



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB

Tel: (01453) 754 351/754 321

www.stroud.gov.uk

Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

COUNCIL MEETING

29 April 2021

7.00 - 11.15 pm

Remote Meeting

Minutes

Membership

**Councillor Gary Powell
(Chair)**

Councillor Steve

Robinson (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Martin Baxendale

Councillor Dorcas Binns*

Councillor Catherine Braun

Councillor Chris Brine

Councillor Miranda Clifton

Councillor Nigel Cooper

Councillor Doina Cornell

Councillor Gordon Craig

Councillor Rachel Curley

Councillor Stephen Davies

Councillor Paul Denney

Councillor Jim Dewey

Councillor Jonathan

Edmunds

*= Absent

Councillor

Officers in Attendance

Chief Executive

Strategic Director of Place

Strategic Director of Change &
Transformation

Strategic Director of Resources

Strategic Director of Communities

Monitoring Officer

Councillor Chas Fellows*

Councillor Colin Fryer

Councillor Lindsey Green

Councillor Trevor Hall

Councillor Nick Hurst

Councillor George James

Councillor Julie Job

Councillor Haydn Jones

Councillor John Jones

Councillor Norman Kay

Councillor Darren Loftus*

Councillor Steve Lydon

Councillor John Marjoram

Councillor Karen McKeown*

Councillor Jenny Miles

Councillor Dave Mossman

Councillor Gill Oxley

Councillor Keith Pearson

Councillor Simon Pickering

Councillor Nigel Prenter

Councillor Skeena Rathor

Councillor Sue Reed*

Councillor Mark Reeves

Councillor Mattie Ross

Councillor Tom Skinner

Councillor Nigel Studdert-
Kennedy

Councillor Haydn Sutton

Councillor Brian Tipper

Councillor Jessica Tomblin

Councillor Chas Townley

Councillor Ken Tucker

Councillor Martin Whiteside

Councillor Tim Williams*

Councillor Tom Williams

Councillor Debbie Young*

Head of Planning Strategy

Principal Planning Officer

Interim Planning Strategy Manager

Senior Democratic Services & Elections

Officer Democratic Services & Elections
Officer

The Chair announced that, following discussions with the Chair of Audit and Standards Committee Councillor Studdert-Kennedy, it had been decided that agenda

item 9ai the Audit and Standards Committee Annual Report 2020/21 would be deferred until Council (AGM) on 20 May 2021. This was to allow sufficient discussion time for agenda item 9bi, the Pre-Submission District Local Plan.

The Chair then informed Members that agenda item 9bi would also be brought forward in the running order and be heard following agenda item 6.

0059 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Binns, McKeown, Fellows, Reed and Young.

0060 Declaration of Interests

Councillor Denney raised a point of order, which had also been raised at the Environment Committee on 20 April 2021, regards the interests of Councillor Tomblin in relation to agenda item 9bi, the Pre-Submission District Local Plan. This was with reference to Rocket Rentals, the business that Councillor Tomblin owned together with her husband, and the land it was situated on, which was within the curtilage of the Wisloe development PS37 in the Pre-Submission District Local Plan. A Companies House check had confirmed that Councillor Tomblin and her husband received an income of £75,000 in 2020 from the land where the business was sited. Councillor Denney highlighted that, if the development were to go ahead, it would surround and likely affect Councillor Tomblin's business and land, and therefore an interest should be declared. Councillor Tomblin declared this interest and took no further part in the meeting.

0061 Minutes

RESOLVED **That the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2021 are approved as a correct record**

0062 Announcements

The Chief Executive expressed thanks to all Councillors, particularly the 19 who would be standing down, for their service and support for the district's communities and the Council's staff during their term of office, especially through recent challenging times. The Leader conveyed gratitude to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Council and marked the achievements and contributions of Councillors Rathor, Curley, Lydon, Townley, Denney and Clifton who would be standing down. Councillor Whiteside then spoke about the accomplishments of Councillors Green, McKeown, Dewey, Pickering and Marjoram, who would all continue to be active in the community. Councillor Davies recalled the service of Councillors earlier in the administration of and advised that Councillor Loftus would be standing down along with further gratitude to Councillors Fellows, Cooper, Young, Skinner, Reeves and Tomblin whose service and participation was also detailed. Councillor Tucker then completed thanks to all Members standing down by also thanking Councillor Whiteside for his tenure. The Chair summed up by expressing his thanks to all Members.

