

Council

**Monday, 22nd February, 2021
2.30 - 6.00 pm**

Attendees	
Councillors:	Roger Whyborn (Chair), Sandra Holliday (Vice-Chair), Victoria Atherstone, Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Dilys Barrell, Angie Boyes, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Stephen Cooke, Iain Dobie, Bernard Fisher, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Rowena Hay, Karl Hobley, Martin Horwood, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Chris Mason, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Tony Oliver, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Jo Stafford, Klara Sudbury, Simon Wheeler, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

Minutes

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Brownsteen, Clucas, Hegenbarth, Parsons and Wilkinson.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Barrell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda Item 9 as her son worked for Cheltenham Borough Homes and Councillor Whyborn declared an interest in the Exempt Minute agenda item 16.

3. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

RESOLVED THAT:

the minutes of the Council meeting held on 7 December 2020 be approved and signed as a correct record.

4. **COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR**

The Mayor paid tribute to Kevan Blackadder, Chief Executive of the Business Improvement District and former Editor of Gloucestershire Echo, who had recently passed away after a short illness. Kevan had shown a real love of the town and had made a huge and positive contribution to the promotion of businesses in Cheltenham. The Mayor asked Members to observe a short period of silence.

The Mayor congratulated the Council on having been awarded the bronze level in the Defence Employers Recognition Scheme and applauded those involved for the efficient roll out of the vaccinations at the Fire Station. He said the pandemic had seen increased use of food banks in the town and reported that his own food bank had raised over £19,000, most of which had already been distributed with some used for the purchase of a commercial freezer. He stated

there was an on-going need to help families and individuals, particularly post-Christmas and announced the opening of two food co-ordinating hubs.

The Mayor highlighted an appeal being organised by Rotary asking people to donate the cost of their vaccination which would go towards helping buy vaccines for people in less fortunate countries.

Lastly the Mayor congratulated Cheltenham Town Football Club on its creditable performance against Manchester City in the FA Cup, where they had lead the premiership club for the majority of the game, but lost 1-3 in the end.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council also acknowledged that Cheltenham Borough Council had been awarded the Bronze level of the Defence Employer Recognition Scheme and stated that the Council was committed to supporting the Armed Forces Community and currently employed a number of people with connections to the military.

The Leader reported that a number of funding bids had been submitted to help support the leisure industry and she would confirm if these had been successful at the March meeting. She also reported that the Council had extended the help hub to ensure that the additional clinically extremely vulnerable residents announced by the Government recently, would continue to receive the support of the Council.

The Leader commented on the thousands of local children who were home-schooling at the moment and commended the Laptops for Learning scheme that went live on 3 February through the Council's No Child Left Behind programme. Together with Cheltenham Education Partnership and IT Schools Africa, this scheme helped to ensure local children had access to the right IT equipment to learn at home. So far over £2,000 had been raised and 24 laptops donated.

The Leader praised the efficient running of the vaccine centre at the Fire station and wished to thank all the volunteers and fire station staff involved with this. She wished particular thanks be placed on record to three people who had co-ordinated the venue as a vaccination centre, namely Sarah Gallagher from Portland Practice, Cameron Jackson from Royal Well Practice and Richard Ball from St Catherine's.

Finally she referred to the Cheltenham Town's football match against Manchester City stating how good the publicity would have been for Cheltenham.

6. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS

There were none.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Graham Beale to Cabinet Member Healthy Lifestyles, Councillor Flo Clucas
	I wish to raise a question regarding the recent loss of Erasmus+ as I am concerned that the its replacement, the Turing scheme will not be a

	<p>sufficient in scope or depth and will likely impact the prosperity of young people in the area; plus my own two daughters who would likely make use of such a scheme.</p> <p>My question therefore: Can you confirm if the Turing Scheme will enable the wide range of activities presently covered by Erasmus+ including youth exchanges, primary and secondary school links, vocational education, lifelong learning projects aimed at encouraging strong relationships with our nearest neighbours in Europe? If the Turing Scheme is not a sufficient replacement, will the council agree to apply pressure on the government to rejoin the Erasmus+ scheme at a later date?</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>The loss of the Erasmus+ scheme is a devastating blow for students. Providing as it did away for UK students to learn in an international context with fees paid and assistance for living expenses, it gave a huge opportunity to take in more than the academic experience. Paying for UK students to study overseas was one aspect; the other was bringing European students to study in the UK. The transfer of experience was unique and beneficial for both the outgoing and incoming student, for the universities, local communities and for the countries concerned too.</p> <p>The Turing scheme, which we are told is to be a worldwide scheme for the best universities, rather than European focussed, has a promised funding profile of £100m. It will give the 35000 or so students who are accepted, some £3000 to pay for tuition fees and living expenses. For students from less well off households, it will not be nearly enough to pay tuition fees, never mind living costs.</p> <p>As the full extent of the Turing scheme is not yet known, I cannot confirm that it will have the same range of activities or opportunities that Erasmus does. Indeed, Prof Mary Beard amongst others has expressed her concern about the loss of Erasmus.</p> <p>The questioner asks if we will work to rejoin the Erasmus + scheme if the Turing scheme is not a sufficient replacement. While the question is addressed to the Cabinet member, I would hope that the Council as a whole, would answer is an unequivocal 'yes'.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Emma Nelson to Cabinet Member Economy and Development, Councillor Victoria Atherstone</p>
	<p>National planning policy requires local authorities to have sufficient sites ready for development to meet their housing need for the next 5 years.</p> <p>I understand that if an authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, then national planning policy and a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” comes to the fore over local considerations. This might make it difficult for a local authority to refuse planning applications when it might otherwise do so.</p> <p>What was the 5-year supply of land for housing in Cheltenham Borough for each of the last 4 years up to April 2021?</p>

