



COUNCIL

MEETING : Thursday, 30th January 2020

PRESENT : Cllrs. Finnegan (Sheriff & Deputy Mayor), Cook, H. Norman, Gravells, James, Morgan, Watkins, Hilton, Stephens, Tracey, Lugg, Hanman, Lewis, Wilson, Bhaimia, Haigh, Williams, D. Brown, Dee, Taylor, Field, Hansdot, Patel, Toleman, D. Norman, Pullen, Hampson, Brooker, Brazil, J. Brown, Coole, Derbyshire, Hyman, Melvin, Ryall, Walford and Bowkett

Others in Attendance

Managing Director
Corporate Director (Partnerships)
Corporate Director (Transformation)
Head of Policy and Resources
Head of Communities
Head of Place
Head of Culture and Traded Services
Solicitor
Policy and Governance Manager
Democratic and Electoral Services Team Leader

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Organ

54. MINUTES

54.1 The minutes of the meetings held on 21 and 27 November 2019 were approved and signed by the Deputy Mayor as a correct record.

55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

55.1 Councillor Watkins declared an interest in Notice of Motion five by virtue of her being the Chair of Marketing Gloucester Limited (MGL) and advised that she would not take part in the debate.

55.2 Councillor Stephens raised a point of order asking whether Councillor Watkins (as current Chair of MGL) and Councillor James (as the former Chair of MGL) would withdraw and not vote on Notice of Motion five. The Monitoring Officer advised that there were no disclosable pecuniary interests

COUNCIL
30.01.20

related to the motion and, in respect of other interests, they would not relate to the substance of what the motion sought to achieve.

56. CALL OVER

56.1 The Deputy Mayor invited Members to indicate whether they wished to reserve agenda items 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 for discussion. Members indicated that they wished to reserve items 9, 10 and 11 for discussion.

56.2 Councillor Cook (Leader of the Council) moved and Councillor H Norman (Deputy Leader of the Council) seconded that the Political Balance on Committees – Review and the Programme of Meetings, May 2020-April 2022 be approved.

56.3 **RESOLVED that:-** the Political Balance on Committees – Review be approved.

56.3 **RESOLVED that:-** the Programme of Meetings, May 2020-April 2022 be approved.

57. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

57.1 A Gloucester resident advised that he had submitted his question, regarding how many unknown persons had been cremated, in advance. Councillor Cook advised that the responsibility of identifying deceased individuals rested with the coroner and the police. He informed residents and Members that unidentified persons were buried and not cremated. And that between 2010 and 2018, no unknown persons were cremated.

58. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS (15 MINUTES)

58.1 There were no petitions or depositions.

59. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Deputy Mayor

59.1 The Deputy Mayor informed Members that the Mayor's children's Christmas party was a great success and thanked Councillors Tracey and Lewis for their assistance in organizing the events.

59.2 The Deputy Mayor also informed Members of two upcoming dates. The Annual Civic Service would be held on 8 March at 3pm and the Mayor's Charity Ball would take place on 22nd May at Hatherley Manor.

The Leader of the Council

59.3 Councillor Cook updated Members about the Mayor following his recent car accident. He advised that the Mayor was awaiting operations and was unsure he would be remaining in hospital. The Mayor remained in good

COUNCIL
30.01.20

spirits and Councillor Cook advised that he had conveyed all Members' best wishes.

Members of the Cabinet

- 59.4 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Strategy, Councillor Gravells, informed Members that the Housing Secretary had recently launched the Building Better – Building Beautiful report and that it complemented the work of the planning policy team in Gloucester.
- 59.5 The Cabinet Member for Culture and Leisure, Councillor Morgan, congratulated the staff at the Guildhall on their winning three awards at the Best Bar None awards. The Guildhall retained accredited status, won the silver award and the best family and community venue in Gloucester.
- 59.6 The Cabinet Member for Performance and Resources, Councillor Norman, advised that the new contact centre with new IT was now operational. This would allow staff to spend more time with those most in need and thanked all officers involved as well as Civica IT.

Chairs of Committees

- 59.7 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Coole, advised Members that they had recently given evidence to Newham's Democracy and Civic Participation Commission. Councillor Coole stated that the Commission welcomed Gloucester's innovative scrutiny process.

60. MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME

- 60.1 Councillor Hilton conveyed the Liberal Democrat Group's best regards to the Mayor. Councillor Hilton asked Councillor James if he could confirm whether he had been on holiday to Italy with the former Chief Executive of MGL while he himself was Chair. Councillor James confirmed that he had and that it was a wedding gift.
- 60.2 Councillor Hilton asked Councillor James who had paid for travel and accommodation on said trip. Councillor James reiterated that it was a wedding gift and he had consulted the rules on receiving gifts and considered that this gift did not come within the scope of the rules.
- 60.3 Councillor Stephens wished the Mayor a speedy recovery. Councillor Stephens asked Councillor Cook if he could accept or refute the allegation that senior officers had pressurized MGL to organise unaffordable events. Councillor Cook stated that he was not involved in MGL at the time and that he could neither confirm nor deny such an allegation.
- 60.4 Councillor Stephens asked Councillor Cook to clarify whether senior Conservative Members had placed pressure upon either MGL or officers with regard to such events. Councillor Cook advised that the Cabinet (except Councillor James) had approved the funding cut and this was the extent of his knowledge.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

- 60.5 Councillor Hilton asked Councillor James to confirm whether Councillor Melvin had assisted in drawing up the tender documents for the sale of the Herbert, Kimberley and Philpotts warehouses. Councillor James replied by stating that there was no such involvement on Councillor Melvin's part.
- 60.6 Councillor Hilton asked Councillor James whether he agreed that, if Councillor Melvin did assist, it was inappropriate given Councillor Melvin's interest in part of the property. Councillor James advised that the tender documents were drawn up by officers.
- 60.7 In relation to the recent purchase of St. Oswald's Retail Park and, specifically, the land to the rear of the site, Councillor Stephens asked Councillor James if an indication could be given as to the process by which plans would be taken forward and a likely timescale. Councillor James advised that the land was jointly owned by the City Council and Tesco. He further advised that he had asked for a report to be brought to Cabinet in March which should show the way forward and Tesco's intentions.
- 60.8 Councillor Stephens stated that, as a landlord, this provided an opportunity for social housing. Did the Cabinet Member of Planning and Housing Strategy agree that social housing was the most pressing housing need. Councillor Gravells advised that there had been discussions with a number of social housing providers and that it was necessary to continue negotiations. As these were commercial issues, there was a need for confidentiality.
- 60.9 Councillor Wilson asked Councillor H. Norman regarding reports on Marketing Gloucester which referred to concerns regarding amounts of payments CEO sent to himself. He asked:
- Were these payments made for "consultancy" services provided in the setting up of UK:DRIC,
 - were they part of the £476,000 total spend,
 - who approved these payments and;
 - how much was the total?
- 60.10 Councillor H. Norman informed Councillor Wilson that a review of UK:DRIC would be undertaken and that she would write to him with the answers to his questions.
- 60.11 Councillor Pullen asked Councillor Cook what preparations were being made to re-tender the Amey contract and whether there was enough resource available. Councillor Cook responded that officers were taking tendering very seriously and that he was hopeful it would be done in partnership.
- 60.12 Councillor Pullen then asked that Councillor Cook give a guarantee that a full options appraisal would be carried out including the option to bring the service back 'in house.' Councillor Cook confirmed that a full options appraisal would be carried out including the option to bring the service back 'in house'.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

- 60.13 Councillor Field asked Councillor Cook if he would join him in condemning the vandalism that had been committed around the space at Milton Avenue and if he would meet with him to explore how the site could be made more secure. Councillor Cook agreed that vandalism should not be tolerated and stated that he would meet Councillor Field to explore options.
- 60.14 Councillor Coole asked Councillor Cook what action the Council was taking to build resilience in case of extreme weather events. Councillor Cook stated that there was capacity and that officers were engaged in flood mitigation.
- 60.15 Councillor Coole then asked if Councillor Cook would agree to liaise with other bodies including the County Council. Councillor Cook confirmed that he had regular meetings with his counterpart at the County Council and that a climate officer was now in place.
- 60.16 Councillor D. Brown noted that the Gloucester Business Improvement District had been paying MGL £3.9k for maintenance. He asked Councillor Cook if the BID had made any other payments for events. Councillor Cook advised that this was a matter for the BID itself.
- 60.17 Councillor Hansdot asked Councillor Watkins why officers were advising those who had been served a notice of eviction to remain in the property until bailiffs attend. Councillor Watkins advised that individuals had to remain in the property for as long as was legal. She stated that as the Homelessness Reduction Act had been enacted, much prevention work had been undertaken. Councillor Watkins encouraged Members to raise cases with officers.

