



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL
www.stroud.gov.uk

(01453) 754354

Fax (01453) 754980

Council Offices Ebley Mill Stroud Gloucestershire GL5 4UB

democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

CABINET

3 October 2007

Minutes

3

Membership:

Chas Fellows	Chair of Cabinet (Leader of Council)	P
Barbara Tait	Planning and Licensing Portfolio (Deputy Leader)	P
David Wride	Business Support and Finance Portfolio	P
Joe Forbes	Community Safety Portfolio	P
Elisabeth Bird	Environment and Rural Affairs Portfolio	P
John Jeffreys	Health and Well-Being Portfolio	P
Frances Roden	Housing Portfolio	P
Nigel Studdert-Kennedy	Regeneration and Tourism Portfolio	P

P = Present

A = Absent

Other Councillors in attendance

Gwen Belcher	Hilary Fowles	Paul Smith
Patricia Carrick	Sarah Lunnon	Linda Townley

Officers in attendance

Chief Executive	Policy and Communications Manager
Strategic Director	Development Surveyor
Strategic Head of Regeneration and Culture	Head of Housing Standards
Strategic Head of Development Services	Head of Cultural Services
Building Programmes Manager	Principal Marketing Officer
Head of Legal Services	Senior Democratic Services and Election Officers
Public Space Manager	Democratic Services and Election Officer
Head of Environmental Health	

Also in attendance

Ed Isaacs the Independent Tenant Advisor from Partners in Change.

CBT.042

APOLOGIES

There were none.

CBT.043 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(a) Personal and Prejudicial Interests

Councillor David Wride declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute CBT.055, land at Chapel Street, Cam and would leave the Council Chamber when this item was discussed. Councillor Nigel Studdert-Kennedy declared a personal interest in Minute CBT.056, Remediation of Former Painswick Gasworks because a family member worked for DEFRA.

No further declarations were made.

(b) Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992

There were none.

CBT.044 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED **That the Minutes of Cabinet held on 12 July 2007 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

CBT.0045 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following questions received from **Mr and Mrs Biddlecombe** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Questions

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

1. "This is not just a Woolaways issue. Why is it being presented as such when it affects the whole community?"

2. "What is the level of the repairs being considered? Would it be to repair the existing problems with the structures or would it be to include other refurbishments?"

Response

1. The initial focus was on the Woolaway homes only. However discussions have highlighted the need in Minchinhampton to address the Council's priority of providing additional affordable housing. If there is an opportunity for the Council to meet both priorities at the same time it would be wrong of the Council not to fully examine it. Any planning proposals affecting the existing sites or adjacent land would be subject to wider consultation.

2. The Woolaways are a type of prefabricated reinforced concrete home which requires a substantial level of work to both repair them and ensure that they meet the decent homes standard. In practical terms repair means propping up the roof whilst both the external and internal walls together with all other fittings are removed and replaced.

The following question received from **Mr and Mrs R Arnold** was submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

“What account does this meeting take of public opinion in Minchinhampton? If none, why not? If any, then why has opinion in the area not been canvassed?”

Response

The opinions of those living within the Woolaway homes have been taken into account as set out in the report presented by Partners in Change, the Independent Tenants Advisor. If the best solution for the Woolaway sites includes the use of adjoining land as a planning exception site, wider public consultation will be undertaken.

The following questions received from **Mr and Mrs M Perkins** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

1. “Why is this issue of Woolaways/affordable homes not considered an issue for the whole community?”

2. “I believe an existing owner of a Woolaways house was able to gain a grant to repair his property. What attempts been made to fund the repairs in a way that allows tenants to stay in their existing homes?”

Response

1. The provision of affordable homes is an important issue for the whole community and a Council priority. If a scheme does come forward which involves the use of additional land to increase the supply of affordable housing wider consultation will take place.

2. Owner occupiers who purchased their Woolaway homes before 1985 were entitled to a Government grant to carry out repairs. Similar funds were not provided to the Council to enable it to repair the Woolaway homes it still kept. A proposal was put to all tenants of Stroud District Council in 2003 that would have provided the funds to repair all the Woolaways. The proposal would have resulted in tenants having a change of landlord – a new housing association specially created by the Council. A ballot showed that a majority of tenants did not support this action. The only remaining option is to work with a Housing Association which is prepared to invest in redevelopment with repair of the Woolaway sites.