	Response from Cabinet Member
	Upon adoption of the JCS in December 2017, the Council could demonstrate a five-year housing land supply of 5.6 years. At the end of 2018 the supply was 4.6 years. In December 2019 the supply was 3.7 years. It currently remains at around 3.7 years.
	Supplementary Question
	Given that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and the current level is just 3.7 years, how will the Council protect us from unscrupulous developers, such as Redrow with their latest bid to put 42 homes in Leckhampton, from proceeding under the “presumption in favour of sustainable development” clause; such development will destroy more valued landscape and further exacerbate traffic and flooding issues; after all, we don’t want to experience the flooding of 2007 again!
	Response from Cabinet Member
	We recognise that a major reason for delays in housing developments coming forward relates to concerns about infrastructure, particularly relating to transport. The Council is actively engaged with the various relevant parties, such as the County Council and Highways England to ensure that issues are resolved, although we are not controlling authority. In another way the Council has taken a direct lead in promoting the Golden Valley development scheme, including the preparation of a supplementary planning document to seek to smooth process of development. At the same time we are vigorously defending the decisions of the Planning Committee at appeal. The Council also took action last year to ensure the adoption of its Local Plan. Having a recently adopted, up to date, local plan is helpful in ensuring support for our decisions from the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State). In fact, a recent case which went to the Court of Appeal (<i>known as the Gladman cases</i>) has emphasised that where a council lacks the required five-year housing land supply, this may tilt the balance in favour of proposed residential schemes, <u>but</u> does not render grants of planning permission automatic. It is estimated that the shortfall in housing supply amounts to 800 dwelling units. However, before approval of any planning application the developer would have to produce relevant information and proposals to ensure that any risk of flooding is dealt with.
3.	Question from Emma Nelson to Cabinet Member Economy and Development, Councillor Victoria Atherstone
	How will the recent loss of the 200 homes planned development for the Portland Street Car Park impact the CBC’s 5-year housing land supply, how many years has this housing development been stalled and when will it be relaunched?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	No formal planning application has been submitted for this site so we had been cautious about including this site in our housing trajectory. The site was originally allocated in 2006, and a planning permission was granted in 2012 which has now lapsed. There is no current planning application for this site. The land is in private ownership and the current intentions of the landowner are dealt with in another question. However, as a council we remain committed to building affordable homes, both working with

	CBH on our own pledge to build 500 new affordable homes as well as by working with others.
	Supplementary Question
	It is good to hear your commitment to building 500 affordable homes, but how many homes need to be built to restore the 5-year housing land supply needed to protect us from unsustainable developments which, together with climate change, may mean the dreadful floods of 2007 are not a thing of the past; and finally, how many people are currently on the waiting list for a home?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The Council has responded to a consultation called Planning for the Future and Cheltenham is in a good position to achieve those housing delivery targets. As of 23/02/2021, 2286 households were currently on Cheltenham Borough Council's Housing Register (i.e. waiting list) for a (rented) affordable home.

8. MEMBER QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Councillor Chris Mason to Cabinet Member Climate and Communities, Councillor Max Wilkinson
	Clean Air Cheltenham have pointed out that it was a legal requirement for local authorities to have an air quality action plan in place by 2020. Could the Cabinet Member for Climate and Communities please explain why Cheltenham does not have an up to date plan?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>I've met regularly with Clean Air Cheltenham to take their feedback on local proposals for improving air quality. Their campaigning in Cheltenham is important and valued, alongside the work of other environmental groups.</p> <p>When a local authority puts in place a new Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), it has a year to publish a plan. I understand we are on course to have a new plan reviewed by the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) in that timescale. We look forward to hearing Clean Air Cheltenham's view on the plan. Councillor Mason might also wish to get involved and I'd welcome his input – perhaps through the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, of which he is chair.</p> <p>The consultancy working on our Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) is considering how we can go further to hit our environmental goals, including extra monitoring. However, as Councillor Mason will know, the majority of our air quality problems are caused by emissions from motor vehicles. He may wish to ask my counterpart on Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) what is being done by the County, as highways authority, to help reduce air pollution from motor vehicles in Cheltenham. GCC's recently published Local Transport Plan was a missed opportunity to implement many of the suggestions put forward by this authority during the consultation process, to help tackle air pollution in our borough.</p>

	Supplementary Question
	As the Cabinet member was not present, the questioner would undertake to ask the supplementary question directly with the Member.
2.	Question from Councillor Tim Harman to Cabinet Member Finance, Councillor Steve Jordan
	Can you please update the Council on the decision of the Borough Council to return £3 million to Government in connection with the Portland Street Car Park. Were all options considered and are there any plans going forward?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>To avoid any confusion Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) hasn't returned £3m as it had not received any money. It has mutually agreed with Homes England to withdraw a bid to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). This is because MF Freeman, the owners of the Portland Street site, who would have received the money, have made it clear they now intend to sell the site as a car park and do not intend to develop it for housing which was a requirement of the proposed funding.</p> <p>CBC have been discussing the site with MF Freeman since shortly after they purchased it to help ensure its development for housing while also meeting the condition of 40% affordable homes. CBC were concerned that the amount paid for the site made this unlikely. When the Housing Infrastructure Fund was announced to help make sites viable for housing development, CBC worked with MF Freeman on a bid to the fund. While the £3m bid was from CBC it was with the agreement of MF Freeman that they would use the funding to go ahead with a housing development. The bid was agreed and related specifically to the Portland Street site and with a number of milestones set by HE including a completion deadline of March 2022.</p> <p>CBC has continued trying to progress the development and had already agreed with HE to extend the milestone for MF Freeman to get an approved planning permission. However in autumn 2020 CBC discovered MF Freeman were marketing the site when approached by their agent to see it the council wished to purchase it. MF Freeman subsequently confirmed their intention to sell the site as a car park. Since the HIF bid was not transferrable to a different site and had a fixed deadline, CBC then discussed the situation with HE and mutually agreed to discontinue the HIF bid.</p> <p>Given the huge effort put in by CBC to get this site developed, the outcome is extremely disappointing. However, as a council we remain committed to building affordable homes, both working with CBH on our own pledge to build 500 new affordable homes as well as by working with others.</p>
	Supplementary Questions
	This is a great disappointment and given the importance of it would the Cabinet Member agree to take a report as soon as possible to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee?

