



# TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL AGENDA

## To: Town Councillors

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Town Council which will be held remotely via Zoom, on **12<sup>th</sup> October 2020 commencing at 6:00 pm.**

Zoom meeting ID: 940 9564 2809

Password: 041494

Members of the public and press are welcome to attend. Telephone dial in details are available on request, please contact the office for more information.

Debbie Hill  
Town Clerk  
6<sup>th</sup> October 2020

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. To receive declarations of interest
3. To consider requests for dispensation
4. To receive written questions from members of the public
5. **Public Participation** *(to provide members of the public/press with the opportunity to comment on items on the agenda or raise items for future consideration. In accordance with Standing Orders this will not exceed 12 minutes in total and 3 minutes per person.)*
6. To note the Mayor's announcements
7. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> September 2020
8. To note the following Committee Minutes: Planning – 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020, Staffing – 10<sup>th</sup> August 2020, Finance – 26<sup>th</sup> August 2020
9. Matters arising from the minutes – for information only
10. To receive Councillor reports for Tewkesbury Borough Council from Cllr Sztymiak and Gloucestershire County Council from Cllr Cromwell
11. To receive the budget report for August 2020

12. To review and agree the response to the NALC consultation regarding the White Paper – 'Planning for the Future'
13. To review and agree the response to the NALC consultation regarding the White Paper - 'Transparency & Competition'
14. To consider a proposal from Cllr Danter that Tewkesbury Town Council displays two lit Christmas Trees on the outside of the Town Hall this year to support Tewkesbury Town Christmas Lights
15. To consider and agree any resolutions to be submitted for consideration at GAPTC AGM
16. To review and agree grant applications
17. To approve the payments list
18. Correspondence

The next Full Council meeting will be  
**November 9<sup>th</sup> 2020 at 6pm remotely via Zoom**

Final date for agenda items and accompanying papers for the Meeting is **7 clear days before the meeting.**

As part of managing the Council's Risk Assessment, Councillors are reminded to ensure they keep their register of interests up to date.

If you have any questions, please contact the Town Clerk.

The Council has a duty to consider the following matters in the exercise of any of its functions: Equalities, Crime and Disorder, Health and Safety and Human Rights. Anyone wishing to attend any meetings of the Town Council who need ground floor access to do so, should inform the Clerk three days in advance of the meeting so that arrangements can be put into place.

**MINUTES**  
**of the Full Council meeting held remotely via Zoom**  
**on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020 at 6pm**

**Present:** Cllrs P Aldridge (Chair), K Brennan, A Rudge, H Davis, S Raywood, M Sztymiak, J Raywood, C Cody, H Bowman, C Danter, K Powell, A Carter

**In attendance:** D Hill (Town Clerk), J King (Assistant Town Clerk) and 3 members of the public

**20/21 - 067 To receive apologies for absence**  
Apologies were received from Cllr Smith.

**20/21 - 068 To receive declarations of interest**  
Cllrs Aldridge & Brennan declared an interest in the grant application from Tewkesbury in Bloom.  
Cllrs Danter & Brennan declared an interest in the grant application from Tewkesbury Christmas Lights.

**20/21 - 069 To consider requests for dispensation**  
None requested.

**20/21 - 070 To receive written questions from member of the public**  
No questions have been received.

**20/21 - 071 Public participation**  
It was noted that a member of the public had circulated comments regarding the Financial Regulations to all Councillors, but had not included the Town Clerk.

A member of the public raised questions regarding the proposed financial regulations, particularly in the areas of :

- The suspension of financial regulations
- The limits for Committee authorisations
- The scrutinization of accounts

**20/21 - 072 To note the Mayor's announcements**

- There will be no Mop Fair due to Covid-19 restrictions
- The Mayor apologised if his comments at the last Full Council meeting were misinterpreted.
- The Town Council is looking at ways for Tewkesbury to mark Remembrance, keeping within the Covid-19 regulations. Full details to be circulated as soon as they are available.

**20/21 - 073 To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2020**  
It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2020  
Proposed by Cllr Danter, seconded by Cllr J Raywood.

- 20/21 - 074 To note the following Committee Minutes:**  
Environment & Amenities – 30<sup>th</sup> June & 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020  
Planning – 10<sup>th</sup> & 24<sup>th</sup> June, 15<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020  
Severn Ham – 25<sup>th</sup> June 2020  
Staffing – 15<sup>th</sup> June & 6<sup>th</sup> July 2020  
Buildings & Moorings – 3<sup>rd</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> June, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020

The above minutes were noted.

- 20/21 - 075 Matters arising from the Minutes – for information only**  
**19/20-115 GCC Report** – Flood defence spending – ongoing  
**19/20-187 Air Pollution** – Deferred to a future meeting  
**20/21-046 Vacancies on Planning Committee** – will include in co-opting meeting  
**20/21-054 Safer opening of High Streets** – Town Clerk to circulate link – complete  
**20/21-054 Spring Gardens Toilets** – E&A to discuss vandalism – complete  
**20/21-056 Freedom of Information request** – Cllr Szymiak requested details - complete  
**20/21-058 Accounting in budget report** – RBS advised this is correct - complete  
**20/21-058 Impact of Covid-19 on Town Hall & Watson Hall income** – Agenda item at next Finance Committee meeting - ongoing  
**20/21-059 Petition NALC re: use of gender neutral pronouns** – can raise it with NALC, can also raise on October for GAPTC AGM - ongoing  
**20/21-061 Insurance details** – Cllr Szymiak requested details - complete

A Cllr asked if there was any update regarding the Safer High Street and the bollards. TTRP have met and there is more investigative work underway.

**Action:** Cllr Cody to circulate the information from the last TTRP meeting.

A Cllr asked if the Planning Committee can co-opt without Full Council agreeing the Planning Committee adopting. **Action:** Town Clerk to investigate.

- 20/21 - 076 To receive the budget report for July 2020**

The budget report was received.

There is a shortfall in income for the Town Hall. The Watson Hall has received a grant from the Borough Council which covers more of the loss in income. What will look different is the bar costs, as the costs had been set for increased usage and this had not happened. However, there has not been as much spent on stock, although there has been more wastage due to lockdown.

A Cllr requested information regarding general and earmarked reserves. The Town Council advised that this was provided in the June Full Council papers but was happy to circulate again. **Action:** Town Clerk to circulate reserves.

- 20/21 - 077 To receive the Q1 bank reconciliation**

The bank reconciliation was received.

- 20/21 - 078 To appoint a Councillor to join the Staffing Committee**

It was RESOLVED to appoint Cllr Brennan to join the Staffing Committee. Proposed by Cllr Bowman, seconded by Cllr Davis.

Cllrs noted the need to review the Committee and Working Groups once the co-option process is complete, as Standing Orders state that all Councillors should belong to at least one Committee.

**20/21 - 079 To review and agree the response to the NALC consultation regarding the changes to the current planning system**

Cllr J Raywood set out the proposed response to the NALC consultation. This is the first of a series of three white papers aimed at changing the planning systems and improving the data that is held about land by the Land Registry. This consultation focuses on housing needs for particular areas. When applied to the number of housing required in the Tewkesbury Borough area – it increases the number from 400 houses to over 1000. The consultation looks at establishing the extent of the housing need and also permission in principle to major developments, this would put the Town Council under enormous time pressures and size thresholds. The next two white papers will look at more general approaches in planning system – delegating land for growth areas and protect areas. Floodplain issues will be addressed in the second white paper and there needs to be some duty to co-operate and collaborate across County and Borough boundaries, as well as within the catchment areas of rivers. These responses are due in by 23<sup>rd</sup> September.

A number of Councillors met with Laurence Robertson MP on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> September and he was very interested in Councillors comments and perceptions of this paper. The Mayor and other Councillors thanked the Planning Committee for their thorough responses and efforts in preparing this response.

A Cllr asked if we need to prepare for what might happen under unitary authorities. Cllr J Raywood advised that it was probably too soon, as the details are not known.

It was RESOLVED to agree the response to the NALC consultation regarding changes to the current planning system.

Proposed by Cllr J Raywood, seconded by Cllr Cody.

**20/21 - 080 To review and agree updated Financial Regulations**

Cllrs discussed the proposed changes to the financial regulations.

It was RESOLVED to refer the financial regulations back to the Finance Committee to prepare a final document to present to Full Council.

Proposed by Cllr Aldridge, seconded by Cllr Sztymiak.

It was noted that an Extraordinary Finance Meeting may be required.

**20/21 - 081 To review and agree grant applications**

The Council reviewed the two grant applications. It was requested that the available amount left to allocate is provided each time applications are submitted.

Cllrs Brennan & Aldridge left the meeting, Cllr J Raywood took the Chair.

Cllrs Brennan & Aldridge rejoined the meeting.

It was RESOLVED to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes.  
Proposed by Cllr Rudge, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

Cllrs Brennan & Aldridge left the meeting. Cllrs requested that next year more information is provided from Tewkesbury in Bloom about the sponsorship arrangements and general costs.

It was RESOLVED to award £1680 to Tewkesbury in Bloom, with the request that the Town Council logo remains on the planters for two years.  
Proposed by Cllr Rudge, seconded by Cllr Davies.

Cllrs Brennan & Aldridge rejoined the meeting. Cllr Aldridge took the Chair.

It was RESOLVED to extend the meeting by a further fifteen minutes.  
Proposed by Cllr Cody, seconded by Cllr Brennan.

Cllrs Brennan & Danter left the meeting.

It was RESOLVED to award £1800 to Tewkesbury Christmas Lights.  
Proposed by Cllr Sztymiak, seconded by Cllr Powell.

Cllrs Brennan & Danter rejoined the meeting.

**20/21 - 082**

**To approve the payments list**

It was RESOLVED to approve the payments list totaling £1974.40.  
Proposed by Cllr Powell, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

**20/21 - 083**

**To receive an update from the Climate Change Working Group**

Cllr Cody provided an update on the actions of the Climate Change Working Group covering areas such as recycling, water and energy usage, active travel and plastic free community. More details are provided on the Town Council website page <https://teiwkesburytowncouncil.gov.uk/climate-change-action/>

Any other ideas and questions are welcome.

**Action:** Cllr Cody will circulate further details to all Councillors.

**20/21 - 084**

**To consider a proposal from Cllr Bowman that the Town Council declares support for the Local Electricity Bill**

Cllr Bowman advised that this is not a proposal that means the Town Council starts an electricity company, but it would allow any local provider to set up and sell electricity to local people. At present a licence costing £1-2 million is required, making it financially untenable for a small plant. The Local Electricity Bill has great potential to unlock community electricity. It would give future Town Councillors options, but doesn't commit the Town Council to anything.

The Local Electricity Bill had a first reading on 10<sup>th</sup> June and the second is due on 29<sup>th</sup> Jan 2021. It has cross party support and if enough support is received, the Government may adopt the bill, which gives it a better chance of success.

It was RESOLVED that the Town Council declares support for the Local Electricity Bill.  
Proposed by Cllr Bowman, seconded by Cllr Cody.

**20/21 - 085 Correspondence**

No correspondence received.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.58 pm.

Signature of Chairman upon approval of the minutes ..... 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

DRAFT

**MINUTES**  
**of the Extra-ordinary Full Council meeting held remotely via Zoom**  
**on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2020 at 6pm**

**Present:** Cllrs P Aldridge (Chair), K Brennan, A Rudge, S Raywood, M Sztymiak, J Raywood, C Cody, H Bowman, C Danter, K Powell, A Carter

**In attendance:** D Hill (Town Clerk), J King (Assistant Town Clerk) and three members of the public.

**20/21 - 086 To receive apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Cllr Davies (personal) & Cllr Smith (work).

**20/21 - 087 To receive declarations of interest**

Cllrs declared interests in knowing previous members of the Council and other applicants through living in Tewkesbury.

**20/21 - 088 To consider requests for dispensation**

The Clerk granted a dispensation to the whole Council as it is expected that members of the Council may know individuals standing for co-option.

**20/21 - 089 To consider the applications for co-option to Tewkesbury Town Council and to receive and short presentation from each applicant.**

Presentations were received from four applicants; Mark Poxon, Rod Gurney, Philippa Devine & Tara Fowler, followed by questions from Councillors. Written answers to questions raised by Councillors to the fifth applicant; Gavin Preedy, were read out as he was unable to attend.

Cllr Smith joined the meeting to vote, Cllr Davies joined the meeting by audio to vote.

Councillors voted confidentially on each of the candidates.

It was RESOLVED to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes.  
Proposed by Cllr S Raywood, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

12 Councillors voted in round one – 7 votes were in favour of Tara Fowler  
11 Councillors voted in round two – 6 votes were in favour of Philippa Devine  
11 Councillors voted in round three – 8 votes in favour of Rod Gurney

Therefore the following applicants were co-opted to the Council:

Tara Fowler  
Philippa Devine  
Rod Gurney

It was RESOLVED to extend the meeting to conclude the final item on the agenda.  
Proposed by Cllr Aldridge, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

**20/21 - 090 To consider the applications for co-option to the Planning Committee at Tewkesbury Town Council**

Cllr J Raywood outlined the reasons for co-option being required, in terms of there only being three permanent members of the committee and the committee meeting fortnightly. Combined with the difficulties of maintaining a quorum when Cllrs have disclosed interests, members of the public with an interest and expertise in planning were sought. Two applications from Ryan Maggs & Richard Carey were received and they have attended Planning meetings as members of the public for the last few months.

It was RESOLVED to co-opt Ryan Maggs & Richard Carey to the Planning Committee until the next Annual Meeting.

Proposed by Cllr J Raywood, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.55pm.

Signature of Chairman upon approval of the minutes ..... 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

DRAFT



## TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020**

Present: Councillors J Raywood, S Raywood, H Bowman and H Davis

In attendance: Mrs J King, Assistant Town Clerk

Also present: 1 observer and 1 member of the public

# MINUTES

The meeting commenced at 7.02pm

**P.20.091 Welcome and a reminder of how the meeting will be conducted.**

After it was established that everyone present could hear everyone else, the chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. It was explained that, in the event of a loss of connection, everyone should try to reconnect as soon as possible. If this could not be achieved within 10 minutes then the meeting would be deemed to have been adjourned and would be reconvened on another occasion.

**P.20.092 To receive apologies for absence**

None

**P.20.093 To receive declarations of interest**

Item 21 – The Town Council owns a neighbouring property.  
Item 25 – Cllr. S Raywood is a licentiate member of the Royal Town Planning Institute

**P.20.094 To receive and consider requests for dispensations**

None



**P.20.095 Public participation** (to provide members of the public/press with the opportunity to comment on items on the agenda or raise items for future consideration. In accordance with Standing Orders this will not exceed 12 minutes in total and 3 minutes per person)

None

**P.20.096 To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020**

Proposed by Cllr. H Bowman , Seconded by Cllr. H Davis  
It was **resolved** to **approve** the minutes

**P.20.097 To receive updates on matters arising from the minutes – for information only**

None

**P.20.098 To note correspondence**

An email has been received from Tewkesbury Borough Council, cancelling the TTRP meeting that was scheduled to take place today.

The Town Council has been informed that there is an ongoing enforcement investigation into an unauthorised extension in Feltham Way. No further information is known, but it is worth noting that these things do happen and that people ought to be encouraged to seek planning advice prior to making alterations to their houses.

