



# STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB  
Telephone 01453 766321  
www.stroud.gov.uk Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

## COUNCIL

28 April 2022

7.00 - 9.55 pm

Council Chamber

### Minutes

#### Membership

##### **Councillor Steve Robinson (Chair)**

Councillor Beki Aldam  
Councillor Paula Baker  
Councillor Martin Baxendale  
Councillor Natalie Bennett  
Councillor Catherine Braun  
Councillor Martin Brown  
Councillor Jason Bullingham  
Councillor Doina Cornell  
Councillor Gordon Craig  
Councillor Kate Crews  
Councillor Laurie Davies  
Councillor Jonathan Edmunds  
Councillor Christopher Evans  
Councillor Helen Fenton  
Councillor Lindsey Green  
Councillor Nicholas Housden  
Councillor Steve Hynd  
Councillor George James  
Councillor Julie Job  
Councillor Chris Brine  
Councillor Stephen Davies  
Councillor Katrina Davis  
Councillor Colin Fryer  
Councillor Victoria Gray

\*= Absent

##### **Councillor Trevor Hall (Vice-Chair)**

Councillor John Jones  
Councillor Haydn Jones  
Councillor Norman Kay  
Councillor Robin Layfield  
Councillor Jenny Miles  
Councillor Loraine Patrick  
Councillor Martin Percy  
Councillor Keith Pearson  
Councillor Nigel Prenter  
Councillor Mattie Ross  
Councillor Mark Ryder  
Councillor Lucas Schoemaker  
Councillor Ashley Smith  
Councillor Nigel Studdert-Kennedy  
Councillor Haydn Sutton  
Councillor Brian Tipper  
Councillor Ken Tucker  
Councillor Chloe Turner  
Councillor Rich Wilsher  
\* Councillor Jessie Hoskin \*  
\* Councillor Nick Hurst \*  
\* Councillor Chris Jockel \*  
\* Councillor Gill Oxley \*  
\* Councillor Tricia Watson \*

#### Officers in Attendance

Chief Executive  
Monitoring Officer  
Strategic Director of Resources  
Corporate Policy and Governance  
Manager

Senior Democratic Services & Elections  
Officer  
Specialist Conservation Officer  
Senior Community Services Officer

**CL.046**      **Apologies**

There were apologies from Councillors Brine, Stephen Davies, Trina Davis, Fryer, Gray, Hoskin, Hurst, Jockel, Mossman, Oxley, Watson.

**CL.047**      **Declaration of Interests**

There were none.

**CL.048**      **Announcements**

The Chair made the following announcements:

- Confirmed that he had signed the Armed Forces Covenant on the 16 March 2022 on behalf of Stroud District Council. The Armed Forces Champions and the Strategic Director of Communities would be considering forming a working group to include ex-service personnel.
- Thanked the Officers of Stroud District Council and Gloucestershire County Council for their work for the Tour of Britain on the 9 September 2022.
- Stroud Women's Refuge had been voted as Stroud District Council's Charity of the Year.

The Leader made the following announcements:

- The Local Government Association Corporate Peer Challenge took place between the 8 and 10 March 2022. The feedback report had been completed and would be brought to Council on the 19 May 2022 for discussion. An action plan would also be taken to Strategy and Resources Committee.
- Thanked those who had welcomed Ukrainians into their homes and Officers from Stroud District Council and Gloucestershire County Council, community organisations and individuals who had provided support to make it a success. They also drew attention to other wars and oppressive regimes and stated that the district and country should be a refuge for those seeking sanctuary.
- The Council meeting fell on International Workers Memorial Day and Members were reminded that more people died at work across the world every year than in wars. They advised that they had been having discussions with the Trade Union Congress and that many Councils had signed up to the Stay Safe: Join the Union Campaign. They asked Members to join them in a minute's silence to remember people who had lost their lives at work.

**CL.049**      **Public Question Time**

Public questions were submitted. They were answered by the Leader, Councillor Cornell. (Refer to [the recording of the meeting](#)).

**CL.050**      **Minutes**

**RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2021 and 17 February 2022 were approved as a correct record**

**Recommendations from other Committees**  
**Recommendation from Environment Committee**

**CL.051**      **2030 Annual Report (2021-2022)**

The Chair of Environment Committee, Councillor Turner, introduced the report and commended the work of her predecessors which included Simon Pickering the previous Chair of Environment Committee. They highlighted the following key points:

- The report was reflective of the last 12 months of work
- Phase 1 commitments in the Master Plan were on schedule
- Phase 2 would begin in a years time
- Section 2 highlighted the key achievements
- Areas of future activities were identified including coordination, monitoring, and further baselining.