Questions to Chairs of Committees

- 60.18 Councillor Haigh asked the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, Councillor Melvin, if the minutes of MGL performance review meetings had been circulated to that Committee. Councillor Melvin advised that this would be followed up.

61. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2020-21

- 61.1 Councillor H. Norman moved and Councillor Cook seconded the motion. Councillor Norman advised Members that, prior to 2013, the Council Tax Support Scheme was a national scheme but that now it was a local scheme. She referred Members to Appendix 1 of the report which outlined the changes and highlighted that there would be no minimum charge for residents.
- 61.2 Councillor Norman also stated that the new process would be streamlined and that a consultation was conducted. The results of this consultation had been shared with social housing providers.
- 61.3 Councillor Haigh moved an amendment to include the recommendation of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that War Pensions be disregarded as income for the purposes of calculating the level of Council Tax support.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

Councillor Norman advised that this provision would be included in the scheme.

61.4 RESOLVED that: -

- (1) the changes recommended to the 2019/20 Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2020/21 be adopted as the approved scheme for Gloucester City Council
- (2) The scheme approved at 2.1 (1) above be updated to align with any legislation changes in January 2020 and to be implemented from 01 April 2020; and
- (3) That War Pensions be disregarded as income in the scheme.

62. CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

62.1 The Chair of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Williams, moved and Councillor Taylor the motion.

62.2 Councillor Williams informed Members that the proposed constitutional changes had been discussed by the General Purposes Committee, the Audit and Governance Committee and with the Trade Unions.

62.3 Councillor Haigh moved and Councillor Stephens seconded an amendment that the proposed amendment to para. 23.01 be removed so as to remove the requirement that a Member leave the chamber should they disclose a disposable pecuniary interest. The amendment was accepted.

62.4 Councillor Stephens requested that the length of speeches for budget amendments be altered to state five minutes rather than three minutes as agreed by the General Purposes Committee.

62.4 **RESOLVED that :-** Council adopt the proposed changes to the Constitution save for removing the proposed amendment to para. 23.01 that would require a Member leave the chamber should they disclose a disposable pecuniary interest and that speeches for budget amendments be five minutes.

63. APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT MEMBER TO THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE AND CHANGES TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

63.1 The Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, Councillor Melvin moved and Councillor Brooker seconded the motion. Councillor Melvin outlined the proposed changes which would see an independent (non-Councillor) Member appointed to the Committee and that, from the next Civic Year, the Chair would not be a Member of party which formed the administration.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

- 63.2 Councillor Haigh expressed concern about the performance and accountability of the proposed independent Member and asked that a procedure be drawn up to provide for their removal should it be necessary. She also suggest that recruitment be conducted by a cross-party of Members.
- 63.3 Councillor Melvin withdrew the motion pending further consideration by the Audit and Governance Committee.

64. POLITICAL BALANCE ON COMMITTEES - REVIEW

64.1 **RESOLVED that: -**

- (1) The size of all Committees be reduced by one with immediate effect and;
- (2) The proposed changes to membership of Committees as set out in Appendix 1 to this report be approved.

65. PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS, MAY 2020-APRIL 2022

65.1 **RESOLVED that:-**

Subject to any further changes, the two-year programme of ordinary meetings of Council and other meetings for the period of May 2019 to April 2021 be approved.

66. NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice of Motion from Councillor Haigh

- 66.1 Councillor Haigh moved and Councillor Derbyshire seconded the following motion:

“This Council has a responsibility to house young people leaving the care of the County Council who have a connection to Gloucester. The County Council supports care leavers until the age of 25 recognising that these young people often face extensive challenges for a variety of reasons and sometimes need extra support to assist them to transition to adulthood.

This Council recognises that we should also support them through their mistakes and provide guidance to help them make more positive choices in the future. Maintaining a stable home can be particularly difficult for care leavers and being deemed intentionally homeless can mean that they slip through the net of support.

This Council resolves to change our housing policy to ensure that no care leaver with a connection to Gloucester is classed as intentionally homeless and that they are always supported back into accommodation and to work with the County Council to help to maintain that tenancy.”

COUNCIL
30.01.20

- 66.2 Councillor Watkins moved and Councillor Gravells seconded the following amendment:

“This Council has a responsibility to house young people leaving the care of the County Council who have a connection to Gloucester. The County Council supports care leavers until the age of 25 recognising that these young people often face extensive challenges for a variety of reasons and ~~sometimes~~ **often** need extra support to assist them to transition to adulthood.