NALC has requested that Local Councils respond to three consultations that are they are circulating at the moment. We will look at one of these this evening. Of the other two, which not to urgent, both are relevant to this committee but one also has relevance for the Finance Committee. It may be appropriate for the two committees to consider that one together.

The Town Council has received positive and encouraging feedback to its response to Gloucestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan consultation in March.

**P.20.099 Erection of a single storey front extension, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.**

Planning Application

32 Bramley Road Mitton Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8AQ

Ref. No: 20/00674/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDXB35QDJM20D	Tue 28 Jul 2020	Tue 18 Aug 2020
Observations:		
No objection		



**P.20.100 Siting of a former BT Red Telephone Box**

Planning Application

23 Twixtbears Bredon Road Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5BT

Ref. No: 20/00629/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDE8PTQDJH20C	Wed 29 Jul 2020	Wed 19 Aug 2020
<p>Observations:</p> <p>The Town Council, while sympathetic to the applicant's wishes, would like to have confirmation that such an installation would not contravene the deeds of the property and would also be interested to understand the Conservation Officer's opinion of the appropriateness of such a request within the Twixtbears area with its own particular character.</p>		

**P.20.101 Change of use of existing offices into 7 apartments, including internal alterations, part demolition and proposed single storey extension.**

Planning Application

Thomson And Banks 27 Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire

Ref. No: 20/00011/LBC

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QEN7A0QD0GF00	Thu 06 Aug 2020	Thu 20 Aug 2020
<p>Observations:</p> <p>The Town Council is pleased to see a potential resolution to the bin storage problem so that each occupant will be responsible for their bin area. It is the Town Council's opinion that the applicant has now responded satisfactorily to the Conservation Officer's concerns.</p>		

**P.20.102 Change of use of existing offices into 7 apartments, including internal alterations, part demolition and proposed single storey extension**

Planning Application

Thomson And Banks 27 Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire

Ref. No: 20/00010/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QEN6USQD0GF00	Thu 06 Aug 2020	Thu 20 Aug 2020
<p>Observations:</p> <p>The Town Council is pleased to see a potential resolution to the bin storage problem so that each occupant will be responsible for their bin area. It is the Town Council's opinion that the applicant has now responded satisfactorily to the Conservation Officer's concerns.</p>		



**P.20.103 Demolition of existing storage shed. Erection of a garden wall and gate and internal and external alterations. (Re-submission of applications 19/01223/FUL & 19/01224/LBC)**

Planning Application

Lucia House Trinity Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5LH

Ref. No: 20/00648/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDXHVDQD0IP03	Thu 23 Jul 2020	Thu 20 Aug 2020
Observations:  No objection		

**P.20.104 Demolition of existing storage shed. Erection of a garden wall and gate and internal and external alterations. (Re-submission of applications 19/01223/FUL & 19/01224/LBC)**

Planning Application

Lucia House Trinity Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5LH

Ref. No: 20/00649/LBC

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDXHXNQD0IP03	Thu 23 Jul 2020	Thu 20 Aug 2020
Observations:  No objection		

**P.20.105 Change of ground floor shop (A1 Use) to residential use (C3 Use) and alteration of staircase to provide access and incorporation with dwelling above.**

Planning Application

81 Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5RX

Ref. No: 20/00560/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QCFR4LQDJ9U1M	Fri 31 Jul 2020	Fri 21 Aug 2020
Observations:  No objection		



**P.20.106 Proposed change of ground floor shop (A1 Use) to residential use (C3 Use) and alteration of staircase to provide access and incorporation with dwelling above.**

Planning Application  
81 Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5RX  
Ref. No: 20/00561/LBC

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QEC7MDQD0IP00	Fri 31 Jul 2020	Fri 28 Aug 2020
Observations:		
No objection		

**P.20.107 Variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 8 (Parking layout) and 13 (boundary treatment positions) to planning permission no.18/00968/FUL for Demolition of Existing Doctors Surgery and Erection of 3 No. 3 bedroom dwellings, associated landscaping and parking.**

Planning Application  
Doctors Surgery Chance Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5RF  
Ref. No: 20/00678/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QE6N89QD0K000	Tue 28 Jul 2020	Tue 25 Aug 2020
Observations:		
The Town Council considers the proposed amendment to the parking arrangement to be an improvement because the view from the street will no longer be dominated by cars. This should also be a safer solution as it reduces the need for cars to reverse out of the site in an area where there are likely to be high numbers of school children and cyclists. The Council, therefore, has no objection.		

**P.20.108 Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) for approved planning application 18/00927/FUL to allow for the change in the external appearance**

Planning Application  
Edgwick's Ltd Northway Lane Newtown Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8JG  
Ref. No: 20/00607/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDIH2TQD0IU00	Wed 29 Jul 2020	Wed 26 Aug 2020
Observations:		
The Town Council has no objection to the proposed change to the external wall treatment. The Town Council would be interested to know how long it is anticipated that the temporary building will be on site.		



**P.20.109 Erection of an extension to existing industrial unit to provide additional storage**

Planning Application

Unit 7 Gannaway Lane Newtown Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8FD

Ref. No: 20/00652/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QDINB2QDJJ60Y	Tue 11 Aug 2020	Tue 01 Sep 2020
Observations:		
No objection, subject to the approval of Gloucestershire County Highways, Severn Trent Water and Land Drainage Advice		

**P.20.110 Erection of a single storey front extension and single storey rear extension.**

Planning Application

The Orchard 20 Spa Gardens Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8DR

Ref. No: 20/00681/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QE461RQDJMZ0F	Tue 11 Aug 2020	Tue 01 Sep 2020
Observations:		
No objection		

**P.20.111 Reform ground floor front openings & internal alterations for disabled person lift/access**

Planning Application

Calico House Back Of Avon Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5BA

Ref. No: 20/00614/FUL

Letter reference	Date requested	Expiry date
DC/E07000083/QEOY8UQD0M602	Fri 07 Aug 2020	Fri 04 Sep 2020
Observations:		
No objection		

**P.20.112 To note any additional information on the Planning Portal regarding applications to which this committee has already responded, and agree further actions**

None

In accordance with Standing Order (3y), which says that a remote meeting shall not exceed one and a half hours, it was unanimously agreed at this stage, to extend the length of the meeting by 20 minutes, at the end of which, it was unanimously agreed to extend the meeting by a further 10 minutes, making a total extension time of 30 minutes.



**P.20.113 To note any additional applications on the Planning Portal which will expire before 9th September 2020 and agree further actions**

There are two applications, which will expire on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> September. Given the heavy workload of this evening's meeting, the Chairman will contact the Planning Authority to request a short extension of time for these, so that they can be considered when this committee next meets.

**P.20.114 To agree a response to the emerging Ashchurch Rural Parish Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan [ashchurchruralpc.org.uk](http://ashchurchruralpc.org.uk)**

The committee agreed the essence of their proposed answers to the thirteen questions in the ARNDP consultations. The wording of these will be reviewed and improved further through email correspondence, prior to distribution amongst all councillors and then submission to ARCP.

**P.20.115 To discuss a response to proposed Changes to the Planning System, and agree further actions**

It was agreed to set up a working party to meet next week in the Mayor's Parlour, in order to draft a response, which will be presented for discussion and amendment at the next Planning Committee meeting and then to Full Council. Working party members will be Cllrs. J Raywood, S Raywood, H Bowman and H Davis

**P.20.116 To note the decisions made in July, in respect of planning applications to Tewkesbury Borough Council**

Item deferred until 9<sup>th</sup> September

**P.20.117 To receive an update on recent email correspondence to MP Lawrence Robertson and to agree further actions**

Item deferred until 9<sup>th</sup> September

The meeting closed at 9.02pm.