	Response from Cabinet Member
	Quite happy for a report to go to O&S committee, but the problem is that the Council do not own the site so there is a limit in what we can do if the owner wishes to do something different.
3.	Question from Councillor Tim Harman to Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Alex Hegenbarth
	In your Facebook page you state that “To be safe our latest Bishops Cleeve Focus will be online only.” Given that a number of his Liberal Democrat Colleagues have delivered leaflets in Cheltenham in contradiction of guidance being followed by other Political Parties has he discussed their conduct with them and is he aware of the concerns expressed by residents that they have merely sought political advantage under cover of community information which is freely available from public sources?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Liberal Democrat members of this council have continued to serve their communities throughout this pandemic. In recent weeks, this has included circulating letters to residents that contain critical information such as helpline numbers for mental health charities and opening hours of local food banks. These letters are deliberately free of any political branding and have been delivered by council members in accordance with their key worker status and is in line with government and police guidance, and many residents have thanked councillors for taking the trouble to help them in these most difficult of times. The Conservative tactic here has been to encourage their supporters to report this activity to the police, who have found no case to answer. No fines have been issued. No charges have been pressed. I am disappointed that the Conservatives are prepared to waste police time to score political points, which is why I know Cheltenham is best served under a Liberal Democrat administration.
	Supplementary Question
	As the Cabinet member was not present, the questioner would undertake to ask the supplementary question directly with the Member.
4.	Question from Councillor Angie Boyes to Cabinet Member Climate and Communities, Councillor Max Wilkinson
	The Government sadly decided to end our membership of Erasmus+ as part of their Brexit negotiations. The programme played a huge part in social mobility and youth exchanges between young people in Cheltenham and European partners. It supported youth co-operation, internationalism and broadened the horizons of so many young people, including many disadvantaged young people. Learning mobility is more than just formal education and the proposed Turing Scheme, which was thrown together quickly, does nothing to achieve what Erasmus+ was doing in this capacity. The Turing Scheme does little in terms of providing opportunities that the Erasmus+ programme did, at huge cost to the tax

	<p>payer. Erasmus+ benefitted a lot of young people in Cheltenham and without that support they will lose out on many opportunities. No young person in Cheltenham should be left behind. I would like to ask that as Cabinet Member, responsible for both Twinning and Communities, that you do all you can to ensure that no young person is left behind or disadvantaged as a result. Will this Council commit to reaching out to organisations, students and youth groups (such as those involved in the International Youth Peace Camp) to find out what we can do as a Council to ensure we do all we can to work with them to ensure they won't lose out.</p>
	<p>Response from Cabinet Member</p>
	<p>I was disturbed not only at the withdrawal from the Erasmus+ scheme, but the way the decision was reached. It is my understanding that the UK government decided to leave the scheme despite Erasmus+ not being part of the EU's negotiating position. This is an inexcusable decision which will be to the detriment of many young people and to the cultural life of our nation as a whole. As long as Cheltenham Borough Council is run by this administration, we will do all we reasonably can to counter the narrow-minded approach of the government. To that end, I'd welcome input from our Twinning Committee on how this can best be done. I hope the dedicated internationalist Cllr Seacome, as Twinning chair, and Cllr Boyes as our representative on the Congress of the Council of Europe will be willing to give guidance. I understand their initial lobbying efforts are being raised at Ministerial level and applaud their efforts.</p>
5.	<p>Question from Councillor Angie Boyes to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rowena Hay</p>
	<p>In my capacity as a Borough Councillor who cares about the future of young people in Cheltenham, as the Co-Vice Chair of Cheltenham Twinning who cares about the future exchanges between the young people in our twin towns, as Member of the Council of Europe who cares about sharing European values with our European countries and as an ex-Erasmus student, I would like to call upon you to join me and support my letter to Gavin Williamson MP, Secretary of State for Education. I have asked him and the Government to re-think abolishing a well-established programme that worked so well and if this is not a possibility then ask Government to widen the scheme to ensure that disadvantaged young people can access the new scheme and to widen its scope. I also ask that you contact Government to provide concrete advice on the new Turing Scheme to ensure Cheltenham organisations are prepared to plan for the participation they want to achieve. Cheltenham is an open-minded, internationalist and welcoming town who welcomes exchanges of young people and opportunity. I would welcome your support on this and to ensure our young people are not disadvantaged in any way as a result of this Government decision.</p>
	<p>Response from Leader</p>
	<p>I am more than happy to support Councillor Boyes letter to Gavin Williamson MP and to ask for further information on the new Turing Scheme, so that as a Council we can help ensure that Cheltenham organisations can be prepared and are able to offer the best possible opportunities for young people from all walks of life to be able to</p>

	participate in international exchanges, particularly to and from our twin towns.
6.	Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member, Climate and Communities, Councillor Max Wilkinson
	The University of Gloucestershire states on its website that it is a "globally welcoming institution." and that it is "proud to host staff and students from at least 17 European Countries". The tragic decision not to continue UK participation in Erasmus+ is a retrograde step that harms UK students, UK universities and UK university town's like Cheltenham. Could I please get an assurance from the Cabinet Member, that the Council will do all it can to minimise the harm to Cheltenham by this xenophobic decision, and will consider working with the University to help promote Cheltenham as an excellent choice of study destination for international students and consider using our twinning links to support UK students in being able to broaden their horizons with opportunities to study abroad?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The need to maintain educational links is heightened due to the government's decision to end Erasmus+. Given the questions being asked by Cllr Boyes and the lobbying being carried out by the Twinning Committee, I'm certain this is a matter which is being given attention locally. I am keen to help however I can. It is my understanding that Twinning has traditionally supported Gloucestershire College programmes with Annecy, Göttingen and Weihai, but new opportunities are now needed. We would hope to work more closely with the University to further develop opportunities to link it with our twin towns. I will take away an action to work with the Twinning Committee chair, Councillor Seacome, with the potential to write to an appropriate contact at the University.
7.	Question from Councillor Mike Collins to Cabinet Member Cyber and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Could the cabinet member please advise on what could be done to prevent the worsening and selfish habit of pavement parking than blights our town? This has now become a major issue that affects all road users including other drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, young families and most disturbingly of all those with mobility issues. I hope that you will agree with me that nobody should be forced onto the highway to avoid a selfishly parked vehicle that is blocking a pavement.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	I share Cllr Collins' frustrations about the proliferation of pavement parking, which impacts on the quality of life of many of our residents. Whilst the responsibility for enforcement primarily rests with GCC as highways authority, it is recognised that this is a national problem and that there are shortcomings in terms of the legislative framework and associated guidance available to help tackle the issue. The Department for Transport's undertook a detailed review of pavement parking and the government's response to the Transport Committee's