The following question received from **Miss P Curwen** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

“Why when there has been a clear and historic veto on building north of the Cirencester Road, is this site at the Tynings now being considered?”

Response

Policy considerations are established in the Council's adopted Local Plan against which any proposal for development would be assessed. Whether or not planning consent could be obtained for a planning exception site north of Cirencester Road has not been tested.

The following questions received from **Mr D Smith** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

1. “Has any account been taken of the effect on local services – school, doctor's surgery, parking, etc – that any development of the Tynings field would have?”

Response

1. No planning proposal for development of the Tynings field has been submitted to the Council. If such a proposal is made in the future all of these factors would be relevant planning considerations.

2. Why would a redevelopment of a Woolaways (Minchinhampton) site be considered a new build not a like for like. This is a financial decision not an environmental one.”

2. Reports to Cabinet in February 2007 showed that new-build “like for like” replacement of homes on the same plot size is the most expensive of all solutions and is not an option that could be afforded by either the Council or a housing association landlord.

The following questions received from **Mr P Hayward** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

1. “I am concerned that the Knapp is a small, steep country lane. Any development would have an adverse effect on this area, especially in terms of traffic. Has this been taken into consideration?”

Response

1. No planning proposal for development of the Tynings field has been submitted to the Council. If such a proposal is made in the future all of these factors would be relevant planning considerations.

2. What attempts have been made to quantify the need for affordable housing in Minchinhampton, and, if established, what is that need?”

2. The need for affordable housing in Minchinhampton has been assessed from this Council's Housing Needs data, which currently supports the provision of an additional 20 affordable homes.

The following questions received from **Mr K W Neate** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: Consideration of developing the field behind the Tynings:

1. "How many tenders has Stroud District Council obtained for the costs which are shown on the report prepared by Partners in Change for Minchinhampton Woolaways properties, especially as the most desirable option to tenants is the most expensive ie transfer of properties and repair?"

2. "What is the purpose of the settlement boundary if exception sites are allowed?"

Response

1. No tenders have been obtained for repair or redevelopment of the Minchinhampton Woolaways. Indicative costs used by Partners in Change have been provided by Michael Dyson Associates (Consulting Structural Engineers) and Tribal (Housing Finance specialists).

2. The development boundary defines the built extent of settlements. Planning Exception sites for affordable housing can be permitted on land outside but adjacent to the development boundary.

The following questions received from **Mr P Walters** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "What attempt has been made to estimate the increase in traffic which would result from the development of the Tynings field, and indeed, the Woolaway homes?"

2. "Which contractors have been approached for realistic estimates of repairing the Woolaway homes in situ – and what are these costs deemed to be?"

Response

1. No planning proposal for development of the Tynings field has been submitted to the Council. If such a proposal is made in the future all of these factors would be relevant planning considerations.

2. The costs of repairing the homes in situ have been obtained from Michael Dyson Associates, Consulting Structural Engineers who specialise in the condition and repair of Prefabricated Reinforced Concrete homes. The cost of repairing each Woolaway home in situ was forecast in October 2006 as £63,485.

The following questions received from **Mr A Tanner and Ms L Jones** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "Have you approached any other Council's in the country to see how they have funded similar issues?"

2. "If an exception order is granted on the Tynings site, will it be in line with policy HN6 (SDC Local Plan, Section 5, Housing)?"

Response

1. The Council has followed Government guidance on the options available to maintain all its properties, including the Woolaways. In recent years visits have been made to see approaches taken at Wyre Forest and West Berkshire and the Council has itself been visited by Taunton Deane. A further visit is being made to Cannock.

2. Yes, it will be.

The following questions received from **Mr and Mrs I Jarvis** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "Why is Stroud District Council basing its decision on any possible development of the Tynings on misleading information regarding local democratic opinion? (For more information, please see the petition handed in by local residents),"

2. If the Cabinet declares that this is not the time to consider local opinion, in that case, why is it included in any of the reports being considered tonight? (Which it most certainly is)."