**Signature of Chairman**

**Date**

**TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE STAFFING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
MONDAY 10<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2020 VIA ZOOM AT 4.00 PM**

**Present:** Cllrs J Raywood (Chair), H Davis, S Raywood, D Hill (Town Clerk)  
One member of the public

**1) To receive apologies**

None. Cllr Powell was absent.

**2) To receive declarations of interests**

None received.

**3) To receive dispensations**

None.

**4) To approve the minutes of the Staffing Committee meeting held on 6<sup>TH</sup> July 2020**

It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the Staffing Committee meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2020. Proposed by Cllr S Raywood, seconded by Cllr Davis.

**5) To receive written questions from members of the public**

The following question was received from a member of the public:

*At the Staffing Committee of 30 Aug 2018, the Committee agreed to "delegate powers to the Town Clerk to deal with interim staffing cover in periods of staff absence and for day-to-day staffing matters in conjunction with the Mayor or Deputy Mayor".*

*Under a Freedom of information request, the Town Clerk has informed me that no interim staff have been recruited since 30 Aug 2018. Given this:*

*A) what was the reason for deciding to delegate these powers to the Town Clerk?*

*B) should this delegation now be cancelled?*

Cllr J Raywood responded that we were living in uncertain times and that it was important for the Town Council to be able to bring in interim staff if required. The purpose of the delegation was to ensure that the business of the Council can continue to run on a day to day basis. The delegation will remain.

**6) To resolve that the press and public are excluded due to the confidential nature of the business under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings Act) 1960 s.1. Sub section 2**

Proposed by Cllr S Raywood, seconded by Cllr Davis.

**TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL**

**7) Matters arising from the last meeting – for information only**

- 5) Purchase of two mobile telephones - carried forward
- 8) 2. Admin. Assistant to be set up as a user on the Assistant TC’s desktop – complete
- 8) 2. Town Clerk to add a note to the website regarding availability of meeting packs - complete

**8) Staffing Matters**

- 1. **Revised Government advice concerning places of work:** The committee discussed the current working arrangements and agreed it would be appropriate for staff to gradually return to work (in accordance with the risk assessment). All four staff who have been working from home will aim to be working half their hours in the office by the end of September assuming guidelines don’t change.
- 2. **To consider a request for permanent home working from the Finance Assistant:** The committee considered the request but agreed that the role of Finance Assistant was an office-based role. The committee agreed to flexibility regarding home working until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020 in line with the context of the request. The plan discussed in item 8) 1. Also applies to the Finance Assistant.
- 3. **To approve the performance related pay rise of the Town Clerk following the annual appraisal process:** It was RESOLVED to award a one point pay scale increase to the Town Clerk with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020. Proposed by Cllr Davis, seconded by Cllr S Raywood.
- 4. **Update on recruitment of a Toilet Cleaner and Bars Supervisor:** The Town Clerk advised that considering the current pandemic and the sustained vandalism at Spring Gardens toilet block, recruitment had been put on hold. As an interim measure the GAB Services will continue to clean the toilet blocks, but due to workloads increasing to near normal levels, the Town Clerk had authorised a temporary increase of an additional 10 hours per week to the contract with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020. The position of Bars Supervisor and bank bar staff will be advertised.
- 5. **Complaint:** A complaint from a member of the public was discussed.
- 6. **Review of Assistant Town Clerk and Events Officer salaries:** The Town Council’s HR Adviser has undertaken a salary benchmarking exercise and the findings of this were discussed and the implications of the recommended salary levels were considered against the budget position. It was noted that both the Assistant Town Clerk and Events Officer had recently completed performance appraisals. It was RESOLVED to award a four point salary increase to the Assistant Town Clerk and a four point salary increase to the Events Officer. Proposed by Cllr J Raywood, seconded by Cllr Davis.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 5.37 pm.

Signature of Chairman upon approval of Minutes ..... 21<sup>st</sup> September 2020

## MINUTES

### *of the*

#### Remote Finance Committee meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2020 at 6:00PM via Zoom

**Present:** Cllrs P Aldridge (Chair), H Bowman, K Brennan, C Danter, J Raywood, S Raywood, M Sztymiak

**In attendance:** D Hill (Town Clerk)

The meeting commenced at 6.11pm. It was pointed out that the Zoom meeting had scheduled for an hour ahead of the actual time of the meeting. Town Clerk to check Zoom settings.

**F.20.031 To receive apologies**

None received.

**F.20.032 To receive declarations of interest**

None.

**F.20.033 To receive dispensations**

None.

**F.20.034 To approve the Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2020**

It was RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2020. Proposed by Cllr J Raywood, seconded by Cllr Danter.

**F.20.035 Matters arising from the Minutes – for information only in relation to matters not on the agenda**

No matters arising.

**F.20.036 To receive correspondence relating to the Finance Committee**

None.

**F.20.037 Public Participation**

A member of the public raised questions regarding the following:

(Review of finance reports) Is the Tudor Bar a part of the Town Council or Trust?

**The bar is run by the Town Council.**

(Payments List) Should the payments list be part of the agenda?

**The Internal Audit report in 2018/19 recommended that the total of the payments approved at a meeting be added to the minutes. This has been actioned.**

(Review Non-attributed costs for Watson hall) What are the non-attributed costs for the Watson Hall?

**Covered under agenda item 13.**

**F.20.038 To review the bank reconciliations for April, May and June 2020**

The bank reconciliations were reviewed. It was noted that there was some discrepancy with dates on the reconciliations presented. The Town Clerk informed the committee that there had been catch up work to complete following a period of furlough for the Finance Assistant. It was agreed that these bank reconciliations should be reviewed again at the next Finance Committee meeting.

**Action:** Town Clerk to add agenda item re distribution of additional £1,100 re Mayor's Charity

**Action:** Town Clerk to add formalization of the floating amount in the Mayor's Charity account to the next agenda.

**F.20.039 To review finance reports**

The budget reports were reviewed.

**Action:** Town Clerk to add an agenda item at the next meeting to assess the impact of Covid-19 on the Council's finances for onward referral to Full Council.

**F.20.040 To consider and agree grant applications from outside bodies**

None received.

**F.20.041 To agree the payments list**

It was RESOLVED to approve payments totalling £9,034.15

Proposed by Cllr Brennan, seconded by Cllr Bowman.

**F.20.042 To review the signatory on the Mayor's Charity account**

It was agreed that Cllr Bowman is added as an additional signatory alongside Cllr Brennan.

**Action:** TC and HB to visit Lloyds to start the process for adding an additional signatory.

**F.20.043 To review non-attributed costs for the Watson Hall**

The Town Clerk reported that the Events Officer estimated 60% of her time had been spent on work relating to the Watson Hall and that GAB Services estimated an average of 18 hours per week had been spent working at the Watson Hall during 2019/20.

**F.20.044 To discuss applying for a Lloyds Bank Business Charge Card**

**Action:** Cllr Aldridge and Town Clerk to prepare recommendation to move this forward.

**F.20.045 To approve expenditure on legal services in respect of the three Land Registry titles at the Watson Hall and Tewkesbury Museum**

It was RESOLVED to approve expenditure on legal services in respect of the three Land Registry titles at the Watson Hall and Tewkesbury Museum from the Legal budget. Proposed by Cllr J Raywood, Seconded by Cllr Danter.

**Action:** Town Clerk to provide update on estimate of costs when available.

**F.20.046 To discuss outstanding Finance Committee actions:**

**i. Internal Financial control checks**

It is the intention to aim for this to take place in September.

**ii. Financial risk register**

For future Finance meeting for onward referral to Full Council.

**iii. Asset register**

For future Finance meeting for onward referral to Full Council.

**iv. Migration of asset register**

It is the intention to aim to start work on this in September.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.23pm

Signature of Chairman upon approval of the minutes ..... 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020

## Summary Income &amp; Expenditure by Budget Heading 31/08/2020

Month No: 5

## Committee Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available
<b>Finance</b>						
Income	9	158,183	314,337	156,154		
Expenditure	5,130	20,739	74,410	53,671	0	53,671
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>(5,121)</u>	<u>137,444</u>				
plus Transfer from EMR	0	0				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(5,121)</u>	<u>137,444</u>				

**Building & Moorings**

Income	934	2,556	23,900	21,344		
Expenditure	720	23,230	64,700	41,470	2,650	38,820
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>214</u>	<u>(20,674)</u>				
plus Transfer from EMR	0	0				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>214</u>	<u>(20,674)</u>				

**Environment & Amenities**

Income	0	2,095	0	(2,095)		
Expenditure	1,562	11,802	68,945	57,143	11,037	46,106
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>(1,562)</u>	<u>(9,707)</u>				
plus Transfer from EMR	0	0				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(1,562)</u>	<u>(9,707)</u>				

**Planning**

Income	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure	0	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>				

**Severn Ham**

Income	0	2,335	37,328	34,993		
Expenditure	2,408	4,340	31,869	27,529	850	26,679
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(2,408)</u>	<u>(2,005)</u>				

**Watson Hall**

## Summary Income &amp; Expenditure by Budget Heading 31/08/2020

Month No: 5

## Committee Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available
Income	2,015	13,309	72,135	58,826		
Expenditure	3,571	16,954	61,700	44,746	2,069	42,677
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(1,555)</u>	<u>(3,645)</u>				

Staffing

Income	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure	16,942	79,953	188,576	108,623	0	108,623
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(16,942)</u>	<u>(79,953)</u>				

Grand Totals:- Income	2,959	178,478	447,700	269,222		
Expenditure	30,333	157,018	492,700	335,682	16,606	319,076
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>(27,375)</u>	<u>21,460</u>	<u>(45,000)</u>	<u>(66,460)</u>		
plus Transfer from EMR	0	0				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(27,375)</u>	<u>21,460</u>				

10 AUGUST 2020

## PC11-20 | WHITE PAPER: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

### Summary

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has issued a new consultation on planning for the future. This consultation seeks any views on each part of a package of proposals for reform of the planning system in England to streamline and modernise the planning process, improve outcomes on design and sustainability, reform developer contributions and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed. The main consultation document can be found [here](#).

First, we will streamline the planning process with more democracy taking place more effectively at the plan-making stage, and will replace the entire corpus of plan-making law in England to achieve this:

- Simplifying the role of Local Plans, to focus on identifying land under three categories
- Growth areas suitable for substantial development, and where outline approval for development would be automatically secured for forms and types of development specified in the Plan
- Renewal areas suitable for some development, such as gentle densification; and Protected areas where – as the name suggests – development is restricted. This could halve the time it takes to secure planning permission on larger sites identified in plans. We also want to allow local planning authorities to identify sub-areas in their Growth areas for self- and custom-build homes, so that more people can build their own homes.

Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development. We will set out general development management policies nationally, with a more focused role for Local Plans in identifying site- and area-specific requirements, alongside locally produced design codes. This would scale back the detail and duplication contained in Local Plans, while encouraging a much greater focus on design quality at the local level. Plans will be significantly shorter in length (we expect a reduction in size of at least two thirds), as they will no longer contain a long list of “policies” of varying specificity – just a core set of standards and requirements for development.

Local councils should radically and profoundly re-invent the ambition, depth and breadth with which they engage with communities as they consult on Local Plans. Our reforms will democratise the planning process by putting a new emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage. At the same time, we will streamline the opportunity for consultation at the planning application stage, because this adds delay to the process and allows a small minority of voices, some from the local area and often some not, to shape outcomes. We

want to hear the views of a wide range of people and groups through this consultation on our proposed reforms.

- Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, and unnecessary assessments and requirements that cause delay and challenge in the current system should be abolished. This would mean replacing the existing tests of soundness, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate.
- Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new standard template. Plans should be significantly shorter in length, and limited to no more than setting out site- or area-specific parameters and opportunities.
- Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable (of no more than 30 months in total) for key stages of the process, and there will be sanctions for those who fail to do so. • Decision-making should be faster and more certain, within firm deadlines, and should make greater use of data and digital technology.

We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions so that as we move towards a rules-based system, communities can have confidence those rules will be upheld.

- We will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms – so that, as we bring in our reforms, local planning authorities are equipped to create great communities through world-class civic engagement and proactive plan-making.

Second, we will take a radical, digital-first approach to modernise the planning process. This means moving from a process based on documents to a process driven by data. We will:

- Support local planning authorities to use digital tools to support a new civic engagement process for Local Plans and decision-making, making it easier for people to understand what is being proposed and its likely impact on them through visualisations and other digital approaches. We will make it much easier for people to feed in their views into the system through social networks and via their phones.
- Insist local plans are built on standardised, digitally consumable rules and data, enabling accessible interactive maps that show what can be built where. The data will be accessed by software used across the public sector and also by external PropTech entrepreneurs to improve transparency, decision-making and productivity in the sector.
- Standardise, and make openly and digitally accessible, other critical datasets that the planning system relies on, including planning decisions and developer contributions. Approaches for fixing the underlying data are already being tested and developed by

innovative local planning authorities and we are exploring options for how these could be scaled nationally.

- Work with tech companies and local authorities to modernise the software used for making and case-managing a planning application, improving the user-experience for those applying and reducing the errors and costs currently experienced by planning authorities. A new more modular software landscape will encourage digital innovation and will consume and provide access to underlying data. This will help automate routine processes, such as knowing whether new applications are within the rules, making decision-making faster and more certain.
- Engage with the UK PropTech sector through a PropTech Innovation Council to make the most of innovative new approaches to meet public policy objectives, help this emerging sector to boost productivity in the wider planning and housing sectors, and ensure government data and decisions support the sector's growth in the UK and internationally.

Third, to bring a new focus on design and sustainability, we will:

- Ensure the planning system supports our efforts to combat climate change and maximises environmental benefits, by ensuring the National Planning Policy Framework targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively address climate change mitigation and adaptation and facilitate environmental improvements.
- Facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.
- Ask for beauty and be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful, and to create a 'net gain' not just 'no net harm', with a greater focus on 'placemaking' and 'the creation of beautiful places' within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Make it easier for those who want to build beautifully through the introduction of a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to automatically permit proposals for high-quality developments where they reflect local character and preferences.

- Introduce a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing England's unique ecosystems.
- Expect design guidance and codes – which will set the rules for the design of new development – to be prepared locally and to be based on genuine community involvement rather than meaningless consultation, so that local residents have a genuine say in the design of new development, and ensure that codes have real 'bite' by making them more binding on planning decisions.

- Establish a new body to support the delivery of design codes in every part of the country, and give permanence to the campaigning work of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission and the life of its co-chairman the late Sir Roger Scruton.
- Ensure that each local planning authority has a chief officer for design and place-making, to help ensure there is the capacity and capability locally to raise design standards and the quality of development.
- Lead by example by updating Homes England's strategic objectives to give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.
- Protect our historic buildings and areas while ensuring the consent framework is fit for the 21st century.

Fourth, we will improve infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensure developers play their part, through reform of developer contributions. We propose:

- The Community Infrastructure Levy and the current system of planning obligations will be reformed as a nationally set, value-based flat rate charge (the 'Infrastructure Levy'). A single rate or varied rates could be set. We will aim for the new Levy to raise more revenue than under the current system of developer contributions, and deliver at least as much – if not more – on-site affordable housing as at present. This reform will enable us to sweep away months of negotiation of Section 106 agreements and the need to consider site viability. We will deliver more of the infrastructure existing and new communities require by capturing a greater share of the uplift in land value that comes with development.
- We will be more ambitious for affordable housing provided through planning gain, and we will ensure that the new Infrastructure Levy allows local planning authorities to secure more on-site housing provision.
- We will give local authorities greater powers to determine how developer contributions are used, including by expanding the scope of the Levy to cover affordable housing provision to allow local planning authorities to drive up the provision of affordable homes. We will ensure that affordable housing provision supported through developer contributions is kept at least at current levels, and that it is still delivered on-site to ensure that new development continues to support mixed communities. Local authorities will have the flexibility to use this funding to support both existing communities as well as new communities.
- We will also look to extend the scope of the consolidated Infrastructure Levy and remove exemptions from it to capture changes of use through permitted development rights, so that additional homes delivered through this route bring with them support for new infrastructure

Fifth, to ensure more land is available for the homes and development people and communities need, and to support renewal of our town and city centres, we propose:

- A new nationally determined, binding housing requirement that local planning authorities would have to deliver through their Local Plans. This would be focused on areas where affordability pressure is highest to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. We propose that this would factor in land constraints, including the Green Belt, and would be consistent with our aspirations of creating a housing market that is capable of delivering 300,000 homes annually, and one million homes over this Parliament.
- To speed up construction where development has been permitted, we propose to make it clear in the revised National Planning Policy Framework that the masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development should seek to include a variety of development types from different builders which allow more phases to come forward together. We will explore further options to support faster build out as we develop our proposals for the new planning system.
- To provide better information to local communities, to promote competition amongst developers, and to assist SMEs and new entrants to the sector, we will consult on options for improving the data held on contractual arrangements used to control land.
- To make sure publicly owned land and public investment in development supports thriving places, we will: – ensure decisions on the locations of new public buildings – such as government offices and further education colleges – support renewal and regeneration of town centres; and – explore how publicly owned land disposal can support the SME and self-build sectors.

#### Proposal 9:

Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools. Since statutory Neighbourhood Plans became part of the system in 2011, over 2,600 communities have started the process of neighbourhood planning to take advantage of the opportunity to prepare a plan for their own areas – and over 1,000 plans have been successfully passed at referendum. They have become an important tool in helping to 'bring the democracy forward' in planning, by allowing communities to think proactively about how they would like their areas to develop. Therefore, we think Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system, but we will want to consider whether their content should become more focused to reflect our proposals for Local Plans, as well as the opportunities which digital tools and data offer to support their development and improve accessibility for users. By making it easier to develop Neighbourhood Plans we wish to encourage their continued use and indeed to help spread their use further, particularly in towns and cities.

We are also interested in whether there is scope to extend and adapt the concept so that very small areas – such as individual streets – can set their own rules for the form of development which they are happy to see. Digital tools have significant potential to assist the process of Neighbourhood Plan production, including through new digital co-creation platforms and 3D visualisation technologies to explore proposals within the local context. We

will develop pilot projects and data standards which help neighbourhood planning groups make the most of this potential.

#### Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

**Protective** – to prevent the creation of unplanned built environments that are poorly supported by infrastructure and services and to protect the Green Belt and conservation areas

**Thorough** – because there are currently many stages within the Planning process at which local people can voice their opinions and there is time for these consultation periods to be managed in a way that allows all interested parties to respond. But a lack of resources (finance and people) within local authorities to enforce planning policy possibly tempts an increasing tendency of developers to try and bend the rules and see what they can get away with.

**Transparent** – with notices on lamp posts, and listings on local council websites

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]

Yes, Tewkesbury Town Council has an active Planning Committee which not only acts as a consultee on local applications; it responds to consultations, both national and local and half of its members represent the Town Council within the planning authority's local regeneration partnership group, alongside other stakeholders. It operates its own pre-applications policy and it is also active in engaging with parishioners on local planning issues, by hosting public meetings at which Planning Officers at Borough and County level are invited to make presentations, to enable local people to be well-informed about local planning issues.

(a). If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]

The Town Council is committed to ensuring that parishioners have access to plans via as many media as possible. This is important because we have an elderly demographic and know that a significant proportion of our more senior citizens cannot, or choose not to, use digital technology. The Town Council endeavours to display hard copies of local policies during consultation periods and is prepared to provide the facilities and support to ensure that local consultations which are solely accessible online are made available to people who do not use the necessary technology.

The Town Council's Planning Committee agendas are posted both digitally and in hard copy; the digital copies contain all the necessary hyperlinks to the relevant documentation for each application under discussion. All applications under consideration are itemised on the agenda, with addresses and reference codes. All Councillors are notified of applications that are located within their own wards, or are likely to have an impact upon them.

Members of the public are always made very welcome to committee meetings and they have opportunities to ask questions and make their opinions known. Under normal conditions, committee meetings are held in a ground floor public space, in order to make them accessible to people who find the stairs difficult and there are always activities for children available, to enable parents and carers to attend. Every effort is made to ensure that technical terminology is understood. Even now, when meetings are held remotely, there are always members of the public present.

We believe that these very human interventions are the measures that are required, to make it easier for parishioners to access and comment on planning applications and policies, whereas a reliance on digital technology will help some people but disenfranchise more.

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

- More/better infrastructure – a recent Gloucestershire Market Towns survey rated Tewkesbury very highly for its transport links to other places, but very poorly for the ability of people to be able to travel around efficiently. This because our nearest motorway junction and main access roads are already being used at, or very near to, capacity and we have a poor frequency of trains direct to Bristol and Birmingham. Our sewerage infrastructure has not kept up with demand and so tankers full of sewerage have to be driven through the town centre daily. We have a major water pipeline which is constantly under watch because it desperately needs to be replaced before it bursts again but, between the weather, Covid 19 and the fact that it runs under a SSSI and breeding area for ground-nest birds, it hasn't been possible to do the work. The power supply is also inadequate for the number of houses we already have and there are frequent small power cuts.
  - Flood protection – our parish is at the confluence of no fewer than six rivers, including the rivers Severn and Avon. The town is surrounded by a floodplain which is inundated several times each year. In July 2007 the town gained world renown for the severity of the flooding, which inundated many homes and made many roads impassable. The development of any site upstream of Tewkesbury has the potential to have an adverse impact on the speed with which surface water arrives on our floodplains. The installation of flood barriers to protect settlements upstream also potentially imperils our town and we believe it is vital that communities that have a watercourse in common should be very much aware of one another's needs and focus on using strategies that safely hold onto excess water, rather than on strategies that protect particular communities but potentially at the expense of others downstream.
  - Protection of existing buildings/heritage – we have a large number of scheduled ancient monuments and listed buildings. These attract tourists which are vital to our local economy and they make the town an attractive place to live in. Our town centre is an Article 4 Direction area.
  - We could go on, because we have far more than three priorities. We have to support our high street and wider economy. We must also protect our green spaces, because they enable us to protect mental and physical health and they are also home to numerous rare and endangered species. The Town Council strongly believes that future housing should be of a high quality, with spaces standards that accommodate modern ways of living and working.
5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
- Not sure. The Town Council's parish is completely surrounded by flood plain. We note that areas of flood risk would be excluded from the Growth category, but are concerned by the phrase 'unless any risk can be fully mitigated'. We wish to know

who would make the judgement that the risk can be fully mitigated and also how that judgement would be made. In our experience, it must not be left to developers to produce flood risk assessments unless there is a rigorous vetting procedure of those assessments, to be carried out by independent experts. We are also of the opinion that it is not enough to consider flood risk with regard to flood plains only, at this stage. The catchment areas of rivers, in particular major rivers such as the River Severn, must be considered as a whole, so that when a site is identified within a river catchment, there has to be mitigation within that site to prevent flooding further downstream, not only to protect property but also to protect biodiversity.

With regard to Renewal areas, there should be caps on the numbers of households or employees that may occupy a site, in order to prevent an adverse impact on the local area, due to excessive parking needs and overcrowding of pavements by waste bins on and around waste collection days.

We are very much in favour of the Protected category, particularly in respect of the inclusion of AONBs, Conservation areas and heritage sites.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?  
[Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

The Town Council is concerned that using design codes and guides, coupled with the use of digital services to screen developments could stifle creativity and innovation. It may also lead to a very formulaic approach to development, as developers realise how they can most efficiently 'tick all the boxes' and thus create a situation that, even more than now, produces housing estates that look pretty much the same, wherever you are in England. There needs to be a push towards the development of new materials and methods, coupled with prefabrication, in order to create high quality new dwellings more quickly. Pre-fabrication is important as it is potentially the way to make airtight houses with mechanical ventilation, that perform as designed and thus make zero-carbon homes. These may well create a new aesthetic and the planning system must have the flexibility to embrace these.

The Town Council is very much in favour of Neighbourhood Plans and would like to see more practical and professional support provided, in order to help communities to produce their plans in a timely and efficient manner.

The Town Council is in favour of the alternative options which are outlined in paragraph 2.16. We would certainly consider that our parish presents a set of exceptional circumstances, as is the case for many parishes throughout England. Indeed, we would go so far as to say that exceptionality is the norm. We are

therefore very keen to retain the Regeneration SPD that pertains to our parish and also our local Flooding SPD, which is particularly exacting but very necessary, considering our location in the Severn Valley and our history of severe flooding.

7. Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, with qualifications. The Town Council is also of the opinion that the need to demonstrate deliverability is very important and should not be removed, particularly because, in some areas, it might be very difficult to identify a stock of reserve sites.

- (b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

The Town Council’s parish is on a district boundary, county boundary and regional boundary, so this is a really important issue for us, and one that has caused problems. There should be a mechanism that ensures the existence of cross-border cooperation, but this cannot be a one-way process. Where development on one side of a boundary will have an impact on the other side there must be negotiation and agreement on an appropriate form of mitigation. When development impacts on a natural feature or large piece of infrastructure that crosses multiple boundaries there must also be a clear awareness of the potential effects across all those boundaries and agreement reached on an appropriate form of mitigation.

All plans should take a holistic approach to managing cross-boundary issues and there should be consultation, as a matter of course, at all stages of the planning process.

The Town Council is concerned that if a proposed development, such as that to the east of Bredon Road, north of Tewkesbury, were to have been submitted under the proposed permission to develop rules, the people of Tewkesbury could be facing a huge adverse impact on every single aspect of its already overstretched infrastructure with no opportunity to protest or seek mitigation, unless there was suitable cross-boundary co-operation, together with a body capable of managing it. The Town Council believes that there should be a fair sharing of CIL and council tax in situations where development happens on one side of a boundary but will lead to a heavy dependence on services on the other side. The Town Council notes, however, that the current Duty to Cooperate principle has not been good for Tewkesbury, in that the local Planning Authority has had to cooperate with Cheltenham and Gloucester by accommodating housing for which they do not have the space. This has put pressure on local planning policy and consequently on the ability of the Severn Valley floodplains to do their job.

8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. The Town Council considers that the proposed standard method of establishing housing requirements is a blunt instrument that will be to the detriment of areas where development is not straightforward, such as in river catchment areas, where development could exacerbate flooding downstream. It also does not take account of commuters, who may choose to live in one area and travel a substantial distance to work. There are too many variables to take into consideration for a standard method to work. Perhaps a system in which areas bid for government money for infrastructure and in return put forward an appropriate number of housing units in that area would be more appropriate. In that way the new houses would come complete with their infrastructure and the community at large derive a benefit from that infrastructure.

- (b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

It may be, but designating sites that can deliver a specified quota of houses will only make housing more affordable if those houses are built. If planning permission has been granted and yet the site remains undeveloped for a considerable time afterwards, then Local Authorities should have the means to develop those sites themselves. Otherwise, those sites are just enhancing developers' balance sheets while doing nothing to address housing need. There is a danger that packing more housing into expensive areas where there isn't much development land anyway will just provide dense housing that will not pleasant to live in but people who have little choice will end up there, for instance, the examples of sub-standard housing that are being created in re-developed office blocks.

9. (a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. The Town Council strongly supports the nationalisation of development rights that was enacted in 1947, when the current planning system was created, in order to suitably manage the impact on others and society as a whole. Due to our historic and natural environment, which includes a significant flood risk, the Town Council considers it important that there is suitable control in all areas, not least to prevent a significant negative externality in the form of flooding, due to increased surface water run-off within our river basin.

(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

The Town Council agrees to a certain extent, but it also believes that there should be room for creativity and innovation. Otherwise there is a danger that the majority of new development will be a pastiche of earlier architectural styles and there will be limited scope for the use of new materials and construction methods.

(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Recent experience of the Planning Inspectorate's decision making over the appeal at Fiddington suggests to us that it would be all too easy for the interests and concerns of local people to be ignored, in favour of new development. New settlements are not in the same league as national infrastructure projects where, to a greater extent, there is a strong reason for overriding local sentiment. Even if a project is of national significance it will still be built in a "local area" and thus have an impact on communities who wouldn't have made the decisions for the project in the first place.

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Such proposals would be very concerning to the Town Council. Around Tewkesbury in recent years several large housing developments have been proposed and become stuck within the planning process because applicants have not been able to demonstrate the extent of their impact on local and strategic highway networks. "As a result of this difficulty, one of these at Fiddington led to an appeal, due to non-determination, because there was insufficient evidence to suggest that the local transport network could cope with the impact of the new development. The Planning Inspectorate has permitted the development, even though the road network has not been improved in any way.

The Town Council is also very concerned with the aspiration that everything should be machine-readable and fit within a specified number of pages. There has to be scope for human judgement, because aesthetics are, to some extent, subjective and machines can only make subjective judgements according to parameters that have been programmed into them by human beings. Limiting the number of pages might result, for large and complex applications, in non-determinations due to a lack of the requisite information. There are also applicants who do not have access to the required software and rely on paper and pens to convey their intentions. They should not be denied access to the Planning System.

The Town Council has also observed that a large proportion of applications for smaller developments lack vital information that is needed in order to make a judgement. It believes that the role of pre-application discussions should be enhanced. The clock should not start ticking on any application from which vital information is missing, unless it could not reasonably be foreseen to be important. This would be helpful to consultees, who can end wasting considerable time in assessing the same applications, in different iterations, time and again.

It would be helpful if statutory consultees could have access to the same software that Planning Authorities have, so that they don't have to rely on someone ticking a box, in order to see all the applications they are entitled to see. It would also be helpful to be able to see and assess the validity, of letters of representation, without so much redaction that they no longer convey anything meaningful.

If everyone had access to the same software platform such a system could work, but it may prohibit some householders and small-scale operators from making applications. There ought to be a scheme that provides training and subsidies for small scale architectural businesses and developers that will enable them to embrace the technology in an affordable way.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Web-based local plans will be helpful to developers and consultants, but must form only a part of a suite of different media, through which planning information is conveyed. Web-based Local Plans are not accessible to everyone, specifically people who are visually impaired and people whose age, income, and technical ability or confidence in using technology, even lack of desire to engage with digital technology, mean that they do not use even the simplest smart phones. Accessing such information on a smart phone would actually be quite difficult for even the most tech-savvy, as the maps would be quite hard to read and digest at the scales that a smart phone could allow.

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. The Town Council considers that this would provide insufficient time for democratic consultation. The current system, which allows for multiple consultation stages, is more likely to illicit a response from a greater number of people. The stage one consultation, as proposed, would be unlikely to elicit much of a response from the public as, at that stage there would little that was sufficiently tangible for people to respond to. People generally don't know what they want until they can see

something that they can analyse. It would therefore be difficult to apply 'best in class' principles to this situation. That leaves just the one consultation period of six weeks' duration, only just over half way through the process, after which a great deal could change, without any consultation at all, probably executed by people who neither live nor work in the place under consideration. The term 'higher-risk authorities' causes us some concern. What would constitute a higher risk authority and who would make the decision that an authority is 'higher risk'? Local plans should be on a rolling process of review and adjustment throughout their lifecycle.

13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes, but there needs to be a less onerous way for local people to produce them, with specialist support available. At the moment the process of producing an NDP is arduous and lengthy and this is discouraging and puts off potential volunteers from becoming involved. If NDPs conform to the housing need in an area, together with environmental and sustainability criteria, they should be the foundation upon which all other planning matters rest. Unless they have due weight, people won't be prepared to put in the effort needed to produce a local plan.

- (b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

There is a role for Neighbourhood Plans to feed into Design Guides for small areas, perhaps individual estates or groups of streets that are similar in nature. There is also a role for Neighbourhood plans in determining aspects of planning that help to determine human behaviour in their local area, such as environmental sustainability, road safety and active travel. Neighbourhood Plans in user-friendly digital form would enable community members to engage with the plans but should also be used by local councils and civic societies to promote engagement in other media, including hard copies and public presentations.

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. There should be a stronger and more frequent monitoring process of sites that have Planning Permission. Planning Authorities should be able to challenge developers about why development is not proceeding in a timely fashion and have measures available to them, to make sure that it does, including the compulsory purchase of sites and the commissioning of other builders to execute the work. It should not be enough, merely to make a small token gesture towards development in order to prevent a permission from dying. A timetable for development should be drawn up which would need to be adhered to within some defined boundaries.

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]

Out of tune with local character and poorly-designed. Recent local developments in the edge of our parish have been of overly high density and very urban in character. They have not reflected the local style and could be anywhere. They are difficult to navigate because there is no obvious direction of movement within them. They have far too many communal spaces within them, for which no one really cares, not even the management companies which have been set up to look after them. It is difficult for the residents to feel part of the existing community because infrastructure such as busy roads create a severance between them and the existing communities feel endangered because the building of these developments put additional strain on existing overstretched infrastructure, such as for drainage, sewerage and transport, and also medical and education services.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

We absolutely do not want our parish to be flooded to an unmanageable extent. In 2007, Tewkesbury suffered an extreme flooding incident, when many homes and businesses were inundated, including the local water treatment works. It experienced less serious flooding in both 2013 and 2020, when a few homes and businesses were inundated, but travel was disrupted significantly. In addition, local farmers were unable to get crops planted and put their animals out to graze. Additional development within the catchments of the six watercourses that meet here will increase flood risk. Very local developments have been shown to move the flood plain, so that houses that did not flood before, now do suffer flooding.

In addition, the Town Council wants to see a reduced reliance on the use of cars in order to relieve pressure on the local transport network and improve air quality. It is also keen to encourage the adoption of new materials and technologies that will make buildings more energy efficient. However, it notes that the proposed changes to the Planning system will make the adoption of such new materials and technologies more difficult, as they might well create a new aesthetic, which might not be seen to comply with the local design codes. Design codes cannot be written to include ideas that have not been created yet, so machines will not be able to judge whether or not the spirit of the code has still been adhered-to, when presented with innovative ideas.

Development should not proceed so fast that our carbon budget is used up unnecessarily. Houses and commercial buildings should be designed to last at least 100

years and in that respect the projected sea-level rises should be factored in when deciding which areas should be built on. The precautionary principle should be used when there is doubt as to the projected flood level risks.

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

The Georgian terrace and Victorian mansion blocks were built by people who imposed their own aesthetic on the places they developed. We seem comfortable with them now, because we are used to them, but that doesn't mean that they were considered to be well-built or well-designed at the time when they were built. 200 years into the future people may be looking at the creations of the major developers who exist now, and aspire to do something similar, which may not be desirable. We also have to be careful not to create a built environment that is a pastiche of former styles. New materials and techniques, new expectations of what makes a house work well, and new sustainability standards may give rise to a new aesthetic which should be allowed honest expression rather than being hidden away behind a false façade.

However it would be useful to see evidence of such design codes having been drawn up by a local community as design can be very much in the eye of the beholder, some people liking large scale design with area integrity and others preferring an eclectic mix of styles and forms. It would also be desirable to have mandatory space standards for different types of housing accommodation and minimum standards for the provision of services.

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

It is probably a good idea for each authority to have a chief officer for design and place making. The Town Council considers that there already exists a body to support design coding and place making, within the Design Council, which absorbed the role of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment; and would like to know how the new body would be different.

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

The Town Council wishes to understand how Homes England would define the word 'beautiful' without resorting to largely subjective criteria that have been settled upon by a small cohort of people, whose views may not reflect the values of residents in all areas of the country. However, it is an admirable objective to aim for design quality at all times. Beauty relates merely to a visual aesthetic, but design quality would cover aspects such

as sustainability, economy in use, comfort, durability, accessibility and function, amongst other aspects.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. The Town Council is of the opinion that beauty is not the chief driver in determining why people choose to buy a particular house. Rather, buyers will often choose to buy a property that offers certainty that it can be sold easily within a few years. A beautiful but unusual house may represent an uncomfortable investment risk to a purchaser who is aware that their family will change in size or they will need to relocate speedily, so the safer option is to buy a house that is like thousands more and thus has an established record of being able to be resold easily and quickly. The fast track for beauty could lead to a reduction in the aesthetic quality of houses overall, if the popularity of certain housing styles is mistakenly believed to be attributable to their appearance.

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space/ Don't know / Other – please specify]

The Town Council's priority is more/or better infrastructure because the local infrastructure for roads, flood defence, drainage and services is already at or close to, capacity. Affordable housing is also important, so that young people will be tempted to live locally and thus create a more balanced age demographic, because currently Tewkesbury has a relatively elderly population, compared to the County as a whole (GCC statistics).

22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Similar strategies have been tried in the past (eg, the Betterment Levy) without success and with results that are contrary to those which the government wishes to achieve. The rate at which such a levy was set would have to be set locally to reflect local needs and market conditions. Otherwise there would be a significant risk of accentuating the north/south divide because authorities in locations where land and house values are lower would have less money to spend on necessary infrastructure than ones in areas where values are high.

- (b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

The rate at which such a levy was set would have to be set locally to reflect local needs and market conditions. Otherwise there would be a significant risk of accentuating the north/south divide because authorities in locations where land and house values are lower would have less money to spend on necessary infrastructure than ones in areas where values are high.

(c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

It would depend on the needs and scale of the local area in which the levy was being collected.

(d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. It would be undesirable to load local authorities with debt. Borrowing in this way would be a speculative action, as there do not appear to be any provisions within the proposed policy to provide local authorities with the power to ensure that developments are actually completed.

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. Otherwise some conversions of large premises could create many dwellings, which could result in a significant increase in demand for services and parking spaces, and cause traffic congestion, for example. But in the absence of a levy the local authority may not be able to mitigate these impacts.

24. (a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes.

(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Neither option is acceptable to the Town Council. The first could result in the under-delivery of necessary infrastructure and the second could result in a significant cost to local authorities.

24 (c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes.

25 (d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. You need to set minimum standards that should be adhered-to, for example, in terms of space standards, access to natural light, ventilation and privacy.

26 Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. It should not be used to reduce council tax.

(a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. It should be the developers who develop the affordable housing. It should not be for the local authorities to make up the shortfall.

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

The emphasis on making the system digital will discriminate against the elderly and against people with some disabilities, such as impaired vision.

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to [policycomms@nalc.gov.uk](mailto:policycomms@nalc.gov.uk) by 17.00 on 15 October 2020. County associations are asked to forward this briefing on to all member councils in their area.

© NALC 2020