	<p>2019 report on pavement parking was published on 12th March, 2020.</p> <p>In line with the department's view, the Transport Committee recommended that the government consults on allowing local authorities to enforce against obstructive pavement parking, with a view to making such an offence subject to civil enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004. They also recommended that, in the long term, the government legislates for a nationwide prohibition on pavement parking across England, outside London, enforceable by local authorities.</p> <p>Subsequently, the government has consulted on the options to help local authorities to tackle this problem and the result of this process is awaited.</p> <p>Three options have been proposed: making it easier for councils to ban pavement parking in their areas; giving councils powers to fine drivers who park on paths and an outright ban. The public consultation period closed on 22nd November, 2020 and the government has committed to publishing a summary of the responses within 3 months.</p>
	Supplementary Question
	If the government do not respond and publish their report today then are they going to be late?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Unfortunately I have not seen the report which, I agree, should have been received by 22 February at the latest.
8.	Question from Councillor Mike Collins to Cabinet Member Cyber and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	I have been contacted by several residents who have expressed concern about the ongoing and increasing developments around our town and the affects that they might have on our many public footpaths. They have particular concern about the affects the Cyber Park development and those taking place in the Brizen Farm area may have on the Cheltenham Circular path. Given this council's policy on improving walking and cycling routes around and within our beautiful town, can I have the cabinet members assurance that everything will be done to protect these important public rights of way?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>There are legal procedures which apply when rights of way are affected by development. The effect that a proposed development will have on a right of way must be considered by planning authorities when deciding whether or not to approve an application for planning permission.</p> <p>The Connecting Cheltenham strategy shows our commitment to improving walking and cycling around and within Cheltenham. Furthermore, the Golden Valley Development SPD clearly highlights our desire to pursue the highest standards of sustainability, including that of a permeable network of streets and lanes, which respects existing Public Rights of Way, to help to encourage active and sustainable travel choices.</p>

9.	Question from Councillor Mike Collins to Cabinet Member Economy and Development, Councillor Victoria Atherstone
	Given the fact that this council has declared a climate emergency, what can be done to ensure that more is done to install additional Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points around our town? Can the cabinet member explore the possibility of including EV charging points as part of both new commercial and domestic planning developments as part of the application process, possibly by way of a planning condition?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The council is looking at options for the installation of more EV charging points in its own car parks and the procurement and partnership delivery options, having regard to the cost and feasibility of these in relation to the sufficiency of local power supply infrastructure. Planning policies can be used to facilitate future growth and the development of place. Long term planning strategies can incorporate policies to encourage the transition to ultra-low emission vehicles and there are several approaches we can take, including planning conditions, permitted development and new parking standards in the local plan. The Government has already amended permitted development rights to allow the installation of EV charge points in certain situations and amendments to the national building regulations are currently being consulted on, to ensure that all new developments with parking also have EV charge point provision. I will explore with officers how our local plan can best help shape the transition towards a low emission future.
10.	Question from Councillor Mike Collins to Cabinet Member Cyber and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	As a member of this councils Licensing Committee, we often receive applications for the introduction of A-boards and other street furniture to advertise businesses that are “off the beaten track” usually off the High Street and The Promenade. These items can often look untidy, nonstandard and generally clutter up the street scene. As part of our towns post Covid-19 rejuvenation plans would the cabinet member commit to contacting the Cheltenham Chamber of Commerce and the Business Improvement District (BID) as well as any other interested or influential bodies to discuss the possibility of installing a number of signposts that could accommodate a flag that could indicate the direction, name and type of business, as well as the distance from the signpost’s location? These need not be as grand as the regency poles that have been installed to direct visitors to the Town Hall, Library and Museum etc. Each pole could accommodate several flags, one for each individual business and these businesses could be asked to make a contribution to the cost of the installation and maintenance of their individual flag, which could be offset from the cost of the otherwise necessary licensing application fee.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	You need permission under the Highways Act 1980 to place an object on the public highway that will cause an obstruction. Both the High Street and Promenade are areas of public highway. An ‘object’ includes ‘A’ board advertising structures, these are therefore subject to licencing

	<p>application and approval. The Council has an approved policy for considering 'A' boards.</p> <p>Ensuring a strong and positive recovery from the pandemic is the highest importance to the council. We will take on board the ideas and share them with the BID (Business Improvement District) and the CERTF (Cheltenham Economic Recovery Task Force), however our current policy is to minimise street clutter and maintain a consistent approach to the streetscape, especially within key areas such as the High Street and the Promenade. Furthermore, if signage was placed for the purpose of advertising particular premises then planning permission is likely to be required.</p> <p>Signage of this form and scale is likely to be very costly to the council and would require high officer input to monitor, manage and maintain as business occupants turnaround. We currently have approximately 5,000 businesses within Cheltenham, of which ~700 are retail and ~400 food services, so I do not think this could be supported unless we can identify how the total number of signs could be fairly and efficiently controlled with tangible benefits to the businesses. There are however other solutions that the council could and are exploring to support our town's recovery.</p>
	Supplementary Question
	Would the Cabinet Member share the other solutions that he refers to in his final sentence?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	As a point of order, the question had been referred to the Cabinet Member Economy and Development, Councillor Victoria Atherstone . As part of Cheltenham economic recovery task force, we are looking into how all of Cheltenham's local businesses can best be supported. As part of this, we are exploring digitalisation and how businesses can market themselves through social media, digital apps, websites, single digital signage boards, etc, without the need for too much fixed infra structure on the streets.
11	Question from Councillor Louis Savage to Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman
	<p>The ongoing COVID lockdown and school closures are having a disproportionate impact on the mental and physical health of children, with those from disadvantaged families affected most.</p> <p>Council parks are essential to the mental and physical health of children and their parents, especially those not fortunate enough to have their own garden.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm that all Cheltenham Borough Council's parks and play facilities remain fully open?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Yes, all parks and play areas remain open.
12.	Question from Councillor Louis Savage to Cabinet Member Climate and Communities, Councillor Max Wilkinson

