letter of 10 April 2017 submitted by the West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group to the Joint Core Strategy Proposed Modifications consultation

Appendix 1 Risk Assessment

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
CR33	If the council does not keep the momentum going with regards to the JCS and move towards adoption this could result in Inappropriate development. It could also lead to other negative consequences such as the intervention in the plan making process by government or the loss of New Homes Bonus.	Tim Atkins	May 2012	4	4	16	Reduce	Ongoing actions managed by JCS team	Ongoing	Tracey Crews	Corporate Risk
<p>Note : The JCS programme holds a detailed risk assessment which is managed through Operational Programme Board and Strategic Issues Board</p> <p>Explanatory notes</p> <p>Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p>Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p>Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

Appendix 2 Process for dealing with petitions at Council

The following is the recommended process to be followed for the debate of a petition at the Council meeting in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme. The Council Procedure Rules shall be suspended in so far as necessary to facilitate this process.

1. The Mayor will remind members of the procedure to be followed

2. Statement by the petition organiser

The Mayor will invite the petitioner organiser or their representative to come to the microphone and speak for up to 5 minutes on the petition.

There will be no questions and the petition organiser/their representative will take no further part in the proceedings.

3. Clarification on the background information in the officer's report

Members will be invited to ask any questions for clarification as to the facts in the officer's report.

4. Statement by the relevant Cabinet Member

The Cabinet Member whose portfolio is most relevant to the petition will be invited by the Mayor to speak for a maximum of 5 minutes on the subject of the petition. They may wish to refer to the background report from officers circulated with the papers for the meeting.

They may also wish to propose a motion at this point; if so, the motion must be seconded.

5. Debate by members

Where a member has proposed a motion (which is seconded), the usual Rules of Debate (Rule 13) will apply.

If there is no motion, the Mayor will invite any member who wishes to speak on the petition to address Council for up to a maximum of 3 minutes.

When the 15 minutes set aside for the debate (as laid down in the Council's Petition Scheme) is up, the Mayor may decide to extend the time allowed for the debate but will bring it to a close when they feel sufficient time has been allowed.

6. Conclusion of Debate

The debate should conclude with one or more decisions taken pursuant to the Petition Scheme as follows:

- taking the action requested in the petition (provided the matter is reserved to full council for decision)
- referring the matter to Cabinet or an Appropriate Cabinet Member or Committee (including Overview and Scrutiny) for further consideration
- holding an inquiry into the matter
- undertaking research into the matter
- holding a public meeting
- holding a consultation
- holding a meeting with petitioners
- calling a referendum
- writing to the petition organiser setting out our views about the request in the petition
- taking no further action on the matter

Carol Kingsbury

26th March 2017

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email springbankgreenbelt@gmail.com

Joint Core Strategy Team
Municipal Offices
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 9SA

Dear Team

I present to you a petition numbering 860 signatories which is on behalf of the residents and families of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park & Hayden. The proposal within the JCS to remove the land at West Cheltenham from the greenbelt, and the subsequent proposal to allocate 45 hectares as employment land directly next to housing in Fiddlers Green and Springbank, together with an allocated site for now 1100 homes, and a further option for housing on the land at Hayden, plus associated infrastructure has aroused strong opposition from the people of the town.

For more than 50 years this beautiful countryside and its views across the Severn Valley to the Malverns, and on a good day the Black Mountains, has been highly valued and utilised by the entire community. Walking paths through this countryside are used by many for recreation, and also to reach our only local amenity "The House in the Tree". How can we convey to you the importance of this countryside to us? Well just imagine that the proposal was to turn Pittville Park into an industrial estate, that is how strongly the residents feel about this proposal.

Of course, the residents are not the only inhabitants of the area that would feel as strongly as the humans do about this proposal. The animals, birds, flora, fauna and trees, would no doubt be even be vocal if they knew of the plan to literally destroy their homes and habitats, yet they know nothing of this. It is our duty to protect this environment as the data from the Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records shows many species that are under threat live in this area.

The 2011 AMEC report which is a study into the viability of the greenbelt in the West Cheltenham area, commissioned by the JCS, clearly states segments to the south NE1, NE2 and NE4 make a significant contribution to the land separating Cheltenham and Gloucester, preventing the sprawl of Cheltenham and the merging of Cheltenham and Gloucester, and further provide a countryside setting for Cheltenham.

