



## COUNCIL

**MEETING** : Thursday, 23rd January 2014

**PRESENT** : Cllrs. Chatterton (Mayor), Hansdot (Sheriff & Deputy Mayor), James, Wood, Dallimore, Organ, Patel, Hilton, Haigh, Gravells, Durrant, Tracey, Hobbs, McLellan, C. Witts, Smith, Lugg, Noakes, Ravenhill, Hanman, Lewis, Wilson, S. Witts, Field, Williams, Llewellyn, Brown, Dee, Porter, Taylor, Beeley, Toleman and Gilson

### **Others in Attendance**

Peter Gillett – Corporate Director of Resources

Sue Mullins – Head of Legal and Policy Development and Monitoring Officer

Martin Shields – Director of Services and Neighbourhoods

Julian Wain – Chief Executive

Penny Williams – Democratic and Electoral Services Manager

**APOLOGIES** : Cllrs Bhaimia, Mozol and Randle.

### **62. MINUTES**

Subject to amending the minutes to record on page 13, to record that Cllr Hilton was being critical of the proposal to move the indoor market to the first floor of the food hall and other sites could be considered. P15, should read Sandhurst Lane rather than Sadlers Lane.

**Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2013 be approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.**

### **63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Chatterton declared a personal interest in the motion regarding the Cathedral as a member of the Cathedral Council.

Councillor Hansdot declared a personal interest in Item 8.

Councillor Smith declared a personal interest in item 12.

Councillor Field declared a personal interest in the motion regarding the Cathedral as an employee of the Cathedral.

### **64. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)**

**COUNCIL  
23.01.14**

Council received the following question from Kay Powell, a local resident, to the Leader of the Council.

*'Is the City Council planning to lease the car park at The Laurels in Tredworth to Gymnasium?'*

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that he would talk to officers and see if any discussions of that nature had taken place, but none had occurred as far as he was aware.

Council received the following question from Kay Powell to the Cabinet Member for Environment.

*'Why do you support the building of a riding arena on St James Park Tredworth, despite the fact that the last two open space strategies that the City Council has published have said that there is a serious lack of public open space in the Barton and Tredworth ward.'*

The Cabinet Member responded by stating that his reasons for supporting the riding arena proposal were set out in the letter that had been submitted to the planning department at that time. He further explained that he supported something that would be of benefit to the community in a deprived ward, for the benefit of children and for parents that could not afford to take their children horse riding. He also pointed out that the land wasn't being used as widely as it could, and therefore any projects that supported regeneration and helped to overcome deprivation were supported.

Kay Powell asked the following supplementary question;

*'If the land was fenced off it would be used by a far fewer number of people than it is currently used by as a public open space. How could you explain that, as I said it completely contravenes the open space strategy which says there is a serious lack of public open space and your letter of support says there is plenty.'*

The Cabinet Member responded by stating that he was sure his letter did not state that there was plenty of open spaces in Barton and Tredworth, but any open spaces in the City including Barton and Tredworth he would like to see used by the community and the residents, and what better way to do that than to have a riding arena that could be used by children of all ages and by adults.

Council received the following question from Mrs Grigg.

*'Can someone please address the issue on Metz way, one of the very large lampposts are out with no light bulbs at all. The last time there was this issue it took six months for the lamp to be repaired.'*

The Leader of the Council responded that he would report the matter to the County Council so that it could be actioned.

**65. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS (15 MINUTES)**

There were no petitions or deputations.

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

**66. ANNOUNCEMENTS (COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 2(VII))**

The Mayor asked that the Independent Remuneration Panel Questionnaires that each Councillor had received be completed as soon as possible. Further that in March the city would be receiving the reconstructed head of King Richard III and it would form the centrepiece of an exhibition at the museum and the Mayor encouraged all Members to visit the exhibition and any supporting events.

The Cabinet Member for the Environment addressed the Council and confirmed that there was no flood damage in the city following the storms and this was a testament to council officers and City Council partners. Moreover, it demonstrated the benefits of the investment in flood alleviation.

**67. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

It was moved by Councillor James (Leader of the Council) and seconded by Councillor Dallimore (Deputy Leader of the Council).