Response

1. The Council is not making a decision about the development on the Tynings at this stage. An Appendix to the report to this evening's meeting includes a report by Partners in Change. Their role is to provide advice to the residents of the Woolaways that is independent and not influenced by the Council. It would not be appropriate to censor or amend the report of an independent advisor. However, paragraph 6 of the main report clarifies the Council's position.

2. The report before Cabinet this evening does include information from members of the Minchinhampton Parish Plan Group that has been examining local affordable housing needs. It also includes information from Partners in Change. Cabinet is being asked to recognise that an opportunity to address the Council's priority for the provision of affordable housing may arise. If it does wider consultation will be undertaken.

Supplementary Question

In the report from Partners in Change it does talk about Minchinhampton Parish Council's opinion which does indicate a democratic opinion from the community, which in fact we now know it was not, so what I am saying is it looks as though a community wide democratic opinion was considered necessary but has not actually been taken into account in the final reports. Why was a Minchinhampton Parish Council view considered necessary if now we know it was not a Minchinhampton Parish Council view and it is not now necessary?

Response

The answer would be researched and a written reply sent to you within 7 working days.

The following questions received from **Mr and Mrs Abendanon** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "Have the National Trust or any environmental bodies (eg Cotswold Conservation Board, Natural England) been consulted on the effect this development might have on the AONB, SSSIs, the Common, etc, in terms of increased traffic, flora and fauna, skyline development, etc?"

2. "What would happen if the landowner refused to sell?"

Response

1. No planning proposal for development of the Tynings field has been submitted to the Council. If such a proposal is made in the future all of these factors would be relevant planning considerations.

2. The views of the landowners are being established. No decisions have been made in relation to the Council's response.

The following questions received from **Mr Endacott** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "In the SDC Local Plan, Policy NE8 states, "Within the Cotswolds AONB, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape over other considerations." How would that fit in with declaring the Tynings an exception site?"

Response

Policies in the Local Plan provide the tests against which development proposals are assessed. Where a proposal does not satisfy all tests, the extent to which it meets the various tests are balanced against each other in determining a planning application. As yet, no proposal has been submitted that can be assessed against the various tests.

2. "If there is an established need for affordable housing, to what extent would developing the Tynings site meet this need?"
2. The Tynings field site would meet the current affordable housing needs.

The following questions received from **Ms J Hanchett** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "Why was Cllr John Williams who lives by the Tynings field in a Woolaways home allowed to discuss the development of the Tynings field with the District Council?"

2. "Why were residents who live in the immediate area not notified about the consideration being given to the field at the Cabinet meeting tonight (October 3)?"

Response

1. Councillor John Williams is a Parish Councillor not a District Councillor and discussed the matter as a member of the Parish Plan Group.

2. At this stage there is no indication whether this possible site could come forward. If a proposal is submitted wider consultation would be undertaken.

The following questions received from **Ms L Graham** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

Question

Re: The Woolaways, including the possible development of the Tynings field:

1. "In the light of the fact that health recommendations state that children should play outside and take exercise, why is it being proposed that in a redevelopment of the Woolaways, residents would lose their current gardens and open spaces?"

2. "How would the field be valued as an exception site?"

Response

1. No planning proposal for development of the Tynings field has been submitted to the Council. If such a proposal is made in the future all of these factors would be relevant planning considerations.

2. A number of factors influence the value of a planning exception site. These include development costs, the tenure mix and potential Housing Corporation support.

Mr A Richardson had submitted seven questions. Democratic Services had unsuccessfully tried to contact him to inform him he could only submit three questions. In his absence the **Cabinet Member for Housing** would answer the first three questions, as set out overleaf.

Question

Re: The work to be carried out on the Woolaway homes at the Tynings, Minchinhampton

1. "Why have the local residents not been informed of the findings of the Partners in Change report which affects them all? This was only sent to some, but not all, of the Woolaway residents who did not own their houses. Was it intended to be kept a secret from all the other owner occupiers and locals?"

2. "The purchase and development of some of all of the field adjoining the Tynings is a subject of major importance to local residents so why were we not told about the possibility of this being developed?"