The definition of Greenbelt per the Planning Practice Guidance states

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

We struggle to see how the area does not fulfil any of the criteria 100%.

This is a Cotswold garden town, adored and envied by many, we must maintain the character of this town as that is its value, to blight the landscape with inappropriate industrial development will not achieve the growth that is sought. Whilst people may come here to work, what would make them want to live here if all that is there is are acres of soulless estates surrounded by more concrete and tarmac? We are in principle not against the requirement for all these things, this town needs to progress, we all agree, and this a complex balancing act, but this plan for West Cheltenham will not enhance but destroy the existing communities.

Traffic is already a major problem for us all. Anyone who has to drive to this town to work on a daily basis, because they cannot afford to live here, experience the gridlock of the Golden Valley and the A40. The people who live on the estates at Fiddlers Green are unable to take the most direct route to work so they have to join the rat runners through Springbank. The roads are already congested by GCHQ employee cars lining these roads with the fear that Springbank itself will become one big car park. From all the residents' point of view this is not acceptable, because we need to know at this stage (i.e. the Examination stage) where all this vital infrastructure is to go, and in our opinion, the Inspector should have this information so that she can be certain that the plan is sound.

Surely these development proposals would be more soundly placed next to Junction 10 of the M5, with this Junction made all way, this would then create your perfect corridor of employment within close proximity of the 4,500 home Elms Park development, we are aware that Highways England do not wish to overload the M5 with local traffic, and yet are investing heavily in widening the M25 to accommodate for this very fact. It is the biggest bypass in England. Alternatively Staverton Airport is ideally situated providing transport access and within close proximity of GCHQ. You could easily link J11 via the Bamfurlong Highways Depot site to Staverton and provide direct and easy access for HGV's. We also understand that the land owner of Morris Hill and Hunting Butts is very keen to accommodate the housing requirement.

We ask of you to research the impact of the proposed development on the "Human Sensory Receptors" within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and

Hayden at the soonest possible opportunity to inform the JCS of such impact prior to the Planning Inspector's hearings.

- Air pollution – increased Nitrogen dioxide levels
- Light trespass – 3 storey glass office blocks directly next to housing
- Hearing – from peaceful countryside to industrial
- Equilibrium
- Smell – an independent odour report relating to Severn Trent Sewage farm

We believe that to have gained this level of support for our objection over such a short space of time provides ample evidence that the local community remain strongly opposed to this change in the green belt boundary.

Yours sincerely



Carol Kingsbury

Chair

West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group

Carol Kingsbury

10th April 2017

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email springbankgreenbelt@gmail.com

Ms Elizabeth Ord
HM Government Planning Inspector
Joint Core Strategy Team
Municipal Offices
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 9SA

West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation Change of Greenbelt Status

Dear Ms Ord

To give more visibility and weight to the objection letters reference the above, I present to you a petition numbering 1044 signatories on behalf of the residents and families of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park & Hayden. The proposal within the JCS to remove the land at West Cheltenham from the Greenbelt, and the subsequent proposal to allocate 45 hectares as employment land directly next to housing in Fiddlers Green and Springbank, together with an allocated site for now 1100 homes, and a further option for housing on the land at Hayden at later date, plus associated infrastructure, has aroused strong opposition from the people of the town.

For more than 50 years this beautiful countryside has acted as part of the "lungs" of Cheltenham. Its views across the Severn Valley to the Malverns, and on a clear day the Black Mountains, are highly valued and utilised by the entire community. Walking paths through this countryside are used by many for recreation, picnicking, star gazing, access to our local amenity, "The House in the Tree", and as a place for silent reflection. Families also bring their children here to educate them about wildlife and farming. How can we convey to you the importance of this countryside to us? Well just imagine that the proposal was to turn Pittville Park into an industrial estate, that is how strongly the residents feel about this proposal.

Of course, the residents are not the only inhabitants of the area, as over the last 50 years a wildlife sustaining ecosystem has evolved. This habitat sustains many species of animals,

birds, flora and fauna, with regular sightings of deer, woodpeckers, owls, nesting buzzards and bats to name but a few of the most talked of in the community. No doubt they would even be vocal if they knew of the plan to literally destroy their homes and habitats, yet they know nothing of this. It is our duty to protect this environment as the data from the Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records shows many species that are under threat live in this area.

The 2011 AMEC report which is a study into the viability of the greenbelt in the West Cheltenham area, commissioned by the JCS, clearly states segments to the south NE1, NE2 and NE4 make a significant contribution to the land separating Cheltenham and Gloucester, preventing the sprawl of Cheltenham and the merging of Cheltenham and Gloucester, and further provides a countryside setting for Cheltenham.

The definition of Greenbelt per the Planning Practice Guidance states

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

We struggle to see how the area does not fulfil any of the criteria 100%.

This is a Cotswold garden town, adored and envied by many, we must maintain the character of this town as that is its value, to blight the landscape with inappropriate industrial development will not achieve the growth that is sought. Whilst people may come here to work, what would make them want to live here if all that is there is are acres of soulless estates surrounded by more concrete and tarmac? We are in principle not against the requirement for all these things, this town needs to progress, we all agree, and this a complex balancing act, but this plan for West Cheltenham will not enhance but destroy the existing communities.

Traffic is already a major problem for us all. Anyone who has to drive to this town to work on a daily basis, because they cannot afford to live here, experience the gridlock of the Golden Valley and the A40. The people who live on the estates at Fiddlers Green are unable to take the most direct route to work so they have to join the rat runners through Springbank. The roads are already congested by GCHQ employee cars lining these roads and the fear is that Springbank itself will become one big car park. From all the residents' point of view this is not acceptable, because we need to know at this stage (i.e. the Examination stage) where all this vital infrastructure is to go.

Surely these development proposals would be more soundly placed next to Junction 10 of the M5, with this Junction made all way, this would then create your perfect corridor of employment within close proximity of the 4,500 home Elms Park development. We are aware that Highways England do not wish to overload the M5 with local traffic, and yet they are investing heavily in widening the M25 to accommodate for this very fact. It is the biggest bypass in England. Alternatively, Staverton Airport is ideally situated, providing transport access and within close proximity of GCHQ. You could easily link J11 via the Bamfurlong

Highways Depot site to Staverton and provide direct and easy access for HGV's. We also understand that the land owner of Morris Hill and Hunting Butts is very keen to accommodate the housing requirement.

We ask of you to consider the impact of the proposed development on the "Human Sensory Receptors" within the communities of Fiddlers Green, Springbank, Cavendish Park and Hayden, considering:-

- Air pollution – increased Nitrogen dioxide levels
- Light trespass – 3 storey glass office blocks directly next to housing and to be built on the top of an escarpment ?
- Hearing – from peaceful countryside to industrial
- Equilibrium
- Smell – the need for an independent odour report relating to Severn Trent Sewage farm

West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group would like to invite yourself and members of the JCS to take a walking tour across the proposed strategic area so as to enlighten you all to what this area holds for the environment and the residents- both animal and human, and for Cheltenham itself. This should be scheduled before any further decisions are made on the future of this area.

We believe that to have gained this level of support for our objection over such a short space of time provides ample evidence that the local community remain strongly opposed to this change in the green belt boundary. Should these wholly inappropriate proposals be pushed through, I would deem that a huge democratic deficit will have been bestowed upon the communities of West Cheltenham.

Yours sincerely



Carol Kingsbury

Chair

West Cheltenham Greenbelt Group

Cheltenham Borough Council

Council – 19th June 2017

Revenues and Benefits Management Restructure

Accountable member	Councillor Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
Accountable officer	Paul Jones, Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer)
Ward(s) affected	None directly
Significant Decision	Yes
Executive summary	In guidance set out by the Secretary of State, our Pay Policy Statement states that Full Council should be given the opportunity to vote before large severance packages are offered and arrangements are finalised for employees leaving the organisation. The guidance states a threshold of £100,000 should be set. This Council acknowledges this guidance and is committed to seeking Full Council approval for any severance packages (including salary paid in lieu, redundancy compensation, pension entitlements/costs, holiday pay, fees or allowances) offered by the authority in excess of £100,000.
Recommendations	Approves deletion of the post of Benefits Manager and consequential costs with a proposed implementation date of 1 st July 2017.

Financial implications	<p>Based on all post-holders being at top of grade, the stage 1 management restructure will deliver a base budget revenue saving of £47,500 per annum.</p> <p>However, reducing the number of managers from 2 to 1 will result in making one of the post-holders redundant. In line with the council's current policy, one of the managers has requested he be considered for redundancy. This officer will be entitled to early access to his pension. The cost to the Council of making the Benefits Manager redundant with immediate access to their pension is calculated to be £114,124. Based on the revenue saving identified above, the payback period is less than 3 years which meets the expected criteria for such decisions.</p> <p>Over the last three years DWP have been paying additional one-off new burdens payments due to extra work created as a result of the welfare reforms. The Benefits Team have been able to manage this additional workload within the existing current structure. As a consequence, an earmarked reserve established to deal with the move to UC is forecast to stand at £151,000 in 2017/18 and it is considered appropriate to use part of these funds to finance the cost of the stage 1 restructure.</p> <p>Contact officer: Paul Jones, paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk 01242 775154</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>The Head of Paid Service is empowered to approve the redundancy of officers below Director level. Redundancy costs above £100,000 are, in line with the council's Pay Policy Statement, referred to Council for consideration.</p> <p>Contact officer: Peter Lewis, Peter.Lewis@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272012</p>
<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>As outlined in the report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy , julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<p>As set out in Appendix 1.</p>
<p>Corporate and community plan Implications</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>None.</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 Universal Credit (UC) has been live in Cheltenham for single unemployed people since June 2015. This along with an improvement in the economy and freezing of welfare benefits / rent increases has seen a 10% reduction in caseload and a bigger reduction in workload as pensioner claims require less work and additional automation/interfaces with DWP/Inland Revenue will reduce the work further over the coming year.
- 1.2 In December 2017 Cheltenham is due to go live on all **new claims** for Universal Credit (UC), which will see the start of a drop in work load over the following 12/18 months. It is anticipated that in 2019/20 we will transfer any remaining working age caseload to DWP leaving us with just council tax support claims for working age customers and rent benefit/council tax support for pensioners until 2022/23 when the rent benefit side may transfer to pension credit.
- 1.3 The authorisation to approve a new structure below 'Director' level rests with the Director responsible for the service; in this case the Chief Finance Officer. However, as the severance package for one individual exceeds £100,000, in line with the pay policy statement, it is being brought before Full Council for approval.

2. Reasons for Recommendations

- 2.1 The new structure includes a newly created post of Revenues and Benefits Deputy Manager who will provide technical support across all functions of the revenues and benefits service. The post will also provide resilience to the new Head of Revenues and Benefits in their absence. The post-holder will manage a small team which spans the Revenues and Benefits areas. This will cover technical, service development, quality and income control and business rates.
- 2.2 This new post will also provide some much needed additional resource on business rates as we move to 100% rates retention and deal with a system which is becoming more and more complicated.

3. Alternative options

- 3.1 An alternative option would be to leave the team unchanged. However, the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP) will eventually take on the majority of housing benefit related workloads under UC and have indicated that it is highly unlikely that TUPE transfer will apply. They have actively encouraged Local Authorities to reduce the cost of administering housing benefit in advance of UC rollout as they are as yet to commit any funding to redundancy costs.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 The Chief Finance Officer has consulted with the Executive Board to gain approval for the Business Case. On 22nd May 2017, formal consultation with the Unions and staff affected under these restructure proposals commenced. The outcome of this meeting will determine whether the restructure, as currently proposed, can be fully implemented on 1st July 2017.

Report author	Contact officer: Paul Jones paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264125
Appendices	Appendix 1 – Risk Assessment
Background information	

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	I	L	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If the Council decides not to agree to the recommendation, then potentially the Council may find that it is obliged to make this decision once the majority of housing benefit related workloads under UC have transferred to the DWP, which will be a missed opportunity to create revenue savings within the base budget in the intervening period.	CFO	May 2017	3	2	6	Accept	Formally agree the recommendation proposed.	19/6/2017	CFO	
	If the post-holder were to leave without serving their notice period, knowledge would be lost which would disable the opportunity for a smooth transition of duties to the newly created management team.	CFO	May 2017	3	2	6	Accept	The existing post-holder will work their 3 month notice period to ensure sufficient time is allowed for knowledge transfer.	30/9/2017	CFO	