**Resolved: That Council procedure rules be suspended to allow the relevant officers to address the Council in respect of agenda items 8 (BT&T Service Review), 9 (Southgate Street Conservation Area and Management Proposals Review and Proposed Article 4 Direction), 10 (Committee on Standards in Public Life) and 11 (Electoral Arrangements for Gloucester City Council).**

**68. BT&T SERVICE REVIEW - IT MANAGED SERVICE PARTNERSHIP**

Council received a report, the purpose of which was to update Members on the strategic partnership proposals for IT service delivery and to seek approval for the commencement of the contract with Civica UK Limited.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources outlined the content of the report and explained that the future delivery of the IT service would be provided by Civica UK. This would entail the transfer of 9 staff to Civica UK for a period of up to 6 years with an option to extend for a further 2 years if agreeable to both parties. In addition it was proposed that a business analyst and contract manager would be retained in house. The savings detailed in the report were highlighted and Council were advised that this proposal offered a modern and dynamic IT service.

Members spoke in support of the proposals and recognised the benefits that the contract would bring.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources thanked Council for its support and explained that there would be strong performance measures put in place, and previous experience would be used to ensure that the contract delivered all the Council needed.

**Resolved:**

- (1) The proposals for the future delivery of the IT Service by Civica UK Ltd, to include the transfer of staff from the City Council to Civica UK Ltd for a period of up to six years with an option to extend for 2 years if agreeable to both parties, commencing 1<sup>st</sup> March 2014 or as soon as**

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

possible thereafter, subject to the formal conclusion of contractual arrangements be agreed.

- (2) Authority be delegated to the Corporate Director of Resources and Head of Legal and Policy Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, to conclude and enter into all the required legal and commercial arrangements for the contract to take effect be agreed.

**69. SOUTHGATE STREET CONSERVATION AREA AND MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS REVIEW AND PROPOSED ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION**

The Council received a report, the purpose of which was to inform Members of the Southgate Street Conservation Area and Management Proposals Review consultation exercise undertaken in September/October 2013 and to consider the adoption of the Review as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The Leader of the Council outlined the content of the report and explained that Southgate was a key gateway to the city that needed regeneration; moreover there were some fine buildings that needed restoration. Members were reminded of the consultation that had been undertaken and of the future work that would be carried out if the Review was adopted as an SPD.

In response to a question regarding permitted development rights and fees, Council was advised that only 16 houses were involved and the cost to the Council was negligible.

**Resolved:**

- (1) The review of the Southgate Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals document be approved as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD will at present be attached to the extant Core Conservation Policy A2 in the 1983 adopted Local Plan, which in due course will be replaced by the City Plan.
- (2) The Article 4(1) Direction for Southgate Street Conservation Area be confirmed.
- (3) Further Reviews of each of the City's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals Documents be undertaken, with consideration of further designation of Article 4 Directions, as resources permit.

**70. COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS IN PUBLIC LIFE - ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13**

The Council received the report of the Monitoring Officer, the purpose of which was to inform the Council of the work of the Committee on Standards in Public Life 2012/13 and identify changes which were needed to be made to the Council's governance arrangements in light of the report.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources outlined the content of the report and explained that code of conduct was to be amended to reflect the updated principles of public life as contained within the report.

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

**Resolved: That the Council's Code of Conduct for Members be amended to reflect the updated Seven Principles of Public Life, as set out in paragraph 3.5 of the report.**

**71. ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL**

The Council received the report of the Chief Executive which advised of the process of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) would be undertaking in its review of the electoral arrangements for Gloucester City Council, and which asked the Council to consider if consultation should be undertaken to review the cycle of elections for Gloucester City Council.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources outlined the content of the report and explained the rationale behind commencing consultation on whole Council elections.

During debate Members recognised that there were benefits and disbenefits for both whole council elections and elections by thirds. However Members were in agreement that public consultation should be undertaken and that all consultation channels should be used wherever possible.