Proposed by Councillor Turner and seconded by Councillor Layfield.

Councillor Layfield welcomed the 2030 report and offered thanks to Officers and Councillors involved in producing it. He drew attention to signs of progress which included a commitment to £180m spend over 30 years on retrofit to bring the council owned housing stock up to SAP C rating. He also stated that 2030 was rightly prioritised within the Council Plan and commended the councils ability to engage with partners from all sectors.

Councillor Braun commended the effort that had been put into the 2030 ambitions from all sides of the chamber and through committees. They reminded Members of the recent UN report that identified that there needed to be rapid deep and immediate cuts to carbon dioxide to limit dangerous climate change and that the current promises from government weren't enough to save the planet.

Councillor Brown echoed Councillor Layfields' statements regarding working with other partners and the council's recognition of this has helped them to make progress towards the 2030 ambitions.

In response to Councillor Studdert-Kennedy the Senior Community Services Officer confirmed that Stratford Park had won the Green Flag award every year since it had first won.

Councillor Green raised concerns about meeting the 2030 objectives and asked whether the council was going to achieve the 2030 aims. Councillor Turner advised that the report showed just one year of a 7-year plan and that they were making good progress.

In summing up Councillor Turner drew Members attention to the highlights and progress listed on page 45 of the document pack.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED To endorse the Environment Committee decision to approve the 2021-2022 Annual Report for the 2030 Strategy and Master Plan.**

**CL.052**      **Review of street or building names and monuments in the Stroud district**

The Chair of the Review Panel, Councillor Bennett, introduced the report and advised that since the worldwide Black Lives Matter protests in June 2020, the Council had committed to carrying out consultation with its communities and undertaking a review of any street and building names, statues and architectural features in the district that may have been considered offensive. They thanked the Review Panel for all of the work they had put into the review over the last 11 months. A public consultation had been launched in 2021 and over 1600 responses were received which helped the panel to compile the recommendations laid out in the report. The Review Panel had concluded, following the consultation, that the Blackboy Clock and Statue should not be on display in the public realm but should be redisplayed with detailed interpretation in a place that provided learning and education. The recommendation that Council was being asked to consider was to explore if removal of the statue could be achieved. Councillor Bennett also drew Members attention to the additional recommendations of the Review Panel.

Councillor Bennett invited some of the Review Panel Members, who attended the meeting, to give their thoughts.

Mr Guthrie, community representative on the Review Panel, highlighted the following:

- They had written to the council in June 2020 regarding the clock
- Thanked the Review Panel members, family and friends for support
- They had taken the time to read through the 1600 responses and take on board what the consultations responses said.
- Asked Members to think of the report as a series of starting points rather than an ending
- The conversation about how the district could become more inclusive for everybody needed to continue.

Ms Hoskin, community representative on the Review Panel, highlighted the following:

- Impressed by the thoroughness of Stroud District Council in conducting the public consultation and the processing of the results.
- People were beginning to realise that diversity enriched communities.
- Encouraged by the proposal of a task force that could implement some of the ideas.

Mr Butler, historian and member of Radical Stroud on the Review Panel, highlighted the following:

- The conception of education should go beyond the demographic of youth.
- Resources should be developed for community education in a variety of accessible ways, means and media.
- Community education could strengthen community cohesion.

The chair thanked the Review Panel members.

Councillor Pearson raised concerns regarding the validity of the consultation results and whether it was a representative snapshot of views across the district. Councillor Bennett confirmed that based on the electorate for the district, which was around 96000, a representative sample would be 1,058 with a margin of error of 3%. The number of

consultation responses received was above the numbers needed for a standard representative sample for the district.

In response to further questions from Councillor Pearson, Councillor Bennett confirmed that until January 2022 they believed that the residents of the building owned the clock and statue and they had consulted with them. However, it became apparent that the clock and statue had been put into a trust 20 years ago, they had contacted the trustees however they had not been able to respond and so they had been in contact with a member of their family instead.

Councillor Green asked whether Stroud Town Council had provided any funds to repair the clock and statue following an application for a grant. It was confirmed that they had received a grant from the Town Council.