3. "Why were Partners in Change allowed to distribute their newsletter headed No3 August 2007 saying that, quote, "Minchinhampton Parish Council would like to see part of the field behind the Tynings developed for social housing and planning permission may be granted"? This had never been discussed by the Council and was simply the hope of one of the Councillors, a certain Mr Williams, with a vested interest in the outcome?"

The following questions received from **Ms S Morgan** were submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing**, as set out below.

Question

"The Inspector's Report of the Stroud District Local Plan for the plan period to 2011 states under Strategy, page 27 that "More modest allocations for development are made within and adjacent to the Small Towns and Larger Villages" which includes Minchinhampton "In these settlements allocations for development have been identified". Can you explain why, when both the Barcelona Farm and Stewart House applications came forward the need for affordable housing was not deemed necessary and what has happened since to establish the need for affordable

Response

1. Partners in Change brief is to provide advice and support to the residents of the Woolaway homes, who should all have received their newsletter.

2. Wider consultation by the Council regarding the possible use of land in private ownership would normally take place once a proposal had been submitted. If any proposals do emerge from the current process there will be opportunity for views to be expressed before any decision is made.

3. Partners in Change are engaged to provide advice to Woolaway residents that is independent of the Council. The Council does not censor or veto newsletters from Partners in Change.

Response

1. At the time the applications came forward the most up to date information available at that time indicated that there was no need for affordable housing in Minchinhampton. Since that time a Housing needs assessment has been updated and the results show a need for affordable housing in Minchinhampton.

housing in Minchinhampton"?

2. "The Inspector to the Stroud District Local Plan describes Minchinhampton as a "Small town". Can you explain why Stroud District Council now describe Minchinhampton as a "Main Settlement" within the adopted Local Plan and what implications this will have on Minchinhampton with respect to any future proposed housing development?"

2. Minchinhampton is referred to as one the 'Small Towns and Larger villages' in chapter 2, (Strategy) paragraph 12 of the Local Plan. Nowhere is it specifically described as a main settlement. The term 'main settlements' is used in section 5.12 of the Local Plan as a collective term for all the settlements of Stroud District having a settlement boundary to which Policy HN8 applies. There is no particular implication arising from this for future housing development. The function and role of all 'main settlements' will be reviewed through the development of the Core Strategy as part of the Council's Local Development Framework.

The Chair confirmed that those persons who had submitted questions and were not present would each receive a written response. A petition had been handed to the Chair from residents of Minchinhampton which he passed this to the Cabinet Member for Housing to consider.

CBT.046

FUTURE OF WOOLAWAY HOMES

The Cabinet Member for Housing presented the report which outlined the progress on the future of Woolaway homes in Stonehouse and Minchinhampton and agree the next steps in addressing the structural condition of these homes.

Outline planning permission had been granted on the site of the 8 Woolaways in Stonehouse for 12 affordable homes. A rehousing plan had been agreed and this would take place between January – March 2008.

The Minchinhampton Parish Plan Group had looked at possible sites to provide additional affordable housing and had identified a possible planning site adjacent to the Tynings but the land was not Council owned.

A Member was very concerned that a group of parishioners in Minchinhampton had expressed the view that the site at the Tynings was "a done deal". The Cabinet Member for Housing assured him that nothing had been decided and full consultation would take place prior to any decision being taken. The Council was presently at a very preliminary stage.

In reply to a Member's question, the Independent Tenants' Advisor confirmed that 35 dwellings in Minchinhampton needed to be replaced. He had to date spoken to 3 of the 5 owner/occupiers. If the site was redeveloped the owner/occupiers would not be able to buy a similar property and the landlord would be encouraged to assist by way of possibly a shared ownership scheme to those owner/occupiers affected by the regeneration of this site.

In reply to a Member's question, the Head of Housing Standards confirmed that a Project Team with inter-departmental representation met currently on a monthly basis with regard to the Woolaways.

All Cabinet Members expressed their concern that all of the proposals for the Woolaways at Minchinhampton complied with the Council's key priorities. After debate Cabinet agreed that a new paragraph 5. should be added to the decision box to reflect both the Environmental and Housing priorities.