Further, Members accepted that the boundary review was needed as there was disparity in ward sizes and the review would afford an opportunity to rectify imbalances regarding ward sizes.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources concluded the discussion by stating that he was pleased by the level of debate and the consensus on consultation.

**Resolved:**

- (1) The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) timetable be noted.**
- (2) That consultation on whether to change the cycle of elections from thirds to whole council elections be commenced.**

**72. IMPACT OF WELFARE REFORM IN RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF MOTION TO COUNCIL ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2013**

Council received a report, which updated the Council on the impacts of Welfare Reform. This report was before Council in response to the motion to Council on 12 September 2013 from Councillor Haigh,

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources outlined the content of the report and explained that the spare room subsidy was introduced in Gloucester on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2013. It was noted that some tenants had fallen into arrears and steps were in place to ensure that assistance was given to the neediest. Moreover, work was in place to assess discretionary housing payments, a new financial inclusion

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

officer post had been introduced and there was a Law Centre presence on site at GCH.

The Leader of the Labour Group thanked the Cabinet Member for the report, adding that the Citizens Advice Bureau and Law Centre carried out valuable work. Moreover, that the Council and tenants needed to be mindful of rogue landlords and that larger social housing properties for bigger families were needed. The Leader of the Labour Group concluded by asking that there was continued monitoring of the issue and that a future report was presented to Council and Overview and Scrutiny.

Further debate ensued, where the impact of the spare room subsidy on tenants was noted.

In response to concerns raised by Members regarding backdating of discretionary housing payments, the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources stated that every case would be considered on its merits.

**Resolved:**

- 1. The current position and effects of welfare reform and particularly the changes because of the spare room subsidy removal be noted.**

**and**

- (2) The support the City Council and its partners are providing to those affected by these changes be noted.**

**73. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS (COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12)**

Councillor Hilton asked the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources about the independent report on the City's financial affairs that stated that detailed options on next year's council budget should be presented to Members in September. Did the Cabinet Member agree with the statement?

Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources responded by explaining that he had not seen that report, however that Council process had to be worked through and Members had very good visibility of the budget setting process and received it in good time to draw conclusions from it. However the Cabinet Member welcomed the opportunity to see the report and would comment upon it once he had read it.

Councillor Hilton responded by explaining that in the previous year, information on the budget was shared just 25 hours before the council tax and budget was set. Further, that he had received details on the planned savings 2 days ago, which was 5 months later than the consultant had suggested. When would this situation be under control so that information was received at an appropriate time so that Members of the Council could plan ahead and consider the information? Further, under the Enterprise contract it was proposed that £1.5m in savings would be made over a two year period. Details had been received for the £500k the current year, but not for the following year and he hoped that for £1m Members would have all of the information including how it would be delivered and the impact in September

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

2015. He asked that an assurance be given as despite there being improvements it would benefit from further enhancement.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources responded that he would like to share information as quickly as he could and he was happy to talk to any Councillor or Group Leader on any matter of a budgetary nature. However he would be happy to read the detailed report.

Councillor Haigh asked the Leader of the Council when the Peer Review Report would be available and when it would be published on the Council's website.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that he was happy for the report to be published, and that he had been clear at the feedback meeting that it was important to be open with them. Further that there was a balance in the report in recognising what the Council did well and the areas where further attention was needed. When the final report was received it was hoped that it would reflect that balance.

Councillor Haigh responded by stating that the Peer Review Team had made it clear that they would be making some recommendations and offering some support and help in those areas. Councillor Haigh concluded by asking if the Council would accept that help and support.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that he could not accept recommendations in a report that he had not seen; but in response to the initial findings that the Peer Challenge Team had presented he felt that they were very accurate and very helpful, and if the final report contained those it would be received in the positive way in which it was intended.

Councillor Hilton addressed the Cabinet Member for Environment and stated that when the free garden waste collection started recycling rates rocketed to 46%, however they were now down to 36% which was a 14% under the target of 50% set by Gloucester City Council. He asked what had gone wrong with the Cabinet Members management of waste collection in Gloucester and why couldn't the target of 50% be achieved.