This Council ~~recognises that we~~ should also support them through their ~~mistakes and~~ **care leavers to** provide guidance to help them make more positive choices ~~in the~~ **for their** future. Maintaining a stable home can be particularly difficult for care leavers and being deemed intentionally homeless can mean that they slip through the net of support.

This Council resolves to change our housing policy to ensure that ~~no~~ care leavers ~~with a connection to Gloucester is classed as intentionally homeless and that they are always supported back into accommodation~~ **are given a priority where this is appropriate for their circumstances** and to work with the County Council to help to maintain ~~that~~ **their** tenancy.”

- 66.3 The amendment was not accepted.
- 66.4 The amendment was put to the vote and was carried. It therefore became the substantive motion. A proposed amendment by the Liberal Democrat group was withdrawn.
- 66.5 The motion was put to the vote and was carried.
- 66.6 **RESOLVED that:-**

“This Council has a responsibility to house young people leaving the care of the County Council who have a connection to Gloucester. The County Council supports care leavers until the age of 25 recognising that these young people often face extensive challenges for a variety of reasons and often need extra support to assist them to transition to adulthood.

This Council should also support care leavers to provide guidance to help them make positive choices for their future. Maintaining a stable home can be particularly difficult for care leavers and being deemed intentionally homeless can mean that they slip through the net of support.

This Council resolves to change our housing policy to ensure that care leavers are given a priority where this is appropriate for their circumstances and to work with the County Council to help to maintain their tenancy.”

Notice of Motion from Councillor Stephens


- 66.7 Councillor Stephens moved and Councillor Pullen seconded the following motion:

COUNCIL
30.01.20

“Council notes that the government has issued the provisional local government finance settlement for 2020/21.

Council further notes that the headline change for Gloucester is an increase of 1.4% in Core Spending Power and that without a one-off increase in New Homes Bonus Gloucester City Council would have again seen a negative change.

The chart below illustrates how we compare to other authorities and England as a whole.



Council is disappointed to note that we are well below the shire district average of 3.4% and significantly below England as a whole at 6.3%.

Historically Gloucester has received a bad deal from the government in terms of funding. The Centre for Cities 2019 outlook report set out the impact of austerity in the past decade; total spending in Gloucester has reduced by 23.4%, meaning the City ranks 9th in terms of total change. Gloucester is also the worst hit district council in the country.

The government produced Indices of Deprivation 2019 show that Gloucester has some of the most impoverished wards in the country. As an example, areas in Matson, Robinswood and White City ranks in the worst 0.1% nationally for some issues.

The level of need in the City is clearly not reflected in the provisional local government finance settlement when compared to other similar authorities and Gloucester residents are severely disadvantaged by this.

Council resolves to:

**COUNCIL
30.01.20**


1. Make urgent representations to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for a significant increase in funding for the City.
2. Seek the intervention of the City MP to lobby for a significant increase and fairer funding in the settlement available to Gloucester City Council.”

66.8 Councillor H. Norman moved and Councillor Cook seconded the following amendment:

“Council notes that the government has issued the provisional local government finance settlement for 2020/21.

Council further notes that the headline change for Gloucester is an increase of 1.4% in Core Spending Power and that without a one-off increase in New Homes Bonus Gloucester City Council would have again seen a negative change.

The chart below illustrates how we compare to other authorities and England as a whole.



Council is disappointed to note that we are well below the shire district average of 3.4% and significantly below England as a whole at 6.3%.

Historically Gloucester has received a bad **challenging** deal from the government in terms of funding, **which has forced us to work innovatively and challenge the status quo**. The Centre for Cities 2019 outlook report set out the impact of austerity in the past decade; total spending in Gloucester has reduced by 23.4%, meaning the City ranks 9th in terms of total change. Gloucester is also the worst hit district council in the country.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

The government produced Indices of Deprivation 2019 show that Gloucester has some of the most impoverished wards in the country. As an example, areas in Matson, Robinswood and White City ranks in the worst 0.1% nationally for some issues.

The level of need in the City is clearly not reflected in the provisional local government finance settlement when compared to other similar authorities and Gloucester residents are severely disadvantaged by this.

Council however welcomes that this authority has received £1.847 million in grant funding from government and organisations such as the Arts Council in the years 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 alone, in addition to £1.474 million in capital grant funding.