RESOLVED

1. **To note progress of the Independent Tenants' Advisor's work at Minchinhampton summarised in Appendix A of the report.**
2. **That once the 8 Woolaway houses at Stonehouse have been vacated that the site identified on the plan attached as Appendix B of the report be transferred to a Registered Social Landlord at nil cost on terms to be agreed by the Head of Regeneration, the Head of Housing Standards and Head of Legal Services.**
3. **That any easements required to facilitate the development of affordable housing be granted, at nil cost, to the Registered Social Landlord on terms to be agreed by the Head of Regeneration, Head of Housing Standards and Head of Legal Services.**
4. **That formal expressions of interest be invited from Registered Social Landlords seeking their proposals for repair and/or redevelopment of the Council owned Woolaway homes at Minchinhampton, with the optional inclusion of an adjacent planning exception site.**
5. **That all proposals for the Minchinhampton sites, including any exception site, will address as a minimum not only the known future or anticipated requirements of the Building Regulations which will be applicable from 2010 in relation to increased carbon dioxide savings but also address the current unmet affordable housing need in Minchinhampton in order to reflect this Council's priorities.**
6. **That representatives of Hampton Waves Residents' Association be invited to join an evaluation panel to agree the brief and assess the submissions received from Registered Social Landlords.**
7. **That subject to agreement in principle with the landowner regarding a possible planning exception site on land adjacent to The Tynings, Minchinhampton that authority be delegated to the Head of Housing Standards to submit a Planning Application to determine the suitability of the site for Affordable Housing.**

8. That the Council's contribution to the projects shall remain limited to the site values with any repurchase or purchase of property being on a back-to-back basis at the purchase price with the selected Registered Social Landlord.
9. In accordance with Financial Regulations C6.11 an exception be made so that land may be transferred, and access and easements granted, at nil-cost as detailed in resolutions (2) and (3) above to facilitate the developments that include Affordable Housing.
10. That the Services of Partners in Change as Independent Tenants' Advisor be extended to support the Minchinhampton tenants through to the selection of a preferred scheme and identification of a preferred partner Registered Social Landlord.

CBT.047**HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET POSITION IN RELATION TO THE DECENT HOMES STANDARD**

The Cabinet Member for Housing presented the report which set out the position in relation to the Decent Homes Standard for Council dwellings. Approval was also sought for the extension of existing arrangements with construction partners through either extension of contracts or new contracts on the same terms as existing.

The potential development of asset management initiatives in different wards throughout the district would be discussed at full Council when the sites had been identified. Ward Councillors were requested to identify any potential sites. The future use of Council garages was discussed and the possibility of using this land for housing. Housing Management Forum had debated the decent homes standard at their meetings on 24 July 2007 and 18 September 2007 and looked at, in principle, with no locations discussed the possibility of the redevelopment of the Council's garages, parking areas and also some existing Council housing.

RESOLVED

1. That proposals be developed to address the shortfall in resources required to meet the Decent Homes Standards by: -
 - a. Making better use of garage and parking areas through sale, redevelopment and/or increases to economic rents.
 - b. Formulating redevelopment proposals on housing sites with higher investment needs and/or higher redevelopment potential to make better use of resources.
 - c. Selling potential development plots of housing land that are too small to accommodate more than one dwelling, and
 - d. That a further report be prepared for Cabinet to identify and quantify these proposals and the resources required to implement them.

2. That approval is given to the extension of existing arrangements with construction partners in contracts H1550; H1564; H1572; H1582; H1588; H1596 and H1606 details of which are set out in Appendix B to Report HS 252/10/07, by new contracts on the same terms as existing.

CBT.048**HOUSING GREEN PAPER – HOMES FOR THE FUTURE: MORE AFFORDABLE, MORE SUSTAINABLE. JULY 2007**

The Cabinet Members for Planning and Licensing and Housing jointly presented the report which would brief Cabinet on the new Housing Green Paper that was published by the Government in July 2007. Comments made by Cabinet Members would be incorporated in the Council's reply to the Government Consultation on the Housing Green Paper by 15 October 2007.

It was intended that implementation of the proposals contained in the Green Paper would unblock the present planning system and set out plans for 3m new homes by 2020, plans included more homes, more social housing, building homes more quickly, more affordable homes and greener homes.

The Cabinet Member for Housing confirmed that Stephen Partridge an acknowledged housing finance expert would be coming to talk to Councillors, Tenant Representatives and staff about the Government's Green Paper on Tuesday, 9 October 2007 at 5.30 pm – 7.30 pm.

There would be no new resources made available to Local Authorities but Housing Associations would be advantaged by cheaper borrowing. At present the Council paid £1,000 for each of its properties as Government subsidy. An urgent reform of the present Government subsidy system was required to enable Local Authorities with housing to meet the Decent Homes Standard in 2010.

The Chief Executive confirmed that both the Government and the Council wanted appropriate housing land released and many aspects of the Green Paper were supportive of the Council's view.

A Member was concerned that the Council had gone through all of the correct procedures for ensuring the release of development land at Hunts Grove but the Government had called in the planning application, which would not only result in a costly delay to the Council but also may result in the loss of 500+ affordable houses.

RESOLVED That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Planning and Licensing, and Housing to agree the final content of the Council's response.

CBT.049**GENERAL FUND REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING 2007/08**

The Cabinet Member for Business Support and Finance presented the report which outlined the current performance against the original revenue budget and the capital programme for 2007/08. The costs to the Council as a result of the July floods would be discussed at the Special Cabinet Meeting on 29 October 2007. The works to the public conveniences in Nailsworth have been brought forward into this years budget

and the works to the public conveniences in Bedford Street and Stratford Park, Stroud have been put back a year because of outstanding issues not being resolved.

- RESOLVED**
- a) **To note the financial implications of the recent flood emergency set out in paragraphs 6 to 9 of the report.**
 - b) **To note the budget position regarding works to public conveniences set out in paragraph 13 of the report.**
 - c) **To note the position on the original 2007/08 revenue budget as set out in Appendix A of the report.**
 - d) **To note the position on the capital budget set out in Appendix B of the report.**

CBT.050**MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Business Support and Finance presented the report which outlined the current financial position indicated in the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan. He confirmed that estimates had been based on the interest rate being approximately 5% or 6%, with savings of 3% and also identified the areas which had had financial pressures.

- RESOLVED**
- 1. **To note the Council's financial position as estimated in the revision of the Medium Term Financial Plan for the General Fund.**
 - 2. **To agree the budget arrangements, as set out in this report, which should be followed in the preparation of the general fund revenue estimates.**

CBT.051**ANNUAL REPORT ON TREASURY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY**

The Cabinet Member for Business Support and Finance presented the Annual Report on Treasury Management Activity that sought approval to change the approved method of disposal from Formal to Informal Tender. He made reference to the change in Treasury advisors in April 2007 and hoped to see an improvement in future returns.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL **That the Treasury Management Activity Annual Report for 2006/2007 be approved.**

CBT.052**GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ISSUES – GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION ASSESSMENT**

The Cabinet Member for Community Safety presented an update on progress in meeting the Council's duty under Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 and agreed arrangements to conclude an assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople.

He confirmed that a detailed study had been undertaken approximately 9 months ago, and another study would be carried out in the future. At present there were 32 private pitches in the District with 8 unauthorised sites. By 2011 it had been estimated that another 17 pitches would be required. Problems were usually

reported from the occupants of unauthorised sites that moved location rather than from established sites.

- RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**
1. That the forecast additional annual pitch requirement for the period to 2011 and identified in Appendix A to this report be noted and accepted as the basis for consultation, and
 2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Safety to incorporate consultation feedback into a final Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and to submit this to the Department for Communities and Local Government by its deadline of 31 December 2007.

RESOLVED That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Safety to respond to the South West Regional Assembly's Single Issue Regional Spatial Strategy consultation by its deadline of 31 October 2007.

CBT.053 **WEBCASTING REVIEW**

The Leader introduced the Webcasting Review report which requested Members to consider whether the Council should make a long term commitment to webcasting, and, if so, to determine the scope of the service to be provided and to also consider funding implications as part of the annual budget. At present webcasting was used for core meetings and Member development.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing hoped that the Public Inquiry for Hunts Grove would be the first Call-In Public Inquiry to be webcast in the country. In reply to a Member's question, it was confirmed that Housing Management Forum were currently trialling webcasting for 3 meetings and figures contained within the report included this meeting. Generally comments regarding webcasting had been very positive.