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded by stating that more and more people are using electronic devices so there was less paper and with regards to packaging manufacturers were cutting down on the waste. With regards to the garden waste he noted that more and more people were starting to compost and the consequence was a reduction in recycling. The Councils aim was to increase recycling, in 2015; a review of the fleet vehicles would help to increase kerb recycling and therefore figures would be increased resulting in less waste being sent to landfill.

Councillor Hilton responded by explaining that Cheltenham Borough Council recycling rate was 46%, a variance of 1%; Cotswold Council 60%, a variance of 2% and they were achieving that despite all of the new gadgets. He noted that recycling rates dropped back as soon as charges were introduced for recycling garden waste collection, and therefore asked the Cabinet Member to explain why charges were to be increased by a further 11% and would that set back the

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

recycling targets and would the Council see further underachievement if the price was raised.

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded that the proposals for the budget were being consulted upon, and that the Cabinet would have to wait until the consultation was completed before proposing a figure. The aim was to increase recycling and reduce the amount to landfill. He concluded by stating that he would be sitting down with officers, looking at trends and seeing where there was scope for improvement and looking at where the Council could achieve its targets.

Councillor Haigh asked the Cabinet Member for Environment about the comments made by the Secretary of State for Local Government that Councils should collect waste weekly and that he had produced a bin bible instructing councils on the merits of weekly collection. Did the Cabinet Member agree with the Secretary of State or was he wrong?

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded by stating that the fortnightly collection of residential waste worked well and that he saw no reason to change it, moreover it saved money.

Councillor Haigh responded by asking what else the Secretary of State was wrong about.

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded by stating that it was unfair to ask him to comment on that point.

Councillor McLellan asked the Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources if he knew the number of the backlog of claims that had not been dealt with.

The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources responded by stating that he would reply in writing about the backlogs.

Councillor Field explained that he had been contacted by the residents of Alvin Street in Kingsholm who had been very enterprising and had been picking up litter in their street, and that the Council had assisted them by giving them equipment and bags. Councillor Field explained that he had been asking for 2 litter bins to be placed on the right hand side of the road, on the garage side of London Road, whereas there were two on Wellington Parade side of the Road, and neither were used by the public, could some litter bins be placed on the other side of the road where they are needed.

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded by saying 'thank you' to the volunteers and that he would look to get the litter bins relocated.

Councillor Smith referred to the environmental report that had been issued and that there were some improvements due to Saintbridge balancing pond and if the Cabinet Member could explain what those were?

The Cabinet Member for Environment responded that he only received the information that afternoon and that he not had a chance to go through all of the



**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

details but that he would forward the information to Councillor Smith in the briefing next month.

Councillor Smith expressed her surprise as she expected the Cabinet Member to know the content of a report that had been issued in his name.

The Cabinet Member for Environment reported that there had been an update that afternoon that went into detail on what was involved and what was to be carried out. He reiterated that the information would be provided in due course.

Councillor Porter asked if the Leader of the Council agreed that the comments contained in the article published in this week's Private Eye did little to enhance the reputation of this authority, damaged civic pride in this great city of ours and reflected poorly on the financial controls that had been achieved in recent years.

The Leader of the Council responded that he was aware of the article that Councillor Porter referred to. He agreed that it was not the type of publicity the Council would choose, and he didn't think it reflected on any financial controls. However, it was right that any allegations such as those that were made, are taken seriously even if they are in publications with reputations like Private Eye. He added that there wasn't any Councillor involvement in the appointment that the article referred to, and he had been assured by senior management the correct process had been followed at all times; but he had asked the Council's Audit and Assurance Manager to carry out an investigation to make sure the correct procedure had been followed and the Council could have complete confidence in the process and its outcome.

Councillor Lugg asked the Leader of the Council on progress regarding Paju.

The Leader of the Council responded that the memorandum, of understanding was being drafted and it was hoped that the matter could be progressed soon.

Councillor Hobbs asked the Leader of the Council about the hoardings by Kwiksave at the bottom of Northgate Street, he added that the hoardings around the Peel and the back parts of Sainsbury's had all been falling down as they had been up for some period of time. However it was now making the entrance way to the Quays and the city very unsightly and had he had any contact with Peel or any other of the Kwiksave owners now to get the hoardings replaced and renewed to make the city look pleasant.