Additionally, this council has implemented a Property Investment Strategy which not only assists this Council in achieving its council plan objective, but also provides an income to this council in order to safeguard services.

Council resolves to:

3. Make urgent representations to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for a significant increase in funding for the City.

Seek the intervention of the City MP to lobby for a significant increase and fairer funding in the settlement available to Gloucester City Council.”

66.9 The amendment was accepted and, as such, became the substantive motion.

66.10 The motion was put to the vote and was carried.


66.11 **RESOLVED that: -**

“Council notes that the government has issued the provisional local government finance settlement for 2020/21.

Council further notes that the headline change for Gloucester is an increase of 1.4% in Core Spending Power and that without a one-off increase in New Homes Bonus Gloucester City Council would have again seen a negative change.

The chart below illustrates how we compare to other authorities and England as a whole.

COUNCIL 30.01.20



Council is disappointed to note that we are well below the shire district average of 3.4% and significantly below England as a whole at 6.3%.

Historically Gloucester has received a bad challenging deal from the government in terms of funding, which has forced us to work innovatively and challenge the status quo. The Centre for Cities 2019 outlook report set out the impact of austerity in the past decade; total spending in Gloucester has reduced by 23.4%, meaning the City ranks 9th in terms of total change. Gloucester is also the worst hit district council in the country.

The government produced Indices of Deprivation 2019 show that Gloucester has some of the most impoverished wards in the country. As an example, areas in Matson, Robinswood and White City ranks in the worst 0.1% nationally for some issues.

The level of need in the City is clearly not reflected in the provisional local government finance settlement when compared to other similar authorities and Gloucester residents are severely disadvantaged by this.

Council however welcomes that this authority has received £1.847 million in grant funding from government and organisations such as the Arts Council in the years 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 alone, in addition to £1.474 million in capital grant funding.

Additionally, this council has implemented a Property Investment Strategy which not only assists this Council in achieving its council plan objective, but also provides an income to this council in order to safeguard services.

Council resolves to:

COUNCIL
30.01.20

4. Make urgent representations to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for a significant increase in funding for the City.

Seek the intervention of the City MP to lobby for a significant increase and fairer funding in the settlement available to Gloucester City Council.”

Notice of Motion from Councillor Coole

66.12 Councillor Coole moved and Councillor Ryall seconded the following motion:

“Council notes:

- That 2020 marks 20 years since Overview and Scrutiny was introduced to most councils in England
- That Gloucester remains at the forefront of innovation in Scrutiny, employing best practice that has been recognised both regionally and nationally through the LGIU and CFPS.
- That Overview and Scrutiny is a vital part of the decision-making process in Gloucester, and has added value to significant decisions affecting residents across the City.
- The nature of the decision-making process is changing as councils diversify how they operate and generate income in light of cuts to funding.

Council resolves:

- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny has sufficient resource to carry out its duties effectively
- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny maintains parity of esteem with the cabinet
- To ensure that, as decision making changes and becomes more time sensitive, with an increase in urgent decisions, that measures are put in place to maintain transparent and robust scrutiny of all decisions.”

66.13 Councillor H. Norman moved and Councillor Cook seconded the following amendment:

“Council notes:

- That 2020 marks 20 years since Overview and Scrutiny was introduced to most councils in England
- That Gloucester remains at the forefront of innovation in Scrutiny, employing best practice that has been recognised both regionally and nationally through the LGIU and CFPS.
- That Overview and Scrutiny is a vital part of the decision-making process in Gloucester, and has added value to significant decisions affecting residents across the City.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

- The nature of the decision-making process is changing as councils diversify how they operate and generate income in light of cuts to funding.

Council resolves:

- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny has sufficient resource to carry out its duties effectively
- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny maintains parity of esteem with the cabinet
- To ensure that, as decision making changes and becomes more time sensitive, with an increase in urgent decisions, that measures are put in place to maintain transparent and robust scrutiny of all decisions **transparency.**"

66.14 The amendment was accepted and as such became the substantive motion.

66.15 The motion was put to the vote and was carried:

66.16 **RESOLVED that:-**

“Council notes:

- That 2020 marks 20 years since Overview and Scrutiny was introduced to most councils in England
- That Gloucester remains at the forefront of innovation in Scrutiny, employing best practice that has been recognised both regionally and nationally through the LGIU and CFPS.
- That Overview and Scrutiny is a vital part of the decision-making process in Gloucester, and has added value to significant decisions affecting residents across the City.
- The nature of the decision-making process is changing as councils diversify how they operate and generate income in light of cuts to funding.