- RESOLVED**
1. That the report be noted; and
 2. To consider the additional funding requirements as part of the annual budget round.

CBT.054 **WASTE AND RECYCLING AND STREET CLEANSING SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Rural Affairs presented the report which allowed Members to consider the design and cost of the waste and recycling trial which would inform more wide scale changes to the waste collection system which were being considered to improve performance in waste minimisation terms. Members considered changes in legislation and the results of a recent Local Environment Quality Report which would impact on the Council's Street Cleansing Contract.

The Waste Project Team met every Monday to discuss progress. There was a dedicated phone line, information leaflets had been sent out and road shows had been held. Approximately 100 people had volunteered to participate on a Focus Group.

Members congratulated the team on their work so far and the positive responses to the roadshows and the trial so far. The team would continue to consult the public in the Stanleys.

A Member expressed concern that the media nationally were causing unnecessary public unrest by publicising fortnightly refuse collections. The local newspapers, however, were supportive of the Council and had given balanced press. It was confirmed the Council would continue to do weekly refuse collections.

Full consultation would be undertaken with statutory bodies for the changes made to Government Guidance – Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse. This would require a re-zoning of the District in terms of response to litter clearance times. A colour coded plan for the re-categorisation was hoped to be available before Christmas.

It was noted that “King Stanley” should have been spelt “Kings Stanley” throughout the report.

- RESOLVED**
- 1) **To note the information provided on the waste and recycling trial which will be delivered in Kings Stanley and Leonard Stanley.**
 - 2) **To support the work being undertaken to develop a new district-wide waste collection and recycling service.**
 - 3) **To note the information provided on the revised Code of Practise for Litter and Refuse and the Local Environment Quality Report 2006/07.**
 - 4) **To support the work which is being undertaken to improve the performance of the Council’s Street Cleansing Service within the context of a more coordinated approach to Public Space Management.**

CBT.055 **LAND AT CHAPEL STREET, CAM – MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT SITE**

Councillor David Wride having declared an interest in this report and left the Council Chamber prior to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Tourism introducing the report which sought approval to change the approved method of disposal from Formal to Informal Tender.

- RESOLVED** **That the approved disposal of the Chapel Street site is undertaken by an Informal Tender process on terms to be agreed by the Head of Regeneration in consultation with the Treasurer, the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Tourism.**

Councillor David Wride returned to the Council Chamber.

CBT.056 **REMEDIATION OF FORMER PAINSWICK GAS WORKS**

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Rural Affairs presented her report and requested Cabinet to consider the proposal and approve funding for remediation of the former Painswick Gas Works. The land was heavily contaminated and DEFRA had indicated to the owners they would fund the necessary works and then withdrew their offer. The owners had been unable to use their garden land for a year. Officers were requested to formulate a policy to ensure that this did not happen again. The Leader confirmed a letter had been sent to DEFRA highlighting the Council's concerns. The Head of Environmental Health confirmed that this site had now been included in the Contaminated Land Register.

RESOLVED **To make available the sum of £35,000 to remediate the former Painswick gasworks site in light of withdrawn DEFRA funding.**

CBT.057 **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STOCK CONDITION SURVEYS OF GENERAL FUND BUILDINGS AND ACCESSIBILITY OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS**

The Cabinet Member for Business Support and Finance presented the report which outlined the results of building condition surveys and identified the funding currently available, together with options for funding any shortfall. He drew Members' attention to an error in Appendix A, page 6, Sum of recommended works, total which should now read £251,410.00 and not £149,200.00 as printed within the report.

RECOMMENDED **That the funding of the building condition surveys be TO COUNCIL considered as part of the Capital Programme and Proposed Schemes report to Cabinet on 13 December 2007.**

CBT.058 **STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI) – FORMAL ADOPTION**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing presented the report to adopt the Council's Statement of Community Involvement as the first document of the Council's Local Development Framework.

RECOMMENDED **That the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) be TO COUNCIL amended as recommended by the Planning Inspector and that it be adopted as the first document of the Council's Local Development Framework and implemented accordingly.**

CBT.059 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 – URGENT ITEMS**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 9.25 pm.