Councillor Green also questioned whether a plaque should be provided on the building and a further consultation carried out once the contextual information had been added. This was so that the public could reevaluate whether the information provided changed their views as to removal. Councillor Bennett advised that it was their plan to provide a plaque even if the clock and statue had not been removed but had received very strong responses in favour of removal.

In response to questions from Councillor Braun, Brown and Studdert-Kennedy the following was confirmed:

- They wanted the communities to help shape any future community events or commemorations and that the task force would help to progress this work.
- They were hoping that schools would be encouraged to use this as a way to educate pupils on the issues surrounding the Blackboy Clock and Statue and the task force would be engaging with communities.
- The figure of £33.5k was for the relocation of the clock and statue and further information on the financials were included in the implications on page 78.
- The plaque would not be placed on the building but would be placed nearby.

Councillor Sutton raised concerns over the removal of the clock and statue and stated that he had spoken to many people who thought it should remain in situ. Councillor Bennett reminded Members that they were not recommending that the statue was removed immediately but that they should pursue removal based on the results of the consultation.

Councillor Patrick asked questions regarding Blackboys Road in Dursley. Councillor Bennett confirmed that the recommendation was for a consultation to be carried out with the residents of the 8 houses in conjunction with Dursley Town Council and that a larger consultation had not been ruled out.

Proposed by Councillor Bennett and seconded by Councillor Cornell.

Councillor Pearson acknowledged the extensive work that had been carried out by the review panel but stated that the implications of the project had not been thought through and it had been poorly costed. He further stated that there was no guarantee that the statue would go to the Museum in the Park and that the consultation did not provide a true representation of the district. He stated that a more thorough consultation should take place.

Councillor Aldam advised that they understood the concerns regarding manipulating history or destroying it and provided reassurance that history didn't change but how we see it could.

Councillor Jones stated that following Councillor Aldams' statement he had been tempted to change his decision and thanked the Review Panel who had produced one of the most thorough pieces of work he had seen. He highlighted his concerns with the budget and the consultation results not being representative. He also drew Members' attention to Historic Englands position which stated 'parts of our heritage may confront us with aspects of our past which we now question, which may be associated with injustice and which may be painful. It is right that as a society we respond to such associations, but we believe that this is best done, not by removal, but by preservation, and responding to them in ways which can explain their context and prompt reflection'.

Councillor James thanked the Review Panel members and stated that we should be removing the statue and clock and put it into a museum as leaving it where it was would be a mistake. They stated that the statue and clock would not be erected now and therefore we needed to acknowledge that and remove it.

Councillor Turner stated that the finances were not exact at this point however they were confident the final figures would be robustly interrogated by the Section 151 Officer. They also confirmed that the majority of responses were in favour of removal and that the statue was not in its first home and had been moved previously, it therefore did not need to be the final location for the statue.

Councillor Evans queried whether a plaque could be included on the anti-slavery arch so that the good and bad sides of history were on display.

Councillor Braun reminded members of the statement that the political group leaders had released in 2020 condemning racism. They also stated that there had been many residents who had responded to the issue and that they need to listen to what people were telling them. They drew Member's attention to page 102 and stated that if the recommendations were approved then they would proceed at every stage with community engagement.

Councillor Cornell commended Members for the level of respectful debate at the meeting and thanked the Review Panel for all their work. Councillor Cornell reminded Members of the anonymous email they had received prior to the start of the review. The email stated that the figurine wasn't based on a specific individual but served as a monument to the commodification and later exotification of black bodies that emerged as a result of slavery and that the statue was symbolic of systemic racism. They stated that if all the recommendations were implemented their understanding of the past would be enriched, and would be enhanced.

Councillor Bennett confirmed that a robust process had been followed and that the recommendations would make a positive difference. They urged Members to vote in favour.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried with 26 votes for, 2 against and 12 abstentions.

**RESOLVED To**

- a) Thank the Review Panel for their contribution to this work; and**
- b) Accept all recommendations of the Review Panel outlined in section 4 of this report.**

Councillor Crews and Councillor Pearson left the meeting and gave their apologies.