Council resolves:

- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny has sufficient resource to carry out its duties effectively
- To ensure that Overview and Scrutiny maintains parity of esteem with the cabinet
- To ensure that, as decision making changes and becomes more time sensitive, with an increase in urgent decisions, that measures are put in place to maintain transparency.”

Notice of Motion from Councillor Hilton

66.17 Councillor Hilton moved and Councillor Field seconded the following motion:

COUNCIL
30.01.20

“This council notes the large number of empty commercial buildings that there are in or around the city centre and the negative impact these empty properties have on the city council’s regeneration plans.

This council agrees that too many land/property owners are failing to progress projects to either sell them, refurbish them or to build new positive buildings as replacements.

This council asks the cabinet member to do more to tackle this problem and to provide a written report to this council on what he plans to do to improve the situation.”

66.18 The motion was put to the vote and was carried.

66.19 **RESOLVED that:-**

“This council notes the large number of empty commercial buildings that there are in or around the city centre and the negative impact these empty properties have on the city council’s regeneration plans.

This council agrees that too many land/property owners are failing to progress projects to either sell them, refurbish them or to build new positive buildings as replacements.

This council asks the cabinet member to do more to tackle this problem and to provide a written report to this council on what he plans to do to improve the situation.”

Notice of Motion from Councillor Wilson

66.20 Councillor Wilson moved and Councillor Hilton seconded the following motion:

This council notes the report that was presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in relation to the organisational and financial failings of Marketing Gloucester Ltd, a company 100% owned by Gloucester City Council.

This council welcomes the recommendations in the report and the resolutions agreed by the OSC.

This council calls for a written apology from the former chair of the board and former leader of this council, who was responsible for the financial and organisational crisis that has hit MGL, which forced this council to bailout the company to the tune of £240,000 to help keep the company solvent.”

66.21 Councillor Haigh moved and Councillor Stephens seconded the following amendment:

“This council notes the report that was presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in relation to the organisational and financial failings of Marketing Gloucester Ltd, a company 100% owned by Gloucester City Council.

COUNCIL
30.01.20

This council welcomes the recommendations in the report and the resolutions agreed by the OSC, **but notes that the report does not address the role of the Cabinet or senior officers in the Marketing Gloucester crisis, and resolves to commission an independent report into these matters, to be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a matter of urgency.**

This council calls for a written apology from the former chair of the board and former leader of this council, who was responsible for the financial and organisational crisis that has hit MGL, which forced this council to bailout the company to the tune of £240,000 to help keep the company solvent.”

66.22 The amendment was not accepted. The amendment was put to the vote and was lost.

66.23 The original motion was voted on and was carried.

66.24 “This council notes the report that was presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in relation to the organisational and financial failings of Marketing Gloucester Ltd, a company 100% owned by Gloucester City Council.

This council welcomes the recommendations in the report and the resolutions agreed by the OSC, but notes that the report does not address the role of the Cabinet or senior officers in the Marketing Gloucester crisis, and resolves to commission an independent report into these matters, to be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a matter of urgency.

This council calls for a written apology from the former chair of the board and former leader of this council, who was responsible for the financial and organisational crisis that has hit MGL, which forced this council to bailout the company to the tune of £240,000 to help keep the company solvent.”

COUNCIL
30.01.20

**COUNCIL
30.01.20**

67. WRITTEN QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS

- 67.1 In relation to question four, Councillor Haigh asked Councillor Watkins if she would be approaching Restorative Gloucestershire to ensure it is highlighted and publicised. Councillor Watkins responded that Restorative Gloucestershire was there as a measure of last resort when anti-social behavior is particularly bad. Councillor Watkins pledged to speak to the Project Solace team to highlight it as a tool.
- 67.2 In relation to question nine, Councillor Field noted that, if cardboard becomes wet it would be almost worthless in terms of raising revenue from recycling. He asked Councillor Cook what could be done to improve the situation.
- 67.3 Councillor Cook replied that whilst its value was reduced, wet cardboard was not entirely without monetary value. Councillor Cook advised that there were holes at the bottom on the blue recycling bags for drainage and that the bags could be securely fastened with the Velcro provided at the top of each bag.

Time of commencement: 6.30 pm hours

Time of conclusion: 9.50 pm hours

Chair