The Chair announced that the Monitoring Officer had advised that, since the Local Plan item was to be considered and debated in this meeting during the pre-election period, it was requested that political comments be measured, with the avoidance of any overt party political references. Councillor Haydn Jones raised a point of order to ask for further clarification on this. The Monitoring Officer stated that it was overt party political references which were to be limited, but that Council could still hold the full debate to which it was entitled to do so regards this item at this time.

0063 Public Question Time

Neil Leighton joined the meeting to ask three submitted questions on behalf of Berkeley and Sharpness Residents' Action Group. Sue Leleu joined the meeting next to ask a question submitted on behalf of Wisloe Action Group. Answers were delivered by Councillor Pickering. Supplementary questions were also raised and answered. (Please see attached PDF)

0064 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

It was confirmed that Councillor Hall had stood down from the Environment Committee, and Councillor Lydon had been appointed in replacement.

0065 PRE-SUBMISSION DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Councillor Pickering presented the report, which had been presented to the Environment Committee on 20 April 2021. The decision made in favour of the recommendations had not been an easy one and thanks were due to all Council Officers past and present who had worked so hard on developing the draft Local Plan. The government expectation for Local Planning Authorities was to require an update to the Local Plan every five years. An update to the District's current adopted Local Plan was now due as it was over five years old and the housing requirements it set out were no longer up to date. Any further delay, additional to the recent delays already experienced due to the pandemic and possible changes in government policy, would increase the risk of the occurrence of planning by appeal. A series of measures to implement the Carbon Neutral 2030 Strategy were embedded throughout the plan: net carbon zero construction standards, carbon zero heating systems, identification of suitable areas for renewable energy, at least 10% new biodiversity gain, multifunctional green space and tree-planting, reuse and regeneration of brownfield land, planning for exemplar carbon neutral settlements, support for active travel and walking and support for the reopening of two new rail stations at Stonehouse and Sharpness.

The government had set out the minimum number of new houses to be provided in the district, which had been raised from a minimum of 456 to 630 homes per annum to be built, largely by private developers, which was an increase of 38%. There was therefore a need for some more new housing, particularly to support longer life expectancy, improvements in the status of women and the need for affordable houses for younger adults, three of the key drivers in the need for more housing. A buffer was required by the government and therefore Officers were advising an overall housing supply of 14,935 homes. Although covering just under 187 square miles, approximately half the district was an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and a

considerable area was now at risk of flooding, therefore only roughly one third of the district remained available for allocation. Reducing the need to travel by private car, the single largest source of greenhouse emissions in the district, had been a primary factor in the development strategy towards delivering the Carbon Neutral 2030 Strategy. Extensive public consultation and work had so far been carried out by Officers and this, along with the significant contribution of the all-party Members on the Planning Review Panel in enabling consensuses to be reached, was formally acknowledged and thanked.

Councillor Pickering summarised the main objectives of the strategy which set out to:

- concentrate housing growth at population centres with best access to services and facilities
- develop new settlements where there was potential to create more sustainable communities
- regenerate the canal corridor through the Stroud Valleys, and Berkeley and Sharpness
- maximise the use of previously developed land
- provide strategic employments accessible within the M5/A38 corridor
- support the development and social sustainability of small towns and villages

It was essential that a sound Local Plan would stand up to scrutiny and that decisions on the choices of sites were transparent, logical and underpinned by evidence. The assessment of potential sites to meet the plan requirements had been rigorously tested. The Council could only consider sites supported by landowners as they must be deliverable. All sites were subject to public consultation and then progressed through the sustainability appraisal process, selected on their performance in that assessment, and also their ability to deliver the Local Plan Strategy. The broad locations resulting were highlighted in maps within the report. Gloucester City Council had identified a shortfall of 6,000 dwellings to meet future housing needs and had asked for help from neighbouring authorities with fulfilling this. It was both a national policy requirement and legal duty that Stroud District Council work co-operatively to accommodate unmet need in the most sustainable places. Following a joint assessment, a site at Whaddon had been identified for up to 3,000 dwellings. Councillor Pickering underlined that the proposal at this stage was not to allocate this site, but to safeguard it. The site would only be allocated subject to Gloucester City wanting the site to be allocated and providing up to date evidence of need at the Local Plan Examination.