**CL.053      Annual Report on the Outcome of 2021/22 Equality Diversity & Inclusion Action Plan and Proposed 2022/23 Action Plan**

Councillor Kay thanked Officers for providing constant help and positive input. They stated that equality work needed ongoing effort by everyone for it to work and that the efforts over the past year had laid a solid grounding. The following was highlighted:

- All council reports now came with equality implications and that they had tried to give them a greater emphasis
- Everyone had some acquired prejudices and that training had been carried out which sought to challenge and change our ingrained prejudices.
- The action plan was constantly being developed and they had asked a future working group to consider the needs of the Gypsy, Roma and traveller communities.
- Councillor Kay would be handing over to a new chair but hoped to remain in the working group.

Proposed by Councillor Kay and seconded by Councillor Bennett.

Councillor James asked the council to ensure they were using gender neutral languages throughout all documentation. It was confirmed that the Constitution Working Group would be looking at this.

Councillor Bennett encouraged members to vote in favour of the report and the ambitious plan that had been created.

Councillor Kay thanked all members of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried.

- RESOLVED**
- a) Note the progress made on the EDI Action Plan 2021/22;**
  - and**
  - b) Approve the EDI Action Plan 2022/23.**

**CL.054      Adopting the APPG Definition of Islamophobia**

Councillor Layfield introduced the report and stated that Islamophobia created barriers and division where there should be openness and inclusion. He advised that it was incumbent on them as Councillors and as a Council to acknowledge the presence of islamophobia in society and do everything they could to eradicate it.

Proposed by Councillor Layfield and seconded by Councillor Aldam.

Councillor Kay advised that he had spoken to members of the Gloucestershire Bangladeshi community and they were supportive of the proposal and would like to participate in any follow up.

Councillor Studdert-Kennedy asked why the Council was only approving one definition and not looking at all religions. Councillor Layfield advised that they had adopted the IHRA definition of anti-semitism in 2021 and that Islamophobia was the most reported hate crime and that it was important that it was recognised.

Councillor Hall stated that Islamophobia was rampant in society and so it needed to be challenged.

Councillor James confirmed that they needed to adopt the definition because they were privileged and they needed to ensure that they were looking after those people that they should be mindful about.

Councillor Edmunds stated that he had previously worked in Gloucester where there were over 3000 British Muslim families and he had learnt so much in his time working with those communities. They stated that Councillors should reach out to those communities as they could also learn more and become much richer people.

Councillor Patrick confirmed that she had attended the Members Briefing and that she had learnt that it was to do with the perception of a particular ethnicity or religion and wasn't what she originally thought.

Councillor Aldam offered her thanks to the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.

Councillor Layfield stated that everyone was a human being but some were treated differently and that it should be acknowledged. He also confirmed that 40 other Councils had already adopted the definition.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried with 37 votes in favour and one abstention.

- RESOLVED**
- a) Adopt the APPG on British Muslims definition of Islamophobia alongside the Coalition Against Islamophobia (CAI) guidelines**
  - b) Include training for Members and Officers in recognising and countering instances of Islamophobia as part of our regular training opportunities**
  - c) Develop and strengthen our links with religious and community groups that represent and embrace our Muslim communities**
  - d) Promote events and messaging around Islamophobia Awareness Month (November) and the recently declared UN International Day to Combat Islamophobia (March 15).**

#### **CL.055      Appointment of Independent Persons**

Councillor Studdert-Kennedy confirmed that they were required to appoint independent persons due to the Localism Act 2011 and that they were proposing to re-appoint two



independent persons and appoint an additional person who had been through the application process.

Proposed by Councillor Studdert-Kennedy and seconded by Councillor Percy.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried with 37 votes in favour and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED** The Council appoints John Acton, Phyllida Pyper, and Adrian Stratton as Independent Persons for an initial period of 2 years until the Annual Meeting of the Council in May 2024, when the appointments may be reviewed and extended for a further 2 years by agreement between the Council and the Independent Person.

#### **CL.056      Ubico Five Year Vision and Business Plan 2021/2022**

Councillor Turner introduced the report and advised that there was an error in the report title as it should have stated 2022/23 instead of 2021/22. They confirmed that the report had been compiled by the Chief Executive as the Councils shareholder representative for Ubico. The Environment Committee had considered a draft of the Business Plan in December 2020. Councillor Turner highlighted paragraph 2.3 which showed the 4 key pillars and 5 themes which had been well received at Environment Committee.

Councillor Studdert-Kennedy asked if they were expecting any increases to the budget for Ubico due to personnel or Covid. The Strategic Director of Resources confirmed that the agreed budget for next year did include an increase for Ubico due to inflationary pressures which would be monitored through budget monitoring.