The Leader of the Council responded that he hadn't had any contact with Kwiksave on that site regarding that particular issue and that he wasn't aware of that issue on that site, but he could do that. He knew that from conversations with representatives of Peel that they were considering how they dealt with hoardings on that site in the future.

The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that he was aware of the missing boards and that he had brought it to the attention of the Neighbourhood Services Manager who had in turn brought it to the attention of Peel Holdings and they had assured the Council that works would be underway soon but that a completion date had not been given.

**COUNCIL**  
**23.01.14**

Councillor Hobbs said that it was a planning enforcement issue

Councillor S Witts asked The Cabinet Member for Environment if he knew how many streets across Gloucester had received unsigned letters from the Council requesting the removal of vehicles from those streets from between 7am in the morning and 3pm in the afternoon to facilitate black bin waste collection and recycling collection

The Cabinet Member for Environment explained that he did not know how many streets the unsigned letters had been sent to but he was aware of a street in Councillor Witts' ward that had received the letters. He explained that although the letters were unsigned they were on Council headed paper so residents would have taken them to be genuine and the reason the letters were issued was due to difficulties Amey were having with waste collections. He further explained that the residents are complying with the requests and the waste is being collected. Members were advised that Ebor Road was a dead-end street and for the large vehicles to go to the end and then to reverse back had resulted in damage to cars so that was why this request was made to residents and that they had been complying. There was a similar issue in Matson Place, again residents have been complying. However in the future letters would go out named and signed.

Councillor S Witts responded by asking which other streets across the city had received the letters and asking that she was provided with the information as she had asked before.

The Cabinet Member for Environment agreed to find out the information and provide it to Councillor S Witts.

Councillor Field asked the Leader of the Council that with the High Court battle between Leicester and York rumbling on developing into a very unseemly squabble for the bones of Richard III it was now time to suggest that there could be third way given our long association with royalty in this city, thinking of William the Conqueror and Henry III being crowned in Gloucester Cathedral and Edward II being buried there, perhaps it was time for us to say we'll have him instead.

The Leader of the Council responded by saying that arguing on the resting place of a long dead monarch is an unseemly squabble and it is best that we stay out of it.

**74. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Moved by Councillor Hilton and seconded by Councillor Hilton.**

This Council notes that Gloucester Cathedral is listed as a top five UK visitor attraction in 'Which' magazine readers' survey.

This Council notes and welcomes plans under Project Pilgrim to invest £5M in the Cathedral and its grounds.

**COUNCIL  
23.01.14**

This Council agrees to approach the Dean and Chapter to consider whether to apply to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport for Gloucester Cathedral to be listed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site”.

After debate the motion was carried.

**Moved by Councillor Haigh and seconded by Councillor Hobbs**

Government figures show that people in Gloucester earn on average less than elsewhere in the South West, and that the region has lower earnings than the UK average. In addition to this, people in the city are typically £1600 a year worse off as a result of the Tory led Coalition Government. The cost of Cameron is a price the people of this city cannot afford!

This Council resolves to make efforts to bring more skilled and well-paid jobs to the City and to work with partners to ensure that people that live in the City have the right skills to take those opportunities when they come.

Upon debate the motion was lost.

**Moved by Councillor Haigh and seconded by Councillor Hobbs**

This Council notes the importance of the Guildhall as a significant venue for live music and the reputation it has enjoyed for many years across the City and beyond. However, in order to continue to be able to attract quality live acts, the technical equipment needs to be of an acceptable standard.

The front of house sound desk and monitor desk are now at the end of their usable life, and no longer meet the requirements of bands who perform at the venue. The Guildhall is having to hire suitable equipment in order to meet these technical requirements. This is not sustainable in the long term. Therefore, this Council requests that the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Culture investigates the costs of updating the sound desks and produces a report and business case for an equipment upgrade to Cabinet as a matter of urgency.

After debate the motion was carried.

**Time of commencement: 19:00 hours**

**Time of conclusion: 21:30 hours**

**Chair**