At Environment Committee, two public questions had been asked and answered and a wide range of questions had been raised by both Committee and another Member in attendance and addressed. An amendment to remove the strategic site at Wisloe was proposed but defeated and the substantive recommendations had been approved. Officers had also agreed to make a number of minor changes in response to requests from Councillors Townley and Tomblin. These were:

- to refer to accommodation for older people as independent living not sheltered housing
- to remove all references to Cam as a town
- to include a glossary

After the reports had been published, other minor corrections had been identified by Officers such as site number consistencies, minor textual formatting changes, and

finalised map and diagram amendments. These would be carried out by the Head of Planning Strategy and team under delegation, before publication. The recording of the Environment Committee had been broadcast live and had been available for all Members to watch in preparation prior to the current meeting.

Councillor Pickering proposed the motion, which was seconded by Councillor James.

Councillor Lydon requested confirmation regarding the rules by which the Local Plan was drawn up and what consequences could result from non-compliance. Councillor Pickering confirmed that all district councils must comply with the national planning guidance set down by the government. The numbers had been set and were very high. Compliance with the strict guidance was mandatory to avoid being penalised and there was always a risk of planning by appeal, as happened in 2013- 14 when a number of significant planning applications refused through the Development Control Committee were then subsequently lost at appeal. The Head of Planning Strategy added that the government figure of 630 was not a target, but a minimum.

Councillor Tipper enquired about dwellings to be built in the Cam area and whether the 38% increase had already been well exceeded in this location. Councillor Pickering informed that this increase would be applicable from the point of adoption of the new, rather than the existing, plan. The Head of Planning Strategy added that the minimum national government requirement of homes per year would have to be spread across the district and it was at the Council's discretion as to how the total minimum of 12,600 should be distributed. There were much larger allocations in other parts of the district, but the assessment work had shown that Cam and other settlements such as Stonehouse could take some of this growth. It was not an increase that had to be applied to each parish or town individually, it was a case of distributing the increase across the district and would tend to relate to the existing towns and larger villages and not in the countryside locations.

Councillor Craig asked how the public transport infrastructure proposals tied in with the industrial strategy and Gloucestershire 2050 Vision. In response, Councillor Pickering highlighted the support of the Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and the Head of Planning Strategy added that the GFirst LEP supported economic growth at the new settlement and at the Gloucestershire Science and Technology Park at Berkeley, so it was in accordance with the Local Industrial Strategy. Regarding the 2050 Vision, there had been an initial visioning document, but this had not developed yet into an approved plan or strategy so had no formal status. In response to further questions from Councillor Craig regarding the ammonium nitrate store, a topic which had also been raised at the Environment Committee, Councillor Pickering and the Head of Planning Strategy confirmed that the allocation of the new settlement at Sharpness was out of the consultation zone, bar a tiny part of the foreshore which was not part of the built development part of the allocation. The draft Local Plan, and the Sharpness allocations within it, were in conformity with the current Health and Safety Executive (HSE) advice and current legislative requirements. If these were to change, the Local Plan Inspector could consider this at examination. Examination was scheduled to commence towards the end of 2021 and most Local Plans took 9 to 12 months to go through this process, therefore it would be at least 18 months until adoption. This would give time for the Inspector to consider any changes to government policy before then. The Sharpness Docks site and its allocation had been rolled forward from the current adopted Local Plan and had therefore already been

through a public examination in 2014-15. There had been no known changes in the legislative framework since. A government white paper in 2020 had proposed changes for new-style Local Plans to be reviewed every 3 years, giving assurance that the planning process would be flexible enough to deal with any changes in national legislation which might occur in the future.

Councillor Pearson asked for clarification in relation the current adopted Local Plan approved in 2015, which covered the period to 2031, and whether the 12,600 figure set out in the latest draft plan now being considered was additional to those dwellings required to be built by 2031, or did it include some of the houses already assigned within the 2015-2031 timescale. The Head of Planning Strategy confirmed that houses remaining to be built that were part of the 2015-2031 plans could be counted towards the delivery of housing in the 2020-2040 timescale, so these were different time periods but there was a crossover and advantage could be taken regards the good current position on the local housing land supply. Ongoing review of the Local Plan was important to keep the supply topped up and to avoid any future shortfall. Councillor Pearson further asked how many extra houses were to be found within the years 2031 to 2040. Members were referred to Table 1 in the Environment Committee report regards housing requirement and supply, which included a total of 4,595 homes already accounted and planned for. The requirement for further housing to be found in addition to this figure was approximately 8,000 houses. The supply already counted was therefore part of the future supply, but more would still need to be found.

Councillor Fryer asked about trigger points for infrastructure in the bigger developments. The Head of Planning Strategy explained that for new major developments it was important for infrastructure to be delivered in a timely manner to avoid dwellings being built without the necessary infrastructure being in place. Phasing development had been detailed in the various large site policies included within the plan, to ensure co-ordination between housing and employment, and the timely provision of local centres with community facilities such as schools, shopping and health amenities, to avoid any infrastructure deficit. The Local Plan established this as a principle and further detail, including numbers of houses for trigger points to be reached, would be set out in the subsequent master plan, development brief and series of supplementary planning documents, incorporating stakeholder and community involvement in the process. Drafts of these would be made available to the Inspector at the examination to demonstrate that each site was deliverable. In response to an additional question on this topic from Councillor Green, Members were informed that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan had been prepared setting out all infrastructure requirements and the views of statutory providers. This would be updated following the decision at the meeting and would then go to the examination, giving an up to date position on what infrastructure was needed, with regard to delivery and policy requirements. This would aim to provide satisfaction that there would be a reasonable prospect that development would take place in accordance with the plan.

A five-minute break was then called and the meeting resumed at 8.39pm.

Councillor Haydn Jones asked whether the train speed for the Sharpness service would permanently be limited to 15mph. Members were informed that the 15mph limit was for the heritage railway-run pilot scheme, and that the commercial service would be faster. The pilot service on the Vale of Berkley railway could be run from 2025 and

the commercial service, after upgrading of the track and signalling, was expected to start in 2029, and would be at normal commercial speed. The second train would then be introduced in 2035. In response to a second query raised with regard to Cam and a question mark over additional land, the Head of Planning Strategy clarified that a mistake had been made in the Environment Committee, in a reference to Cam North West increasing in size. The correct position was that there hadn't been any increase to the amount of land, but the point that an increase to the number of dwellings needed to achieve efficient use of land remained valid. In terms of net density, 700 dwellings per hectare would be a low level and 900 would be needed in order to achieve efficient use of land and an average density across the development of around 30 dwellings per hectare. Increasing the number of dwellings to 900 would also ensure that the appropriate level of infrastructure could be provided including the proposed new primary school.

Councillor Hall asked about the creation of jobs and whether criteria for employers coming to the area would include requirements for trade-union recognised jobs paid at least at the living wage and protected by trade union conditions, especially in light of needing to provide opportunities for young people to live and work in the area. Councillor Pickering advised that the local plan cannot have control or any influence over these aspects. Councillor Green enquired about the employment land allocated at Sharpness and what was in the pipeline for that. The Head of Planning Strategy highlighted the widening of proposed employment usage for land at Sharpness Docks in the adopted local plan, to attract more general usage in association to the regeneration of the docks promoted by the Canal and Rivers Trust, rather than dock-related usage as previously specified in older plans. In terms of the new settlement, additional employment development and uptake would be supported by proximity to new residential areas and there was also an expectation that land would be available as grow-on space for incubator companies, based at the Gloucestershire Science and Technology Park. There would need to be more evidence provided and put forward at the Local Plan examination that this market was developable and that this aspiration would be achievable.

An amendment to recommendation a) was proposed by Councillor Mossman as follows:

- a) Subject to the removal of Wisloe (PS37) and the insertion of Moreton Valence (PGP2), approve the draft Local Plan (appendix A) for publication (and so on)

This was seconded by Councillor Cooper. Councillor Mossman addressed Members giving explanation of the proposed amendment and asking Members to consider it for a number of reasons, in comparison of the two sites, considering location, the Council's climate change strategy and sustainability agenda, infrastructure, community and developers' commitments to these aspects. The anxieties of the local community raised by the Wisloe Action Group were also referenced. Councillor Pickering expressed sympathy with the amendment but asserted that all sites had been looked at in great detail by Officers, Members and professional advisers. The amendment was debated by Members with input from Councillors Denney, Hurst, Lydon, Cooper, Pearson, Haydn Jones, Tipper, Cornell and Davies.

On being put to the vote, the amendment fell with 10 votes for, 26 votes against and 6 abstentions.

Members then debated the substantive motion with input from Councillor Pearson before an amendment was proposed by Councillor Craig and seconded by Councillor Green as follows:

- a) Subject to the removal of PS34 and PS36 and them being replaced with Moreton Valence and Whitminster, approve the draft Local Plan (appendix A) for publication (and so on).

Councillor Craig gave context for the proposed amendment including comparative examples of risks, infrastructure costs, potential railway and traffic issues, poor air quality and concerns around the lack of revisions to the consultation distances, given the ammonium nitrate stores.

Councillor Lydon spoke in debate before proposing that the question be put. This was seconded by Councillor Brine. On being put to the vote, this proposal was carried with 26 votes for, 15 votes against and 1 abstention. Councillor Craig gave a reply.

On being put to the vote, the amendment fell with 9 votes for, 27 votes against and 6 abstentions.

In response to a proposal from Councillor Lydon, seconded by Councillor Brine, to move straight to the vote on the substantive motion, the Chair asserted that sufficient debate had not yet been conducted.

A vote was then taken regards continuing past 10.00pm. Agreement for this was carried with 39 votes for, 3 votes against and no abstentions.

Debate on the substantive motion followed with contributions from Councillors Davies, Studdert-Kennedy, Lydon, Tipper, Hurst, Braun, Denney, Haydn Jones, Green, Whiteside, Tom Williams, Cornell, Mossman, Craig and Hall. Councillor Pickering summed up.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried with 26 votes for, 7 votes against and 8 abstentions.

- RESOLVED**
- a) **To approve the draft Local Plan (appendix A) for publication, in accordance with Regulations 19 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and subsequently submit to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012;**
 - b) **To approve the public consultation reports (appendices B and C) for publication, and**
 - c) **To delegate to the Head of Planning Strategy authority to make minor map, textual and formatting changes to the draft document before publication.**

The Chair confirmed that, with consent of the relevant Members, it was decided that Item 7 the Ubico Five Year Vision and Business Plan 2021-22, would be deferred.

0066 UBICO SHAREHOLDER DECISION

The Strategic Director of Resources introduced the report and outlined that Gloucester City Council (GC) had voted to join the Ubico Partnership. A majority decision was now being sought on whether to accept this, through votes with existing shareholders. The Ubico board had defined four tests to decide on acceptance of new members and the report set out how these four tests had been met. Members were being asked to resolve that the Chief Executive, in her role as the Council's Ubico shareholder, can vote for GC to join the Ubico Partnership.

Councillor Pickering proposed the motion, which was seconded by Councillor Whiteside.

Councillor Denney asked whether Officers were satisfied, given the recent known issues with the waste collection and disposal service at GC, that they would be able to be productive members of the partnership. The Strategic Director of Resources informed that the previous issues were due to disputes with the contractor at the time. Ubico had taken a prudent and risk averse approach to the business plan, allowing plenty of capacity, and had worked hard on the operational plans. Throughout the mobilisation process it would be ensured that arrangements were in place to manage the contract effectively. Councillor Hurst enquired, because of aspects such as timescales and vehicle compatibility, whether GC could be adequately integrated into the existing partnership without affecting problems further down the line. Members were informed that vehicle compatibility would not be an issue given GC vehicles would be delivering the GC service and their vehicles were a mix of being owned outright (Ubico would take over these) and by the current contractor. Following the hard work and recent improvements with the waste collection service at Stroud District Council, and the experience of the Council's Officers and Members involved in this process, help and support as part of the mobilisation process had been offered to Ubico and GC and both parties were really happy to work in this way.

Councillor Pickering summed up and expressed support for the motion. He added that he had carried out discussions at a political level with the relevant lead Councillors at GC. Officers in the Council's Finance Team, including the Accountant, were thanked for hard work in analysing and investigating all the financial aspects of the Ubico contract and also the Head of Community Services and Community Services Manager for their technical input. This would be a good step towards a unified collection system which would be of benefit to residents across the whole county.

A number of Councillors had left the meeting and did not vote on this item.

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

0067 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Member questions had been submitted and were asked by Councillor Davies and Councillor Lydon. These were answered by the Chair of Housing Committee and the Leader. Supplementary questions were also answered (Refer to the [recording of the meeting](#)).

0068 NOTICE OF MOTION

Motion regarding support of the Climate and Ecological Emergency (CEE) Bill

The motion was presented by Councillor Pickering, who informed Members that this motion encouraged the government to move with the process and join in helping the Council, who were showing leadership as one of the local authorities leading on climate change, in delivering the targets set out in the Carbon Neutral 2030 Strategy. This needed to be done in partnership with citizens and business and the government must also play their part.

The motion was moved by Councillor Pickering and seconded by Councillor Cornell.

Councillor Rathor proposed a friendly amendment that the Council consider invoking a citizens' assembly as part of the action around supporting the CEE bill. This was seconded by Councillor Kay, accepted by Councillors Pickering and Cornell, and confirmed by the Chair as a friendly amendment. Councillor Rathor gave further context about the magnitude of the task, and highlighted the requirement for human brilliance, speed, commitment, vision and togetherness. A citizens' assembly would help facilitate this togetherness. So much more was needed than that which the Council could do alone.

Councillor Davies expressed opposition to the motion, despite the Conservative Members' absolute commitment to the cause of climate change, because this was not considered part of the District Council' business. The bill also mandated natural climate solutions at the exclusion of technological solutions such as direct air capture and carbon capture.

Councillor Whiteside spoke in favour of the motion, offering that it was necessary to work together to get this done, and quickly, and to do everything within the Council's power to move this forward. The Council were already doing this within the 2030 Strategy and the Green group hoped that the government would support the Council all the way.

Councillor Cornell added that the CEE was quite a specific and extremely rigorous bill and councils across the country were being asked to support it. If the motion was agreed tonight, it would next be discussed with the local MP to ask for support. The bill had been written and informed by the top scientific and academic leaders in the UK. Our entire carbon footprint must now be considered and support for this bill would set a standard, as well being ambitious. The Labour group held to the importance that this would become law. It was good that the issues of climate and ecological emergency were being brought together in one place.

Councillor Pickering summed up and noted that motions like this are valuable. The example of the Climate Change Act 2008 was given, which started life as a private Members' bill. If carried, this motion would provide an opportunity for the government to build upon it and a basis to develop legislation. It was important to act now and work together.

A further number of Councillors had left the meeting and did not vote on this item.

Upon the vote the motion, including the friendly amendment that the Council consider invoking a citizens' assembly as part of the action around supporting the CEE bill, was carried with 25 votes for, 9 votes against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED**To note that:**

- i. **This Council has declared a climate and ecological emergency;**
- ii. **There is a Bill before Parliament - the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill (published as the "Climate and Ecology Bill") - according to which the Government must develop an emergency strategy that:**
 1. **requires that the UK plays its fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial temperatures;**
 2. **ensures that all the UK's consumption emissions are accounted for;**
 3. **includes emissions from aviation and shipping;**
 4. **protects and restores biodiverse habitats along overseas supply chains;**
 5. **restores and regenerates the UK's depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, maximising their capacity to absorb CO2 and their resistance to climate heating;**
 6. **sets up an independent Citizens' Assembly, representative of the UK's population, to engage with Parliament and Government and help develop the emergency strategy.**

And therefore to:

1. **Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill;**
2. **Consider invoking a citizens' assembly;**
3. **Inform the local media of this decision;**
4. **Write to local MPs, asking them to support or thanking them for supporting the Bill; and Write to the CEE Bill Alliance, the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, expressing its support (campaign@ceebill.uk)**

The meeting closed at 11.15 pm

Chair