	<p>Since 2014 the Chinese government has pursued a policy in which it is estimated that 1 million Uyghur Muslims have been held in secretive detention camps without due legal process.</p> <p>The oppression of the Uyghur Muslim minority in China has been described by leading human rights organisations as the largest systematic persecution of an ethnic or religious minority group since World War 2.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member undertake to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure any contact between Cheltenham Borough Council representatives and officials of the Chinese government is brought to the attention of Full Council in advance (for example the 2018 trip to China made by the then Chief Executive)? - That any such contact will always include a formal expression of this Council ongoing commitment to fundamental human rights, including religious freedom?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Cllr Savage has raised an important issue that should give us all pause for thought. While the business of international relations will primarily fall to the Government, it is of course correct that Cheltenham Borough Council is mindful of its responsibilities and does all it can to promote human rights. I would like to think these points are raised as part of our discussions with twin towns, but I respect the independence of the Twinning Committee, which is chaired by Cllr Seacome. I will investigate the potential for a protocol relating to future trips and how these are reported back.</p>
	Supplementary Question
	<p>Cllr Savage did not have a question but said he would be in contact with the Cabinet Member to ask for his support in bringing a variation of this question back to Council as a motion.</p>
13.	Question from Councillor Louis Savage to the Leader
	<p>Cheltenham is of course grateful for the deep and enduring friendship of the people of Weihai, China, and will note particularly the generous gift of 10,000 face masks received from the people of our twin town at the height of the pandemic.</p> <p>Twinning visits to Cheltenham will offer visitors from Weihai the chance for free and open exchange of information and political opinions, something which is regrettably not always possible in their home country.</p> <p>Can our twinning links, now or in the future, be used to demonstrate our commitment to and promotion of democracy and fundamental human rights?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>Engagement and visits to any towns or places twinned with Cheltenham are led by the Twinning Association and its Executive Committee which is independent of the Council though with representation through three</p>

	<p>elected members and one officer.</p> <p>The principles of the Twinning Association are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ promote and foster friendship and understanding between the people of Cheltenham and the people of its twin and friendship towns and overseas visitors in general ▪ encourage visits by individuals and groups of all ages to and from its twin and friendship towns and to broaden the mutual understanding of the cultural, recreational, educational and commercial activities between the link towns ▪ promote and support the Council's sustainable community strategy and partnerships by working together to create a great future for Cheltenham <p>Cheltenham has been at the forefront of the post-war twinning movement and has sought to encourage friendships and education and sharing of cultures between people living in Cheltenham and its twin and friendship towns as a means to encourage peace and mutual understanding.</p> <p>As such the Twinning Association's activities are non-political in nature. Arrangements for twinning visits are typically made with local administrations rather than national governments.</p> <p>Any change to this approach of the Twinning Association and its future role would be a matter for the Executive Committee.</p>
--	---

9. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT - REVISED FORECAST 2020/21 AND BUDGET PROPOSALS 2021/22

The Cabinet Member Finance and Assets introduced the report and thanked Cheltenham Borough Homes (CBH) for going above and beyond in terms of maintaining services during the pandemic whilst providing additional support. Demand for Universal Credit had increased by 30% whilst arrears were reducing, a tribute to work with tenants building up debt. Covid had impacted the capital investment programme to a degree with some delays. Customer satisfaction remained high.

In terms of the specifics, the Cabinet Member Finance and Assets referred to the social housing white paper which proposed a charter for tenants. Looking at that so far CBH were complying with this which was positive.

Universal Credit roll out was still ongoing and there had been a big increase in take up due to the pandemic. Government had temporarily increased the maximum that can be claimed by £20 a week and the Cabinet Member advocated that this should be maintained.

In terms of rent, national policy was CPI plus 1% .The rent would be slightly less than anticipated as inflation was 0.5% so that resulted in a 1.5% rent rise. Whilst there would be less rent receipts, CBH have been able to freeze the management fee.

Under right to buy there is permission to spend money received, but this is restricted by a time limit. As part of the consultation CBC was lobbying

government for more flexibility in how that money is spent and the outcome of the consultation was eagerly awaited.

With regards to the proposed planning reform there was concern that the immediate impact may be the reduction of affordable housing being built and this had been raised in the council's response to the consultation.

The top priority for the 2021/2022 budget remained the provision of customer services. Assumptions were made with regard to the same level of voids, that right to buy would continue and there would be continued support from Homes England. There were also assumptions that garage rents would increase in line with housing rents with a 1.5% rise. Cleaning charges were being kept to a minimum at 0.4% and the net effect of this was the projection of an increased surplus, which would be put back into the services.

Other budget priorities focussed on climate change and CBC and CBH were working closely on this. With regard to community investment, this related to health and wellbeing, community safety, education and training, skills, and enabling community involvement. The projection was that this would equate to £15 million of social value being added into the community for the coming year.

The capital programme for next year amounted to £24 million – £9 million into existing stock. It focussed on measures to tackle climate change. Safety was a significant issue emphasised by Grenfell, and it was confirmed that all fire risk assessments were up to date and more vigorous standards were being introduced, starting with sheltered housing and places occupied by more vulnerable people would be brought in over the coming year. Asbestos checks were all up to date, however there may be more vigorous testing brought in for this too.

Significantly £15 million would go into new build with a 500 home target over the next 5 years.

Alongside this, work was being progressed on the private rented sector.