Councillor Kay stated that the business plan promoted equality of access to all essential services and this should be addressed in future reports to explain what was in place to ensure people had equality of access.

Proposed by Councillor Turner and seconded by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Green stated that Ubico had done a fantastic job throughout the pandemic and asked for her thanks to be passed on to the relevant teams. The Chair offered his thanks on behalf of the whole council and the Leader also reiterated the good job that Ubico had done. Councillor Cornell echoed Councillor Greens statement.

Councillor Davies left the meeting.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** To note the Business Plan for 2022/23.

#### **CL.057      Member Questions**

There were none.

#### **CL.058      Notice of Motions**

- a) Motion calling for Gloucestershire County Council to make 20mph the default speed limit for residential areas in Stroud District and throughout Gloucestershire is proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Layfield

Councillor Brown introduced the Motion and highlighted the following key points:

- The majority of Parish and Town Councils across the County and Forest of Dean and Cotswold District Councils were in support of the Motion.
- It was part of an international campaign - 20mph (30km/h) was becoming the recognised standard for residential areas.
- Safety was the primary reason for implementation.
- Important for quality of life as people should feel safe.
- Evidence on the effect on pollution was mixed however it was explained that studies showed that acceleration caused more emissions.

Councillor Layfield brought Members attention to some of the benefits to road users:

- People would feel safer and more able to cross the road.
- Cyclists would be able to maintain pace with traffic.
- According to a 2018 report produced by Transport for London: "In 20mph zones vehicles moved more smoothly with fewer accelerations and decelerations. This driving style produced fewer particulate emissions."
- Road noise would be considerably reduced.
- Lower speeds reduced the number and severity of road injuries.

Councillor Hynd stated that there had been a real world study carried out in Bristol between 2014 and 2018 and the University of the West of England had published results of the study. The results showed that it had caused a 2.7mph average drop in speed limits, 170 less serious injuries recorded every year, a saving to the local economy of £15m and 45 deaths per year had been prevented.

Councillor Turner stated that approving the Motion would bring the council in line with the direction of travel of many of our neighbouring counties. They also drew on their experiences of spending time in London and stated that where the 20mph zones had been introduced it had been transformative.

Councillor Studdert-Kennedy advised that this needed to apply to cyclists as well as vehicles.

Councillor Edmunds stated that his ward had 20mph limits put in place however it had been a long process and that he therefore supported the motion.

Councillor Cornell confirmed that they would be supporting it and that she had been made aware recently of the issues involved with speed limits following concerns raised by Parish Councillors.

Councillor Housden stated that the motion had been discussed at the County Council in June 2021 and that he would be opposing the motion due to the following reasons:

- There was no evidence that a blanket change was the answer and that a combination of changes were needed to deal with speeding.
- £550k was being invested in a county wide community speed watch safety fund which would be available in the coming weeks.
- Part of the County Councils road safety policy would include the development of 20mph zones but also included education.

Councillor Patrick stated when she had previously walked in areas with 20mph limits, the cars were present for longer and therefore she found that she breathed in fumes for longer.

Councillor Braun stated that everyone has the right to a safer street and that it was a good time to discuss the motion as the County Council were currently reviewing their policies and would be consulting with the District Council.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried with 25 votes in favour, 7 against and 5 abstentions.

**RESOLVED Stroud District Council:**

- i. believes that 20 mph is plenty where people live, work and play;**
- ii. agrees with and supports the UK Government's endorsement of The Stockholm Declaration (Third Global Ministerial Conference on Road Safety, Stockholm, 19–20 February 2020), which resolved that authorities should "mandate a maximum road travel speed of 30km/h [20mph] in areas where vulnerable road users and vehicles mix...except where strong evidence exists that higher speeds are safe";**
- iii. calls on Gloucestershire County Council, as the Local Highways Authority, to identify areas which would benefit from a 20mph speed limit, and to provide the necessary funding to implement these changes, as supported by a majority of responding parish councils to the consultation carried out by GCC in 2021, and will ask the Chief Executive to write to GCC accordingly;**
- iv. will ask the Chief Executive to inform the local media of this council's support for 20mph to become the default speed limit for Gloucestershire;**
- v. will ask the Chief Executive to write to our MPs (enclosing a copy of this motion) asking them to support the implementation of 20mph limits for residential areas throughout Stroud District.**

The meeting closed at 9.55 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank