

Cheltenham Borough Council Council Minutes

Meeting date: 17 March 2025

Meeting time: 2.30 pm - 4.35 pm

In attendance:

Councillors:

Paul Baker (Chair), Dr David Willingham (Vice-Chair), Frank Allen, Glenn Andrews, Victoria Atherstone, Garth Barnes, Dilys Barrell, Angie Boyes, Barbara Clark, Julia Chandler, Flo Clucas, Mike Collins, Ashleigh Davies, Chris Day, Iain Dobie, Jan Foster, Steve Harvey, Rowena Hay, Sandra Holliday, Martin Horwood, Alisha Lewis, Dr Helen Pemberton, Richard Pineger, Julie Sankey, Stan Smith, Dr Steve Steinhardt, Izaac Tailford, Julian Tooke, Simon Wheeler and Suzanne Williams

Also in attendance:

Paul Jones (Deputy Chief Executive (Section 151 Officer)), Claire Hughes (Director of Governance, Housing and Communities) and Gareth Edmundson (Chief Executive)

1 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bamford, Beale, Chelin, Garcia Clamp, Jeffries, Joy, Lynch, Oliver, Orme, Smith and Tooke.

2 Declarations of interest

With reference to Agenda item 9, Councillor Horwood declared an interest, as a member of Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council with responsibility for its neighbourhood plan. He does not regard this as a prejudicial interest, and on advice will not withdraw from the Chamber during consideration of that item.

3 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February will be approved at the next meeting of Council.

4 Communications by the Mayor

The Mayor began by saying his mayoral year had flown by and it has been his privilege and pleasure to serve Cheltenham as its Mayor.

He had enjoyed a busy few weeks, with the following highlights:

- a visit to the School House Café in St Paul's, an amazing facility which provides space and support for the local community. He attended a great event run by a charity called Wiggly, which provides free meals – on this occasion pancakes;
- the YMCA's BIG Shelter Build event invited over 40 primary school children to design and build cardboard shelters, conveying a powerful message in a practical and fun way. This was followed by a Sleep Easy Soup Kitchen event where people slept out in the shelters, raising money to support local people without a safe place to call home. It was a great occasion, although sad that it is needed;
- a first experience of Park Run, another fabulous national event involving nearly 700 runners at Pittville Park every week, with a different charity taking responsibility for marshalling. He encouraged people to give it a try;
- Gloucestershire's Young Musician of the Year event, where incredible talent was on show, in a county blessed for music.

He said the future Mayor and Deputy Mayor have much to love and look forward to in the year ahead.

Turning to sad news, he reported the recent passing of two former councillors and prominent members of the local community: John Oates, who represented Park Ward on the borough council for many years, had a passion for aviation, and was very involved in the airport committee; and Charmian Sheppard who served as a county councillor for St Peter's for 20 years and had a particular interest in education. He thanked them both for their dedication and hard work over the years, sent condolences to their families, and invited Members to share their thoughts.

Councillors Hay, Willingham, Wheeler, Collins, Atherstone, Horwood and Barnes all paid tribute to the councillors, thanking them for their huge contributions to the borough, and also extending condolences to their families and friends.

5 Communications by the Leader of the Council

The Leader shared the following communications:

- following some public concern, the county council has engaged in a dialogue about its proposal to replace paving with tarmac on the Promenade outside Cavendish House. This engagement is welcome, particularly in light of the problems with the quality of work on The Strand. CBC is not the responsible authority but the Leader will write to the leader of the county council requesting

that they pause their plan, re-think, and engage more widely before making a final decision;

- the sale of the of the Municipal Offices and the airport is moving forward, and we will shortly be in a position to announce the preferred bidders for both;
- the Golden Valley planning application is also getting closer, with ongoing dialogue with the county council highways;
- work has started at North Place, and we look forward to the site providing much-needed attainable housing;
- the county council has applied for planning permission for a new sports hub at Pittville School – this is particularly welcome, and helps with the delivery of our sports strategy. It is also good to note that a new Special Educational Needs school is planned, although this is likely to be full as soon as it is built.

6 To receive petitions

There were none.

7 Public Questions

There were none.

8 Member Questions

There were none.

9 Neighbourhood Planning Protocol

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control introduced his report, asking Members to adopt the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol and to delegate authority to make any minor changes and update the constitution if necessary. This is being done in line with government guidance and to ensure that the document, which dates back to 2015, remains fit for purpose and in line with a number of government acts as well as our own Corporate Plan priorities. He said the council always supports local communities and parish councils in creating their own neighbourhood plans, and it is important that the protocol remains up to date and live, with reviews on a regular basis.

A Member asked how the council can encourage more communities to get involved in neighbourhood planning, saying that in some areas, finding the requisite 21 people is difficult with the result that areas with good volunteer networks are much more likely to engage with the process. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control said that this is an age-old question and applies to most things the council does. He said the protocol doesn't address this issue in detail – it is basically a list of what needs to be done and the various stages and gateways - but the council wants to do its best for all communities in Cheltenham and anyone coming forward will have its full support.

In debate, a Member welcomed the report and timely update of the protocol and hoped that the reforms proposed can be carried forward as part of a greater process

of reforming the neighbourhood planning processes, noting the various barriers to engagement for some communities. He was also conscious of the difference between parished and non-parished areas of Cheltenham, with significant deprivation in some of the unparished areas, and hoped that the council might bring forward new measures to encourage outreach work on neighbourhood plans and the establishment of more neighbourhood forums. He supported the report as a good first step towards that.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control suggested that elected Members are responsible for taking the lead in their communities, to make sure the people they represent know what is available, support their first steps, and direct them towards officers for help and guidance if appropriate. He said the protocol is a living document and can be improved in the future to ensure it is always fit for purpose.

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1. the Cheltenham Borough Council Neighbourhood Planning Protocol, attached to the report at Appendix 4, is adopted;**
- 2. authority is delegated to the Director of Community and Economic Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control, to prepare the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol for publication correcting any minor errors such as spelling, grammar, typographical and formatting changes that do not affect the substantive content of the Protocol;**
- 3. authority is delegated to the Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer to make changes to the constitution, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;**
- 4. authority is delegated to the Director of Community and Economic Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Building Control, to make any future amendments to the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol such as updates to references to Government guidance, to ensure it remains fit for purpose.**

10 Capital, Investment, Treasury Management Strategies 2025/26

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets introduced her report, saying that the Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies would provide the funding for the ambitious multi-million pound strategy set out in the budget approved in February, and ensuring that council tax payers' money is spent and invested wisely for maximum return. She said it is the real heart and soul of how the council manages money and services, from regenerating our favourite assets to EV charging points and safe cycle parking.

She went on to say that the housing capital programme proposed a £104.7m investment between 2024-25 and 2028-29, to increase the supply of social and affordable housing in Cheltenham, in addition to the £35m already spent on this.

Although a huge sum, she said there will always be a housing list, but the council will use every penny of the housing revenue account wisely and do all it can to deliver houses – as always in investing in Cheltenham for Cheltenham.

She urged Member to approve the strategies, and thanked officers of the finance and assets team for making the detail of the work a reality and delivering one of the most innovative and inventive financial strategies of any council of the country.

Questions

A Member thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for the report, noting that the Capital Strategy states that capital expenditure will be funded from external resources, and capital receipts from the disposal of surplus assets where possible, with borrowing only used if no other funding source is available, and debt repayment and interest costs covered without additional pressure on the revenue budget. He said Table 2 of the Capital Strategy shows £171m of capital expenditure being financed by debt over the next three years, and Table 7 shows financing costs for the same period falling from £4.6m to £4.2m, a reduction which, given current and future interest rates, can only be achieved if a substantial portion of planned investment is financed from external resources and capital receipts.

He asked for assurance that in reality, the majority of planned investment will be financed from external resources and capital receipts rather than the amount of new debt shown in Table 2, and asked if the Cabinet Member agreed that while a prudent level of borrowing to fund investments is acceptable, it would be inappropriate to borrow to meet interest payments.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets said she would stand behind the finance team's decades of experience in investment planning, and said that with some substantial assets in its portfolio, the council will do all it can to finance within its means through asset disposals and redeployments. .

In response to further questions, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets confirmed that:

- the county council receives 74% of council tax income, understandable as it delivers very expensive services such as social services, education and highways, but unfortunate in that it means that CBC has no jurisdiction over some things, such as potholes and paving. This is one of the problems highlighted by the devolution conversation - when delivering standardised services at scale and over an extremely large area, the community-driven ethos and connection is lost – but every financial decision the council makes is about delivering the best it can for the people of Cheltenham;
- regarding the Environmental, Social and Governance Policy (ESG) in respect of treasury management - specifically what the council is doing to try and tackle the worst excesses and detrimental effects of extreme capitalism (including the tobacco and alcohol industries and irresponsible gambling companies) - the ethos at CBC is to invest in Cheltenham for Cheltenham. Investment decisions align with that, particularly ESG decisions around climate, and she is confident that we have no investments in any of those areas.

Debate

In debate, Members thanked officers and the Cabinet Member for an excellent piece of work and made the following points:

- carrying out peer reviews on other authorities, it is interesting to note the different attitudes to borrowing: some councils are completely risk averse and will not invest anything in their towns until they have enough money in the bank - laudable in some ways but not benefitting their residents – while others prefer to borrow at a reasonable rate to finance essential regeneration work. CBC is very good at managing its debt ratio, and lucky to have some highly valuable assets; prudent borrowing is an important part of what we do;
- Paragraph 2.3 of the Capital Strategy is particularly important, demonstrating that the aim is not just to get cash and spend it, but to look at what Cheltenham people and communities need and build everything we do on addressing those needs. Our finance team understands that and knows what to do to make Cheltenham's economy grow and benefit all its residents;
- the council is blessed with fantastic staff across the board, and investing in our town from property and industrial units to affordable and social housing is key to Cheltenham's success. We cannot sit back and be complacent – we need to take sensible risks, including borrowing, to invest in people and property which will in turn generate returns through council tax or rents. CBC is one of the best authorities in the country when it comes to investing in the town and its future.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets thanked Members for their comments. She said life is about risk, and CBC is not afraid to take the best risks available in a field it knows well, or to invest to make money to improve residents' lives. Unlike other more cautious authorities which are incapable of seizing opportunities and are subsequently living with the challenges that approach has brought them, CBC has followed this successful strategy for the past ten years, and always got it right on the things that really matter. She thanked the Leader for embarking on this strategy of commerciality with a reasonable amount of risk when she was Cabinet Member for Finance.

RESOLVED THAT:

- **the Capital Strategy 2025/26 at Appendix 2;**
- **the Investment Strategy 2025/26 at Appendix 3; and**
- **the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2025/26 at Appendix 4**

are noted and approved.

11 Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation

The Leader introduced her report, which proposes the abolition of Cheltenham Borough Council, following the government's white paper requiring all remaining two-tier local authorities to become unitary councils.

She made the follow points:

- in many ways, it feels like the wrong time to be embarking on a lengthy and costly distraction for the local government sector, especially for CBC with its ambitious programmes – including Golden Valley, improving housing services, providing more affordable homes, and being a town of sanctuary for refugees, asylum seekers and the homeless – as well as delivering excellent services day in day out;
- CBC has a clear choice, however - to step aside and wait for reorganisation to happen or to take a proactive role and make a clear statement about what we believe is best for Cheltenham – and has opted for the latter, this being so important for the future of the borough;
- together with a joint cover letter from all Gloucestershire councils, three interim proposals will be submitted to government: a single county-wide unitary; CBC's preferred option for two unitaries – one in the east and one in the west; and a 'greater Gloucester' model;
- the two unitaries proposed (Gloucester City, the Forest of Dean and Stroud in the east, Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and the Cotswolds in the west) are the right shape and size to meet the government's assessment tests but still be connected to residents, and this is the preference of five Gloucestershire MPs, including Max Wilkinson. This plan is ambitious, progressive and promotes innovative potential solutions to the significant problems that threaten to outstrip and overwhelm local government if we continue on the same path;
- the government believes growth and productivity are the way to solve the country's problems, and CBC's plan will do that and more, using technology to enhance our clusters in cyber security, and green energy to make residents more prosperous and healthy and less reliant on expensive care services;
- the proposal is ambitious for the future, keeping devolution front and centre, and in addition boldly calls for Gloucestershire to become part of the West of England Combined Authority (WECA), to help create a bigger strategic authority with a strong regional voice at the heart of government. We need to engage with existing WECA authorities on this plan to make sure it works for all; if we hesitate, the government may step in and place us in a strategic authority that isn't right for Cheltenham or the county;
- the main message to convey is that achieving management efficiencies through rationalising councils is ultimately a dead end - we need real, positive change, to push the boundaries on what is possible.

She concluded by saying that although she and the Cabinet have approved the decision, she was keen to bring the matter to Council to enable Members to have their say.

Questions

In response to a Member's question, the Chief Executive confirmed that:

- to clarify what is meant by shadow authorities, and based on what has been implemented in other local government reorganisations - in particular in Cumbria as part of the last round of local government reorganisation – there would be a shadow election in May 2027, with the vesting date and creation of the new authority from April 2028, an election four years after that point, and a four-year election cycle thereafter;

- the shadow authority and existing local authority would run side by side for a 12-month period, the main responsibilities of the shadow authority being to oversee the implementation of the new authority, appointing the chief executive and senior officers, and getting the building blocks of decision-making in place. To ensure alignment during the 12-month period, the shadow authority would also be given district and county powers, and none of the three bodies – shadow authority, district council, county council – can make significant decisions without the agreement of the others .

In response to further questions from Members, the Leader confirmed that:

- there will be more consultation in the next phase of the process, including engagement with schools and education providers;
- the company commissioned to write the report is Plexal, CBC's partner for the MX project. They have provided a very full report in just four weeks; the cost was £34k;
- a cabinet working group has been set up, headed by the Leader, as the first step of a governance review to consider what will happen to residents who do not live in one of Cheltenham's five parishes. A meeting is scheduled for later this week, focussing first on existing parishes and what they want - to expand and be strengthened or to be absorbed into a single town council. Area forums have been set up in some parts of the country; Cheltenham must decide collectively on what is best for us, and this work will run alongside the devolution programme, involving a lot of consultation. There are also some very active residents' associations in Cheltenham, who will be part of this process;
- regarding the possibility of tweaking some boundaries to make them more logical and practical and based on the River Severn, the white paper is not entirely clear about this, and it is not part of this submission. If our submission is recognised, however, proposals will be worked up between now and November, including consideration of boundaries.

Debate

In debate, Members made the following comments:

- the report and conclusion to address three levels of local government are strongly supported. At the top strategic level, it is right that we aim to be part of the existing WECA with Bristol and South Gloucestershire, to create a logical whole which rather than splitting up the area in fact reunites historic Gloucestershire, and at unitary level, two authorities will keep power as close to the people as possible;
- a smaller local unitary authority ensures a greater chance of supporting culture and the arts, so important to the people of Cheltenham, in the face of discretionary spending against big ticket items such as statutory adult social care and children's services; we also need the strongest representation on unitary committees and decision-making bodies when it comes to the critical planning decisions to be made in the next few years, such as the Municipal Offices and Cavendish House;
- regarding population, the unitary councils of Bath and North East Somerset (BANES), South Gloucestershire, and North Somerset are smaller than the

proposed unitaries, but exercise control over children's services, education and more with no worse a record than Gloucestershire County Council's – bigger is not always better;

- regarding parish and town councils, this is a real opportunity to look at more devolution and local-based neighbourhood decision making, to reinvent and bring that level of government even closer to local people;
- the government has given us a great opportunity to be radical and innovative about how to provide services to residents in local communities. Gloucestershire is a huge land mass, with many local identities, and the report highlights areas of excellence in both sides and across the county; there would be concerns about one unitary delivering the services people need, and although the government has recommended 500k as a minimum population size, it is good that it is open to proposals which do not fit to this;
- we know that the two-tier model doesn't always work, and are aware of the desperate need to invest more in highways, housing and schools across the county; how do we ensure that residents' voices are heard and the services they need are available to allow communities to prosper and grow? Trying to achieve this on such a huge scale can't give them what they need;
- there is a question around the number of councillors who will represent each division, each county division (made up of two wards) currently being represented by five councillors: a reduction from five to two councillors would represent the loss of 110 councillors across the county and a saving of £490k. There is a potential negative impact to be considered here, taking into account the need for representation across all areas and the challenge for councillors of working age or with full-time carer responsibilities of having time for all their residents;
- there are areas of Cheltenham borough which fall outside the Cheltenham constituency, and local government reform provides the perfect opportunity to address that, taking account of place-based identity;
- there are two main reasons why a two-unitary model suits us best: localism - Gloucestershire is a huge county and people want their services delivered in an efficient, effective and easy-to-access way – and identity - Cheltenham and Gloucester are both great urban centres but deliver very different things, which should not be diluted in any way; Cheltenham has many links and history with Tewkesbury and the Cotswolds, making them more natural bedfellows;
- devolution doesn't feel like the right way forward for local government, making it less accessible at a time when people already feel disengaged, but opting out is clearly not an option. CBC's leadership have drafted proposals to the very short government deadline, which may be ignoring other pressing national problems in order to crowd out smaller parties from participation in democratic decision making. This has resulted in no cohesive plan between the areas and districts of Gloucestershire, and it is important that we are all on the same page when going forward. It would be a fantastic chance for proportional representation, to create a more accurate representation of what residents actually want – this was supported by Liberal Democrats in 2022. Wards such as St Paul's are likely to be neglected in a larger unitary authority and accounting for nuanced local needs should be a priority. To reflect Cheltenham Green Group's disapproval of the seismic management changes being introduced too rapidly for a proper

response, and their desire to find longer-term mechanisms for effective democratic representation, they will abstain from supporting devolution, acknowledging that we must move forward but concerned by the lack of knowledge about what is best for our communities;

- those responsible for bringing this report forward are our engineers, taking something which they feel won't work – a single unitary authority where local voices will not be heard – and breaking it into two parts which are both functional and workable in our communities. They are engineering a new future for our county and our town, and hope that everyone will engage to ensure residents across the county have a voice;
- although local government reorganisation is not welcome, removing accessibility and adding hurdles, the council is ready to fight for the right result for Cheltenham residents. The two-unitary model is right for many reasons, not least keeping decision-making as close to residents as possible, with local knowledge to understand the impact of those decisions, whether positive or negative. The government has stated that unitary authorities should be the right size to achieve efficiencies, meet local needs, and be informed by local views, but a whole-county unitary authority would not achieve those goals. The two-unitary proposal allows for meaningful reorganisation, and innovative ways of working and finding local solutions, without excluding current cross-council ways of working, such as Ubico. This can continue across two unitary authorities, collaborating and sharing workstreams while focussing locally on meeting the day-to-day needs of residents;
- the smaller areas also allow greater focus on economic growth, with the two-unitary proposal clearly setting out its plans for cyber and green energy, and the opportunity to look at new ways to address issues faced by public services. This interim proposal sets out clear and achievable gains and provides a brighter future;
- in addition, joining WECA is the right way forward, in view of Cheltenham's strong cultural and working links with Bristol, Bath and South Gloucestershire;
- the two unitary proposal neatly parcels the county into two homogenous groups, but Gloucestershire is a lot more diverse than this suggests – there are at least six different county regions, each including diverse and unequal districts. Maybe having a single combined authority would be a chance to level up the inequalities and heal divisions, in addition to the obvious financial and administrative benefits;
- it was unrealistic to be sent a 92-page paper on Friday afternoon and be expected to full digest this by Monday. The Leader is to be thanked for bringing the report to Full Council, but the short notice seems undemocratic, regardless of what other councils have done;
- a reluctance to embrace unitary councils comes from CBC's record for balancing its books every single year, keeping non-mandatory operations going, rarely losing any front-line services and still managing to invest. This cannot be said of other councils, including to county which has balanced its budget by selling off its rural estate. There is a concern that a single unitary council might start selling off Cheltenham's much-prized investments and assets; a smaller authority, with Tewkesbury and the Cotswolds, would have a bigger say in the running of its local finances;

- county councillors are particularly aware of the size and differences across the country, and if all power were to be centralised in Gloucester, Cheltenham may be left playing second fiddle, with other large conurbations of Cirencester, Tewkesbury and Stroud all left out, as well as the Forest of Dean. Two unitaries is better in general for all the people of Gloucestershire, though not without challenges, with areas of severe deprivation across the county, and even areas of the Cotswolds deprived through lack of access to services;
- putting too much power into the hands of one person – such as the Mayor of Bristol and the Police and Crime Commissioner – can have catastrophic consequences, but we should definitely look to join WECA and fight for the best we can get for the people of Cheltenham and Gloucestershire;
- there is a lot to be gained if both parties at CBC acknowledge their commonalities and work together, recognising the different regional identities and districts and looking to find the pragmatic in the policy. In view of the levels of deprivation in the county, the economic arguments for two unitaries cannot be stressed enough, and there is a great case to be made for managing efficiencies and costs and at the same having parity between the two areas. Supporters of a single authority suggest that the two-unitary situation will create economic inequality, but reference to the report shows that this is likely to be relatively minimal, with deprived areas in Cheltenham and Gloucester, and also the ageing population that will come with an East Gloucestershire unitary, bringing its own problems around employment and resourcing;
- there is a strong case for working towards something that identifies districts and a common sense of purpose, at the end of the day recognising that all districts are constructions – different areas with different identities which have formed one identity – and a Cheltenham and Cotswolds authority can be based on a shared common identity that may have different parts but at the same time coheres into one. Ultimately, we are trying to build something that works for the broadest range of people and identities without stretching to the limits where it becomes untenable. It would be good if the Green Group can join the Liberal Democrats to work on this deal.

The Leader thanked Members for their excellent contributions, and addressed some of the points made:

- in an ideal world, we would have much smaller districts, but this is no longer a reality; the population target of under 500k is addressed in this interim proposal, and as a Member said, we want proportionality and balance, with none more powerful than the other;
- there is no need to abandon the Teckal companies already in existence and working well across all the Gloucestershire authorities, such as adult health and social care – we have locality-based services which won't need massive desegregation;
- there is a good argument for boundary changes and this will need further discussion between now and November;
- the county council's report was only published last week, and it was only when CBC knew what the county was proposing and who was writing its report that it was clear that this would not provide the answers CBC was looking for - much

more than a straight comparison between district councils and a single unitary model;

- it has been said that there isn't enough clarity in the white paper, but this is being taken as an opportunity to tell the government what we want for our residents, focussing on the art of the possible. We are not embracing CBC's abolition, but must do all in our power to safeguard and protect as much as possible, such as carrying on with the Golden Valley Development and all the cultural, leisure and community services delivered by districts across Gloucestershire;
- it is clear that the county council is being dissolved and its services redistributed, so there is no reason why the centre of power should have to be Shire Hall, which may not be fit for purpose any more than the Municipal Offices are;
- we will have no choice about having a Mayor, but should look at this as an opportunity – it comes with a big price ticket which can be used collectively across the region;
- it is true to say that the report has been put together in a short timeline, but CBC's proposal has been shared with other districts. The main issue is that we cannot passively wait for something to be done to us; the government has not provided very much clarity, but the report shows them what could be done. Other councils around the country have simply expressed a simple preference for reorganisation in their areas, but the government wants a proper assessment that covers the priorities set out in the white paper – we have had the boldness to do that and can feel proud;
- it is unfortunate that Members only received the report on Friday, but unreasonable to say the process has been undemocratic. Many conversations have taken place, councillors have been briefed, and this is a good proposal which covers a lot. Stroud leaders prefer this direction of travel and all but one of the district councils have signed the letter to the minister confirming WECA as the preferred option. It is disappointing that the Green Group do not feel able to support the submission but their decision is respected.

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1. following Cabinet approval of the following recommendations (below), the content of this report and the council's preference for two unitary councils for Gloucestershire and the submission included at Appendix 5 are noted.**

RECOMMENDATIONS approved by Cabinet:

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1. the joint letter to be submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government found at Appendix 4 is approved;**

2. a preference is expressed for two unitary councils to be created in Gloucestershire and the interim submission included at Appendix 5 is approved, setting out an outline case to be appended separately to the joint letter alongside other interim proposals submitted by respective Gloucestershire councils;
3. authority is delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader to work with the other six Gloucestershire councils to submit the joint letter and any associated separate appendices submitted by councils individually;
4. that there is not alignment on the shape of local government in Gloucestershire is recognised by Cabinet, but a commitment to ongoing collaboration with other Gloucestershire Councils, stakeholders and MHCLG as the devolution and reorganisation process progresses is agreed, to ensure that we deliver the best outcomes for residents and businesses.

12 Notice of Motions

There were none.

13 Any other item the Mayor determines as urgent and which requires a decision

There was no other business on this occasion.