Further into the future there is planned investment of £30 million capital spend with up to £25 million on new builds.

Finally, Members were referred to appendix 5 which illustrated the great work CBH undertook.

In response to a question on the 2 ½ year wait for a response from the government on the use of right to buy, the Cabinet Member agreed that he would raise this with the Cheltenham MP.

Members made the following comments in the debate:

- Members recognised the great work CBH was undertaking in terms of managing the housing stock and new build and supporting tenants and the example of the arrears reduction was given, a particularly significant achievement during these extraordinary times. Thanks were given to the interim Chief Executive of CBH, the Board and all staff at CBH for all they continued to achieve.
- Social media engagement with the community via the community investment officers was welcomed

- The issue of small brownfield sites was raised and it was requested that CBC and CBH work together with professionals on the possibility of using these for housing.
- It was requested that more work was undertaken to build relationships to tackle anti-social behaviour due to the impact that this was having with local communities.

The Cabinet Member Housing undertook to take the issue with regard to brownfield sites to CBH.

The Leader emphasised the social value work that CBH was undertaking, and thanked them for this.

Summing up, the Cabinet Member Finance commented that there were smaller brownfield sites and Members were requested to make CBH aware of them so they could be investigated for their viability. Finally, he thanked the Interim Chief Executive of CBH and the Cabinet Member Housing responded that as suggested, there is no reason that smaller sites cannot be used for building on.

The Mayor moved to a recorded vote.

RESOLVED (unanimously) THAT:

1. **The revised HRA forecast for 2020/21 be noted;**
2. **The HRA budget proposals for 2021/22 (shown at Appendix 2) be approved, including a proposed rent increase of 1.5% and changes to other rents and charges as detailed within the report;**
3. **The HRA capital programme for 2021/22, as shown at Appendix 3, be approved.**

FOR: (35): Atherstone, Babbage, Baker, Barnes, Barrell, Britter, Brownstein, Coleman, Collins, Cooke, Dobie, Fisher, Flynn, Harman, Harvey, Hay, Hobley, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, Mason, McCloskey, McKinlay, Oliver, Payne, Savage, Seacome, Stafford, Stennett, Sudbury, Wheeler, Whyborn, Williams and Willingham.

AGAINST (0)

ABSTENTIONS (0)

10. GENERAL FUND REVENUE AND CAPITAL - REVISED BUDGET 2020/21, AND FINAL BUDGET PROPOSALS 2021/22

The Cabinet Member Finance and Assets presented the budget report, explaining that it continued the Covid recovery work which invested in the economy and tackling climate change. He wished to place on record his thanks to all staff for their efforts during Covid and praised them for rising to the challenge. He paid tribute to the Executive Director Finance and Assets and his team for their work on distributing a total of £31.4 m of business grants to date.

He explained that the budget before Members was based on the Covid recovery budget agreed by Council in November 2020. This had focussed on certain

asset disposals so the council was able to underwrite the budget for the next three years. Since November, the country had entered into a further lockdown which impacted the budget in terms of reduced income, amounting to a net £100k which would be funded from general balances. The 2021/22 budget builds on the recovery strategy. In terms of the national context, the government settlement was confirmed on 10 February and was only for one year which was disappointing, particularly as there had been promises of a business rates and fair funding review. On a positive note, government commitment to support loss of income by 75% had been extended to the end of June, although there was concern that loss of income would continue. It was therefore difficult to predict the impact of this and the impact of Covid on the potential to collect council tax and business rates. New Homes bonus had been extended for a further year and revenue support grant remained at zero. A lower tier service grant had been received amounting to £121k; this represented an adjustment grant and was top-sliced from the national new homes bonus allocation.

In terms of council tax support, more than 4,000 people locally had benefitted from the CBC scheme. The Gloucestershire business rates pool continued to prove beneficial meaning the council was £1.184m better off against its baseline target. Covid was having an impact on business rates as government had allowed zero rates. To that end, projected income has dropped but government funding was in place to cover this. Government had requested local authorities to delay billing until the national budget had been announced.

In preparing the budget, Cabinet were mindful of the economic difficulty many people and businesses were facing. The council continued to try to maximise efficiency, reduce costs and increase income where practicable and he was pleased to report that a further £400k of savings could be banked into this budget. This was an exceptional effort, given the circumstances.

The budget would continue to protect frontline services whilst investing in tackling climate change and economic growth locally. The council's commercial strategy, adopted in 2018 would continue, maximising the use of skills and assets and aiming to achieve long term, sustainable growth. Evidence showed that Cheltenham remained an attractive place to invest which was positive in terms of the council approach.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the following additional element of the proposals:

- inflation only assumed where demonstrated
- a 1% pay increase assumed in the base budget
- a freeze on fees and charges
- extending the flexible use of receipts policy
- reconfirmation of £1.5m investment in the cyber central project to ensure it was well resourced in order to seize on this massive opportunity for the wider community
- £75k into budget to support resourcing of carbon neutral projects
- £21k in base budget for the sustainable weeding regime
- £75k investment in economic development
- £75k investment in apprenticeships representing four extra posts to be recruited in the next 6 months

Capital Programme

- £0.4m set aside for high street towards Cambray phase of work
- £500k to fund disabled facilities grants
- £500k towards Cheltenham Trust to pump prime commercial activities
- £4.5m to fund PRS housing in addition to the affordable housing provision accounted for in the HRA.

The Cabinet Member referenced the reduction in PWLB rates by 1% which was a positive, with the CBC focus remaining on the local economy and service provision. He also referenced the large rolling programme of planned maintenance which had been scrutinised by the Asset Management Working Group.

In terms of consultation, he wished to thank the Budget Scrutiny Working Group, the C5 Parish Councils Group and the voluntary sector. The voluntary sector was pleased that the council intended to protect the grants such as community pride and emphasised the importance of tackling the social divide in the town.

He emphasised the legal requirement for S151 officer to publish a report on the proposals and referred Members to Appendix 2.

In terms of council tax, the Cabinet Member confirmed that district councils remained capped in terms of any increase without a referendum. The proposed council tax rise for Cheltenham equated to 2.34%, which represented less than 10 pence a week for a band D property, a modest amount for the investment being made in the town and the services provided.

The budget was seconded by Councillor Hay.

In response to a question relating to a breakdown of S106 drawdown in light of the move towards Community Infrastructure Levy, the Executive Director Finance and Assets explained that this was not traditionally part of budget setting but would be reported at year end and included in the budget monitoring report which is submitted to Cabinet.

Group Leaders were invited to address Council:

Councillor Harman, Conservative Group Leader, firstly wished to pay tribute to Kevan Blackadder, congratulated Cheltenham Town Football Club on its recent performance in the FA cup and thanked all volunteers currently assisting with the vaccination programme.

Moving on to the budget, he thanked the Executive Director Finance and Assets and his team. On behalf of his group, Councillor Harman advised Members of the following amendment (which had been circulated to Group Leaders in advance of the meeting).

Savings:

- Reduce cabinet posts by 3 = £42k pa saving
 - Move to 4-yearly elections = £32k pa saving (see note below)
- Total = £74k pa

Investments:

- Additional bring site recycling collections at peak times = £9k pa
- Community Investment Fund = £20k pa (i.e. £1k per ward)
- Climate Change Funding = £45k pa

Speaking to the amendment, Cllr Harman stated that Cheltenham was the only district in the county which did not have 4 yearly elections. Not only would this save money, but also provide the electorate with the opportunity to change the whole council if it wished to do so. Additionally, the current cycle caused a degree of confusion. Although the impact of 4-yearly elections would not be felt straight away, there was an elections equalisation reserve comprising £250k.

Should there be fewer elections in future, there would be ample headroom for this reserve to be drawn on in the first two years to make the savings available from next year.

In terms of the proposal relating to number of Cabinet Members, he emphasised that this was not about changing the functions of Cabinet, but rather that the funding of this role would be best allocated to projects, rather than an additional Cabinet Member. In total these measures would save £74k without effecting frontline services.

With regard to capital, Councillor Harman referred to an area of concern for residents in the borough which was the issues around bring sites around bank holidays and he proposed £9k to address this.

Secondly, he referred to a proposal for a community investment fund of £20k, comprising a £500 allocation for each ward councillor. This would represent a modest way locally for elected members who know the needs of their areas to allocate funding appropriately. Finally, Councillor Harman referred to an additional £45k, to supplement the existing budget, to tackle climate change and this could be used to fund the bus station feasibility study. Boosting public transport would assist greatly with carbon reduction in the town. He finished by saying that these proposed amendments would improve the budget proposals.

On behalf of the PAB, Councillor Stennett was invited to address Council. He congratulated the Executive Director Finance and Assets, and the finance team on putting together a balanced budget in these particularly difficult times. He commended the speed in which officers were able to provide financial support to businesses and the council tax support schemes. He supported the long term investment approach to generate funding to support services and his group would be supporting the budget proposals.

The conservative amendment was proposed by Councillor Harman, seconded by Councillor Babbage.

In response to a question on the amendment, Councillor Harman clarified that in terms of the proposed reduction in Cabinet Members, the intention was to redistribute the functions across a smaller number of Members.

The following points were raised in the debate on the amendment:

- Similar amendments had been proposed by the opposition in previous years and it was regretful they were being debated once again
- The £20k pot (£500 for each ward Councillor) proposed for community investment represented a token amount and would therefore be of minimal benefit; there were better means to leverage in additional funding for communities in cooperation with partners such as charities and community organisations.
- Abolishing the Cabinet Member Climate Change role would send out the wrong signal at a time when Cabinet was focused on supporting the climate emergency, which required significant community engagement. Additionally, it was important to recognise not only the knock on effect of the global crisis, but also the fact that businesses were struggling to deal with Brexit. There was a great need to do all we can to support the town in terms of innovation, green growth, connectivity, reimagining high streets, new planning policies and the significant investment in the Golden Valley development which would plan 4000 new homes, 40% of which would be affordable. The council was incredibly ambitious and innovative and this required significant Cabinet Member involvement.
- Regarding bring sites, it was noted that the last 12 months had been unprecedented with recycling increasing from 850t to 960t with a 49% increase at bring sites. Crews had worked tremendously hard and there was no evidence to suggest there were any particular issues around bank holidays. The proposed £9k would have minimal effect in improving the sites which cost £200k to operate.
- Four yearly election - more democracy is good; there were other authorities with elections by halves.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Babbage was disappointed with the reaction to the amendment. The investment for climate change would facilitate progress to the bus station feasibility study and this would make a difference to the town.

In summing up, Councillor Harman emphasised the importance of whole council elections. It would save money and would provide the opportunity to change the administration if the electorate wanted and, from his experience, it would provide clarity for residents. In terms of number of Cabinet Members, he did not want to downplay climate change but made the comparison with the County Council budget and the size of its Cabinet. He felt that the £1000 per ward community investment proposal would facilitate projects that would be of benefit to the town.

In responding to the amendment, the Cabinet Member Finance & Assets regretted the late input into the budget process by the opposition. He rejected the proposed reduction in size of the Cabinet particularly given the County Cabinet had increased in size. On principle he disagreed with the four yearly election proposal. Uberto had responded excellently in managing the levels of recycling caused by the impact of the pandemic with no specific issues on bank holidays.

The proposed community investment funding was minimal and the administration around it would absorb most of this allocation. As far as tackling

climate change was concerned, there was an additional £300k in the capital budget and £75k in revenue. This council had set itself a high target and a key determinant to its success would be the amount of government and other funding it would attract. Government changes to building regulations, energy policy and planning rules would also help in tackling climate change. He regretted the recent County Council decision not to support the Connecting Cheltenham proposals.

The Mayor moved to a recorded vote on the amendment.

FOR: (6): Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Savage, Seacome

AGAINST: (28): Atherstone, Baker, Barnes, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Flynn, Harvey, Hay, Hobley, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McCloskey, McKinlay, Oliver, Payne, Stafford, Stennett, Wheeler, Whyborn, Williams, Willingham.

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

The amendment was lost.

After a brief adjournment Members moved to the debate on the substantive. The following points were made:

- The Chair of the Audit, Compliance and Governance Committee explained that the committee had responsibility for signing off the statement of accounts. Last year the council's independent auditors had stated that the council was fiscally sound and fiscally well managed. He added that it was also one of the first local authorities in the country to distribute a support package for its local businesses, which was to be applauded.
- The £4.5m funding on the enabling of private rented sector housing was welcomed
- Thanks was given to officers in the licensing team for their consistent work to drive the recovery in the town, particularly when they go above and beyond. The example was given of the significant contribution the team made to the all-party parliamentary group on ideas for the recovery of the night time economy.
- There was recognition of the high level of financial stewardship by the Executive Director Finance and Assets and the finance team in delivering the budget.
- Providing apprenticeships was to be welcomed at a time when there had been an overall drop in funding from businesses in the period 2019-20
- CBC was one of the first authorities to publish a recovery strategy and thanks were given to the members of the Cheltenham Economic Recovery Task Force. 9 key priorities had been identified in the recovery plan for CBC to focus on over the coming months. The additional funding proposed in this budget would ensure the council is delivering for the residents and businesses in the town and for those businesses wishing to position themselves in Cheltenham.

- The capital programme was exciting and something to be proud of as it would really make a difference to the town. There was significant investment in the town's economy, giving the example of the airport, the minster innovation exchange and these capital projects would create jobs and wealth. Allotment investment was welcomed, parks and gardens play area refurbishment. Something for everyone given the challenging circumstances.

In seconding the budget, the Leader emphasised that there was a clear view and vision for the borough. The council had a strong track record of financial management and a bright future. She then gave a snapshot of the significant effort and financial investment the council had made in the town over the past year. This was staggering and she was really proud of the value for money the council provided for the town.

She thanked the Cabinet Member Finance for his significant contribution and wholly supported the budget moving forward.

In summing up, the Cabinet Member Finance thanked Members for their input.

The Mayor moved to a recorded vote on the substantive.

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1. The revised budget for 2020/21 be approved;**
- 2. The budget assessment by the Section 151 Officer at Appendix 2 be considered in agreeing the following recommendations;**
- 3. The final budget proposals be approved, including a proposed council tax for the services provided by Cheltenham Borough Council of £219.08 for the year 2021/22 based on a Band D property (an increase of 2.34% or £5.00 a year for a Band D property), as detailed in paragraphs 4.17 to 4.22;**
- 4. The growth proposals at Appendix 4 and outlined in Section 6 be approved;**
- 5. The savings / additional income totalling £400,000 and the budget strategy at Appendix 5 be approved;**
- 6. The use of reserves and general balances be approved, and the projected level of reserves as detailed at Appendix 6 be noted;**
- 7. The capital programme at Appendix 7 be approved;**
- 8. The programmed maintenance programme at Appendix 8 be approved;**
- 9. The flexible use of capital receipts strategy as detailed in Appendix 9 be approved;**
- 10. It be noted that the Council will remain in the Gloucestershire**

business rates pool for 2021/22 (paragraphs 4.6 to 4.16);

11. The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) detailed in Section 5 and Appendix 10 be approved;
12. The Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22 be approved, including the continued payment of a living wage supplement at Appendix 11;
13. A level of supplementary estimate of £100,000 for 2021/22, as outlined in Section 14, be approved.

FOR: (28): Atherstone, Baker, Barnes, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Coleman, Collins, Dobie, Fisher, Flynn, Harvey, Hay, Hobley, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, McCloskey, McKinlay, Oliver, Payne, Stafford, Stennett, Wheeler, Whyborn, Williams, Willingham.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (7) Babbage, Cooke, Harman, Mason, Savage, Seacome, Sudbury

11. COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2021-22

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Assets, Councillor Steve Jordan, introduced his report relating to the setting of the Council Tax for the year 2021/22. He commented that the Council had just agreed its budget and was now required to formally approve the total Council Tax for the residents of Cheltenham for the ensuing year, including the Council Tax requirements of the County Council, Police and, where relevant, parishes. He recommended members' support.

There being no questions or comments, the Mayor moved to a recorded vote.

RESOLVED (unanimously) THAT:

- the formal Council Tax resolution at Appendix 2 be approved
- the commentary in respect of the increase in Council Tax at Paragraph 6 of Appendix 2 be noted.

FOR: (35): Atherstone, Babbage, Baker, Barnes, Barrell, Boyes, Britter, Coleman, Collins, Cooke, Dobie, Fisher, Flynn, Harman, Harvey, Hay, Hobley, Holliday, Horwood, Jeffries, Jordan, Mason, McCloskey, McKinlay, Oliver, Payne, Savage, Seacome, Stafford, Stennett, Sudbury, Wheeler, Whyborn, Williams, Willingham.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

12. APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR-ELECT AND DEPUTY MAYOR-ELECT

The Chief Executive, Gareth Edmundson, introduced his report and confirmed that the Order of Precedence had been amended and up-dated. He then read out an amendment to the recommendation that had been circulated to members prior to the meeting.

There being no questions or comments, the Mayor moved to the vote.

RESOLVED THAT:

- **the Order of Precedence in Appendix 2 be noted.**
- **Councillor Sandra Holliday and Councillor Steve Harvey be put to the Annual Council Meeting for election as Deputy Mayor and Mayor respectively for the Municipal year 2021 - 2022.**

FOR: (32)

AGAINST: (2)

ABSTENTIONS: (1)

13. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were none.

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

None.

**15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 -EXEMPT INFORMATION
RESOLVED THAT:**

“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:

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

The Mayor declared an interest in this item and left the meeting.

16. EXEMPT MINUTES

The Deputy Mayor took the Chair.

As several Members had had problems accessing the Exempt Minutes from the Modern.Gov application, and thus had not been able to read them, it was agreed to defer the approval of the exempt minutes from the 7 December 2020 Council meeting to the next full meeting of Council in March.

Roger Whyborn

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank