



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Cabinet

Tuesday, 6 December 2011
6.00 pm

Municipal Offices, Promenade, Cheltenham, GL50 9SA

Membership	
Councillors:	John Rawson, Klara Sudbury, Andrew McKinlay, John Webster, Roger Whyborn and Colin Hay

Agenda

	SECTION 1 : PROCEDURAL MATTERS	
1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING The minutes of the last meeting held on 15 November will be approved at the next Cabinet meeting on 13 December.	
4.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS	
	SECTION 2 :THE COUNCIL <i>There are no matters referred to the Cabinet by the Council on this occasion</i>	
	SECTION 3 : OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES	
5.	PUBLIC ART WORKING GROUP REVIEW Report of the Cabinet Member Sport and Culture	(Pages 1 - 20)
	SECTION 4 : OTHER COMMITTEES <i>There are no matters referred to the Cabinet by other Committees on this occasion</i>	
	SECTION 5 : REPORTS FROM CABINET MEMBERS AND/OR OFFICERS	
6.	REVIEW OF THE GARDEN WASTE SCHEME Report of the Cabinet Member Sustainability	(Pages 21 - 30)

7.		REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S HALF-YEAR PERFORMANCE Report of the Cabinet Member Corporate Services	(Pages 31 - 40)
8.		TREASURY MID-TERM REPORT 2011/12 Report of the Director of Resources	(Pages 41 - 48)
9.		PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF 7 CCTV CAMERAS TOGETHER WITH SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE- HONEYBOURNE LINE-CHELTENHAM RAILWAY STATION TO JUBILEE BRIDGE Report of the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety	(Pages 49 - 54)
		SECTION 6 : BRIEFING SESSION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader and Cabinet Members 	
10.		BRIEFING FROM CABINET MEMBERS	
		SECTION 7 : DECISIONS OF CABINET MEMBERS AND OFFICERS Member decisions taken since the last Cabinet meeting	
		SECTION 8 : ANY OTHER ITEM(S) THAT THE LEADER DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND REQUIRES A DECISION	
		Section 10: BRIEFING NOTES Briefing notes are circulated for information with the Cabinet papers but are not on the agenda	

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

**Cheltenham Borough Council
Cabinet – 6th December
Public Art Working Group Review**

Accountable member	Councillor Andrew McKinlay, Cabinet Member Leisure and Culture
Accountable officer	Wilf Tomaney – Urban Design Manager
Accountable scrutiny committee	Social and Community
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	At its July meeting, the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from a Working Group established to consider Public Art provision in the Borough. It resolved to recommend the Groups findings to the Cabinet.
Recommendations	<p>1 That the Cabinet endorse the recommendations of the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee in respect of the Public Art Review Working Groups findings – as set out in Appendix 2.</p> <p>2 That the Cabinet agrees the appointments method to the Public Art Panel identified in Paragraph 3.4 of this report.</p>

Financial implications	<p>As detailed throughout Appendix 2 (Public Art Working Group report 11th July 2011) with specific reference to 1.25 to 1.30 of the report. The Working Group's recommendations is that there should be a sustainable funding strategy for all public art projects. Projects should be entirely self-funding with the whole cost of a project (including "peripheral" items such as selection of art work, project management, landscape, long-term maintenance etc.) being identified early in the project and funded through a properly managed budget.</p> <p>Contact officer: Sarah Didcote, sarah.didcote@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264125</p>
Legal implications	<p>There are no direct legal implications as a result of this report. One Legal input may be required on a specific project basis.</p> <p>Contact officer: Donna Ruck, Solicitor donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272969</p>

<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>The administration of a regular cycle of Public Art Panel meetings may have implications on officer capacity. Some time is already spent on this function under the current arrangements, however clarity will be needed as to whether the new arrangements will significantly alter the current time commitment.</p> <p>Contact officer: Amanda Attfield, amanda.attfield@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264186</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a risk to the Council's reputation if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed. 2. There is a risk of not achieving some Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently – this may have knock on impacts on environmental quality, economic function of the town centre etc.
<p>Corporate and community plan Implications</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to deliver Public Art impacts on a number of Corporate Strategy Improvement Actions 2010 – 2011 across a range of objectives, principally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment: Cheltenham's natural and built environment is enhanced and protected. Economy: We attract more visitors and investors to Cheltenham. Arts and Culture: Arts and culture are used as a means to strengthen communities, strengthen the economy and enhance and protect our environment. 2. As part of a wider strategic approach to the environment, public art can also deliver on Corporate Strategy outcomes aimed at safer communities and encourage low carbon travel.
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>No direct impacts resulting from this report.</p>

3. Background

- 3.1** At its July meeting Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from a the Public Art Review Working Group – which it had established to consider the processes, policies and procedures associated with delivering public art in the Borough.
- 3.2** Appendix 2 contains the report of the Working Group and details its findings – which were based around a more formalised operating procedure for the Council's long-established Public Art Panel and the appointment of a lay-chair.
- 3.3** The Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to recommend the findings to Cabinet; its Minutes are at Appendix 3.
- 3.4** At O&S Committee there was discussion of how various appointments would be made to the Panel. It is suggested that the following mechanisms are used:
- a** The core of the Panel as identified in the review report (Appendix 2, para 1.13) already exists, with individuals on the Panel representing an organisation. It is suggested that if any of these leaves the Panel, the relevant organisation is invited to nominate another representative.
 - b** The Review recommends the appointment of a public art advisor. It is suggested that nominations are sought by local advert and direct approaches to suitably qualified or experienced people locally. The Public Art Panel would then shortlist, interview and appoint.
 - c** Community co-optees will be sought from local community organisations (formal or informal as appropriate) – according to the nature or location of the project.
 - d** The independent chair would be drawn from within the core lay-membership of the group.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1** To improve the policy and delivery environment around public art in the Borough.

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1** The recommendations result from a series of wide-ranging discussions over four meetings which addressed a range of issues and considered various approaches to resolving issues.

6. Consultation and feedback

- 6.1** The Working Group included a representative from the Civic Society, a lay-member of the O&S Social & Community Committee and Borough and County Councillors.

7. Performance management –monitoring and review

- 7.1** The report represent the findings a review process. It included input from a Project Manager on delivery and process issues.

Report author	Contact officer: Wilf Tomaney, wilf.tomaney @cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264145
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Risk Assessment2. Public Art Review Working Group – Final Report3. Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee 11th July 2011 - Minutes
Background information	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1.

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-4	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	Reputational risk if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed.	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager	
	Risk of failing on Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager	

Explanatory notes

Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-4 (4 being the greatest impact)

Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (6 being most likely)

Impact Description	Impact score	Probability	Likelihood Description	Likelihood Score
Negligible	<u>1</u>	0% - 5%	Almost impossible	<u>1</u>
Marginal	<u>2</u>	5% - 15%	Very low	<u>2</u>
Major	<u>3</u>	15% - 30%	Low	<u>3</u>
Critical	<u>4</u>	30% - 60%	Significant	<u>4</u>
		60% - 90%	High	<u>5</u>
		> 90%	Very high	<u>6</u>

Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 6

Cheltenham Borough Council
Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee
11 July 2011
Public Art Review Working Group – Final Report

Accountable member	Councillor Andrew McKinlay, Cabinet Member Leisure and Culture
Accountable officer	Wilf Tomaney – Urban Design Manager
Accountable scrutiny committee	Social and Community
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	At its September meeting, the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to the establishment of a group to review Public Art provision in the Borough. The Working Group has made a series of recommendations, which it considers will improve provision.
Recommendations	<p>That the Committee endorse the recommendations of the Public Art Review Working Group as set out below and recommend them to Cabinet:</p> <p>The Review Group recommends that:</p> <p>A. Public Art provision should be considered under the commissioning umbrella.</p> <p>B. The wider membership of the Public Art Panel and its supporting officers is broadly correct but would benefit from some adjustment, including the introduction of a Public Art Advisor.</p> <p>C. The Public Art Panel should be chaired by an independent “lay-member”.</p> <p>D. The Public Art Panel should have a regular programme of standing meetings, within the Council’s municipal calendar.</p> <p>E. The Public Art Strategy and the Public Art Supplementary Planning Guidance are in need of review.</p> <p>F. Processes should be in place to ensure that each public art project has a fully developed project management and funding plan at the start of a project.</p> <p>G. A project leader/manager should be established.</p> <p>H. It is essential that a proper mechanism is put in place to ensure adequate funding is available to meet the objectives of each</p>

project.

- I. **Funding must provide for administration/project management costs and for maintenance, in addition to the cost of any works.**
- J. **There should be an ability to take Section 106 contributions on smaller schemes and pool them in order that they can be reasonably used.**

<p>Financial implications</p>	<p>As detailed throughout the report with specific reference to 1.20 to 1.30 of the report. The intent of the Working Group's recommendations is that there should be a sustainable funding strategy for all public art projects. This approach is supported - projects should be entirely self-funding with the whole cost of a project (including "peripheral" items such as selection of art work, project management, landscape, long-term maintenance etc.) being identified early in the project and funded through a properly managed budget.</p> <p>Contact officer: Paul Jones, paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 775154</p>
<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>Legal advice was provided to the Review Working Group throughout its deliberations and appropriate legal advice and comments have been incorporated into this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Nicolas Wheatley , nicolas.wheatley@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272695</p>
<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>The administration of a regular cycle of Public Art Panel meetings may have implications on officer capacity. Some time is already spent on this function under the current arrangements; it is not clear if the new arrangements will significantly alter the time commitment.</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie Mccarthy – HR Operations Manager , julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a risk to the Council's reputation if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed. 2. There is a risk of not achieving some Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently – this may have knock on impacts on environmental quality, economic function of the town centre etc.

<p>Corporate and community plan implications</p>	<p>1. Ability to deliver Public Art impacts on a number of Corporate Strategy Improvement Actions 2010 – 2011 across a range of objectives, principally:</p> <p>Environment: Cheltenham’s natural and built environment is enhanced and protected.</p> <p>Economy: We attract more visitors and investors to Cheltenham.</p> <p>Arts and Culture: Arts and culture are used as a means to strengthen communities, strengthen the economy and enhance and protect our environment.</p> <p>2. As part of a wider strategic approach to the environment, public art can also deliver on Corporate Strategy outcomes aimed at safer communities and encourage low carbon travel.</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>No direct impacts resulting from this report.</p>

1. Background

1.1 At its September meeting, the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to the establishment of a group to review Public Art provision in the Borough. The Committee resolved that:

- 1 A Public Art Review Group be established and Councillors Seacome and R Hay nominated as the Borough Council members. A County Council member, art community representative and community representative are also to be included in the Review Group.
- 2 The processes, policies and procedures associated with delivering public art be examined by the Review Group.
- 3 A detailed timetable be established by the Review Group at their first meeting, with the aim of bringing a final report to the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee in approximately 6 months, with interim progress reports as necessary.

1.2 The Review Group met 4 times and consisted of:

- Councillor Diggory Seacome – Chair
- Councillor Rowena Hay
- Councillor Antonia Noble (GCC)
- Professor James Harrison (S&C O&S Committee)
- Jenny Ogle (Civic Society)
- Judith Baker (Admin)
- Paul McKee (Arts Development Officer)
- Hilary Mervyn-Smith (Project Manager)
- Nicolas Wheatley (Solicitor)
- Wilf Tomaney (Urban Design Manager)

1.3 The Review Group discussed a range of issues covering governance, funding, commissioning, delivery, ambition, the Public Art Panel, Civic Pride, policy, strategy and processes.

Current Arrangements

1.4 Delivery of public art within the Borough is governed by a number of processes and procedures:

a The **Public Art Panel** was set up in 1992 in order to encourage the provision of public art within the Borough; to provide direction, advice and support to those delivering it; and to encourage wider community involvement in the siting and development of projects. Its current membership is as follows

- Cabinet Member Sport and Culture (chair)
- Planning Committee representative (currently Councillor Seacome)
- Nick Sargent (University of Gloucestershire)
- Brian Carvell (Cheltenham Arts Council)
- George Breeze (Community representative)

Officer support is led by

- Arts Gallery and Museum Manager

supported by

- Arts Development Officer
- Parks Development Manager and
- Urban Design Manager

Over its lifetime there has also been occasional attendance from

- Cheltenham Business Partnership Manager
- Jenny Ogle (Civic Society)
- Lesley Green (independent arts consultant)
- Public Art South West
- MAD Youth Council

- b A Supplementary Planning Guidance note (SPG) was adopted in 2004 to establish a planning policy basis for the provision of public art pieces through new developments – either through funding contributions or the delivery of pieces of work.
- c A Public Art Strategy was published in 2004 to help tie the various elements together and establish a co-ordinated approach to the delivery and management of public art provision in the town.
- d The Civic Pride Urban Design Framework SPD establishes public art as an important component of the regeneration initiative.

1.5 Delivery of public art is through a number of processes, including:

- a Planning applications – either as part of a building or landscape design or through funding provided under a Section 106 agreement (planning gain)
- b Council-led projects – particularly through the Art Gallery and Museum, Parks, Built Environment and, in the future, as part of Civic Pride (the Cheltenham Development Task Force Public Realm Working Group includes public art in its terms of reference and includes a representative from the Public Art Panel).
- c Other Projects led by individuals or organisations – e.g. Civic Society involvement in the Holst statue and the Hare and Minotaur.

The Review Group Recommendations

- 1.6** Although the Review Group recognised that public art is successfully commissioned and delivered within the town, it identified a number of problems with the current system.
- 1.7** At the root of the problems, the Review Group considers, is that the delivery of public art has a low priority corporately and that delivery suffers as a result. Thus, there are issues which hamper commissioning and delivery, such as a lack of funding; an inability to provide sufficient officer resource to support projects; and the ad hoc operation of the Public Art Panel. This was not intended as a criticism of those involved in the processes, who are genuine in their desire to see public art delivered, but more a recognition that for the Council, public art is a peripheral activity and not a significant element in any portfolio or job description.
- 1.8** In considering the issues, the Review Group recognises that the Council is not in a position to put significant additional resources into public art and so has considered how the environment around its delivery might be adjusted to help delivery.

Commissioning

Recommendation A. The Review Group recommends that Public Art provision should be considered under the commissioning umbrella.

- 1.9** The Group identified that there are a range of difficulties and opportunities in the delivery of the whole public art function which make it a good candidate for commissioning. These difficulties are identified in the discussion below. However, they include management of the public art panel, project management of installations and the need for championing of public art.

Public Art Panel

1.10 The Review Group concludes that the Public Art Panel lacks focus and makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation B. The Review Group recommends that the wider membership of the Panel and its supporting officers is broadly correct but would benefit from some adjustment., including the introduction of a Public Art Advisor.

1.11 The Review Group considers that the Panel requires specialist advice on Public Art matters and suggests that a Public Arts Advisor is invited onto the panel. This is intended as an unpaid post which will aid the Panel in its tasks of appraising projects and in being proactive in seeking opportunities for new projects. The advisor would be someone with experience in previous projects, being able to advise on the artistic merits of proposals, ways and means of putting ideas into practice, and ready to explore new ways of identifying and funding new approaches. In the past this role was provided at various times by Public Art South West (PASW) and Lesley Green (at that time an officer of the County Council).

1.12 Additionally, Recommendation C (below) identifies issues with current arrangements for Cabinet representation on the Panel. The Review Group considers that specific Cabinet representation is not important on the Panel but that representation by a Council Member with a strong interest in the arts and culture is important. Additionally, a continued link to Planning Committee is considered important.

1.13 Thus, the Review Group considers that at its core, Public Art Panel would consist of:-

- An independent chairman (see Recommendation C below)
- Two CBC councillors (see Recommendation C below)
 - one a member of Planning Committee;
 - another councillor with an interest in art or culture.
- Cheltenham Arts Council representative
- University of Gloucestershire Art Department representative
- Civic Society representative
- A public art advisor

and possible co-optees

- Community representative (specific to particular projects and their locality)
- Project leader (see Recommendation G below)

The Panel itself might like to consider if members with other skills or from representative groups would be helpful and should be co-opted on an ad hoc basis.

Officer support with reference to any particular project will be drawn from the following teams

- Art Gallery, Museum and Tourism
- Parks Team – many art works are on parkland and are delivered by the parks team
- Built Environment Division – the other main corporate source of public art work (including coordination of public realm works and input to the Civic Pride project).

Recommendation C. The Review Group recommends that the Panel should be chaired by an independent “lay-member”.

1.14 The Panel is currently chaired by a council member – generally (currently) the Cabinet member with a culture brief. As such, when chairmanship changes, continuity can be difficult as an incoming Chair is unlikely to have been previously involved in the Panel. Additionally, public art is

often a small element of both the culture brief and of the overall portfolio of the Cabinet member (in recent years for example, this brief was accompanied by the finance brief).

- 1.15 The Review Group feels that handing the chair to a lay member will enable the Panel to be put in the hands of someone with a strong commitment to public art.

Recommendation D. The Review Group recommends that the Public Art Panel should have a regular programme of standing meetings, within the Council’s municipal calendar.

- 1.16 As mentioned earlier, the Group considered that the Panel has lacked focus. It is apparent from the discussion above that there are a number of reasons which might have led to this. However, a contributory factor is the intermittent nature of the meeting schedule (again a result of Public Art’s low corporate priority). This should be addressed through the establishment of a scheduled series of meetings every 3 months, with ad hoc meetings more frequently if a particular project needs discussion. These fixed meetings should be registered on the Council Calendar. A more formalised reporting structure should be considered. Administrative support to the panel will be provided by Cheltenham Borough Council.

Policy

- 1.17 Public Art sits well with the Council corporate objectives:

Objective	Public Art’s role
Enhancing and protecting our environment	By creating beautiful places By creating a backdrop which can encourage sustainable transport choices – particularly walking & cycling, but also providing a focus for transport nodes
Strengthening our economy	By providing a pleasant, interesting and attractive destination for visitors By providing a town centre which has richness and variety in its public realm, to supplement the towns retail, commercial, leisure and cultural offer
Strengthening our communities	By providing a focus for community activity and engagement in design and implementation By providing a centre piece for spaces which people will want to use
Enhancing the provision of arts and culture	By expanding the town’s cultural resource

- 1.18 In addition there is a series of lower level policies which more directly act on public art delivery – Public Art Strategy, Public Art Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Civic Pride Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document and its supporting Technical Appendices.

Recommendation E. The Review Panel recommends that the Public Art Strategy and the Public Art SPG are in need of review.

- 1.19 The Strategy is due for a review as some of its contents are out of date. It could be refocused to establish a clear set of delivery objectives, supported by the more up-to-date Civic Pride SPD.

- 1.20 The Public Art Review Group considers that the Supplementary Planning Guidance needs to be redrafted in order to enable the Council to better use funding delivered through Section 106 agreements. In particular, this would assist towards the Panel's aspirations of firstly enabling top-slicing to support project management and maintenance; and secondly, of allowing pooling of smaller funding contributions so that they can be reasonably used on public art projects. It is appreciated that current Government policy places limitations on the use of S106 contributions in these ways.
- 1.21 In April 2011, Cabinet considered its planning policy work programme and determined that because there were insufficient staff resources available, the redrafting of the Supplementary Planning Guidance is not a priority for this year and will not be undertaken. Capacity for redrafting will be reconsidered in 2012. Despite this the Review Group still considers that there is an urgent need to redraft the SPG.

Delivery

- 1.22 Delivery of public art is a specialist process involving the selection of artists and work; procurement; legal, property and planning issues and finally, installation and maintenance. Delivery of public art is neither a regular occurrence, nor a major element of any one officer's job description. As a result, each project is additional to "the day job" and involves unfamiliar processes. A number of authorities (particularly those involved in major regeneration projects) use a "lead artist" – effectively, a specialist art project manager to coordinate public art procurement and delivery.

Recommendation F. The Review Group recommends that processes should be in place to ensure that each public art project has a fully developed project management and funding plan at the start of a project.

- 1.23 One reason for the difficulties in delivering public art projects has been the ad hoc nature of their inception. This regularly leaves resources (both funding and staffing) stretched. In future, each scheme needs to be seen as an individual project and be properly programmed and managed. This will help delivery and ensure there is a proper focus on the project in hand.

Recommendation G. The Review Group recommends that a project leader/manager should be established.

- 1.24 The project leader would be an important member of the Public Art Panel. The lead artist would not be a permanent officer of the Council, but would be retained on a term-contract arrangement. The contract could establish varying fees, depending on the nature of particular pieces of work undertaken. The job description would include advising the Panel on procurement and fund-raising, project managing public art delivery etc. Funding would need to be drawn through a "top-slice" of funds for public art (e.g. from Section 106 funding, or other ad hoc public art project funding).

Funding

- 1.25 The Review Group found that funding is rarely adequate for each project. Although costs vary depending on the nature of each piece, all recent major installations have struggled for sufficient funding to meet expectations. Each generally needs significantly more than procurement of the art piece – and costs regularly include landscape and engineering work; legal, planning and project management fees; and on-going maintenance. Failing to make allowance for on-going maintenance is not acceptable to the Council and could threaten the approval of future projects on Council land.

Recommendation H. The Review Group recommends that it is essential that a proper mechanism is put in place to ensure adequate funding is available to meet the objectives of each project.

- 1.26 A number of recent projects have been under-funded for their ambition. Those negotiating funds need to be aware of the likely costs of each project. This will involve those commissioning projects engaging at an early stage with the project manager to establish project objectives, possible solutions, an understanding of “peripheral works” (e.g. landscape architecture) and likely costs. It may involve meetings between the project manager and contributing developers.
- 1.27 Concerns were raised at the Review Group about the timing of the Panel’s involvement in any particular project and where it should fit in the planning process. To often projects are merely considered as addenda to a development, leaving them ill-thought out and poorly funded. Any mechanism needs to consider this issue of communication between the Public Art Panel and those negotiating, particularly on planning applications.

Recommendation I. The Review Group recommends that funding must provide for administration/project management costs and for maintenance, in addition to the cost of any works.

- 1.28 The level of contribution for these areas needs to be established, but is likely to be around 10% for administration etc. and at least 5% for maintenance (this will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis).

Recommendation J. The Review Group recommends that there should be an ability to take Section 106 contributions on smaller schemes and pool them in order that they can be reasonably used.

- 1.29 Over the years, the Council seems to have collected a number of Section 106 contributions around the £300-£700 mark. It is difficult to find suitable public art projects for this level of funding. The Review Group received reports indicating that pooling of Section 106 monies in this way may not be acceptable in legal terms, but considers that it should be possible to:
- a explore the pooling of existing monies through contact with the relevant developers; and
 - b establish a system which enables continued collection of contributions from smaller schemes and the pooling of such funds.
- 1.30 Schemes funded in this manner would need to be situated in locations where they have a wide ranging benefit – either a central location or a major park.

2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 To improve the policy and delivery environment around public art in the Borough.

3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 The recommendations result from a series of wide-ranging discussions over four meetings which addressed a range of issues and considered various approaches to resolving issues.

4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1 The Working Group included a representative from the Civic Society, a lay-member of the O&S Social & Community Committee and Borough and County Councillors.

5. Performance management –monitoring and review

- 5.1 The report represent the findings a review process. It included input from a Project Manager on delivery and process issues.

Report author	Contact officer: Wilf Tomaney, wilf.tomaney@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264145
Appendices	1. Risk Assessment
Background information	1.

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	I	L	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register	
	Reputational risk if Public Art is either not delivered or its delivery is badly managed.	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager		
	Risk of failing on Civic Pride objectives if the Council cannot deliver Public Art effectively and efficiently	Urban Design Manager	August 2010	2	3	6	Reduce	Establish proper project management and funding arrangements	To be confirmed	Urban Design Manager		

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 18

Extract from the minutes S&C O&S Committee July 2011

10. PUBLIC ART REVIEW

Councillor Seacome, Chair of the Public Art Review Working Group introduced the report as circulated with the agenda.

The working group was formed by the Social and Community O&S Committee in September 2010, when Councillor Hay queried the effectiveness of delivery of public art in Cheltenham.

The working group discussed a range of issues and agreed upon a series of recommendations (A-J) which it considered would improve provision. He proceeded to highlight some of the recommendations.

The working group proposed that the core size of the Public Art Panel be reduced, to include co-opted members on an ad-hoc basis.

Where generally the panel was chaired by a council member, currently the Cabinet Member with a cultural brief, the working group felt that this hindered continuity and therefore proposed that the panel be chaired by an independent "lay-member".

Another recommendation was that rather than the current intermittent nature of the meeting schedule, the panel should have a regular programme of meetings within the Council's municipal calendar, with more regular ad-hoc meetings where necessary.

The working group found that funding was rarely of an adequate level to achieve the objectives and expectations of each project.

Finally, the Council had collected a number of Section 106 contributions of between £300 and £700 over the years and it had proved difficult to find suitable projects for this level of funding. The working group wanted to see these existing monies pooled and whilst this was not possible in legal terms, advice had been that this could be further explored through contact with the relevant developers. In future there would need to be a system which enabled the collection and pooling of smaller contributions

Councillor Hay, a member of the working group expanded upon the legal advice that had been provided on the pooling of Section 106 contributions. The suggestion had been that in future, a developer could be asked to agree to their individual contribution being pooled at the planning stage. However, if negotiations did not take place at this stage, the monies could not be pooled.

Where existing contributions had not yet been used, contact could be made with the developer in question to ask consent to pool the monies. There was a risk associated with this approach that the developer ask for the money back.

Members agreed that there was a misconception of what constituted public art, not necessarily a statue, etc, though admittedly the topic evoked differing opinions. A member felt that there was a need for more clarity on where the funding for public art was derived.

Members of the Public Art Review working group and the Urban Design Manager gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- It was not for the working group to decide how the various appointments to the Public Art Panel would be made, this was a Cabinet decision. There were mechanisms in place for the appointment of Independent Members and this information would be circulated to Cabinet Members ahead of their meeting.
- Section 106 contributions were utilised to address the impact of a development and whilst an argument could be constructed for using the monies in the town centre, it could be difficult to justify using it in an entirely different ward.
- The report contained more detail in support of the recommendations and clearly explained what they aimed to achieve and why.

Councillor Smith highlighted Swindon Borough Council as an example of where Section 106 contributions were pooled for general use across the borough rather than limited to a specific area. He also felt strongly that Officers needed to demonstrate more innovation and use existing and future monies for other projects including play areas, etc.

James Harrison, as a member of the working group, had been struck by the level of discussion and got the impression that the Public Art Panel had, in the past been rather reactive and suggested that the aim of the recommendations was that the panel be more proactive.

Members were comfortable with the recommendations in their current form, on the understanding that Cabinet considered the comments of the committee.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the recommendations of the Public Art Review Working Group, as set out in the report to Cabinet, be endorsed by the committee and recommended to Cabinet for approval in conjunction with the comments made by the committee.

Cheltenham Borough Council

Cabinet 6th December 2011

Review of the Garden Waste Scheme

Accountable member	Councillor Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member Sustainability
Accountable officer	Rob Bell, Director Operations
Accountable scrutiny committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	Yes
Executive summary	<p>This report reviews the garden waste scheme introduced in February 2011 as part of a package of measures designed to increase recycling and composting and reduce waste to landfill. The overall effect of this has been very positive, with recycling and composting performance increasing from 36% to 50% in the first quarter of this year.</p> <p>Review of the garden waste scheme and consultation with householders has influenced proposed improvements to the scheme. These include the provision of an alternative bag scheme in hard to access areas and the offer of a discount to existing and new brown bin customers for a set period.</p>
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Introduce a pay-per-bag service, at a charge of £1.25 per disposable bag to be sold in rolls of 10, in those hard-to-access streets where the existing wheeled bin service is less appropriate as a practical solution for garden waste collections, with effect from 30th January 2012. 2) Introduce a reduction in charge for the wheeled bin service to £34 per annum for new customers, and for customers who renew before their renewal date. This reduction is to run from 01/12/11 for a limited period of up to six months. 3) Delegate to the Director of Commissioning future changes to charges for garden waste services, in consultation with Cabinet members (Sustainability & Finance) and S151 officer.

Financial implications	<p>The gross operating cost of the Garden Waste scheme is budgeted to be £409,400 in 2011/12.</p> <p>The introduction of a reduction in the Garden Waste bin unit price with effect from 1 December 2011 is likely to result in foregone income for 2011/12 of £16,700. An additional income stream of £16,700 is anticipated from this reduced bin price. The proposed scheme is therefore cost neutral in 2011/12.</p> <p>In April and May 2012 the income foregone from sales would be £3,400. If 98% of all customers renewed their application the potential foregone income would be £8,300. A reduced price to £34.00 could generate an additional income stream of £8,900. Potential new customers for the period Jun 2012 to March 2013 could generate £36,800. The net additional receipt in 2012/13 is therefore anticipated to be £34,000.</p> <p>Contact officer: Andrew Powers, Accountant andrew.powers@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264121</p>
Legal implications	<p>There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: donna.ruck@teWKesbury.gov.uk, solicitor 01684 272696</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	<p>The use of bags will introduce different manual handling risks to our employees which need to be addressed by 1) ensuring appropriate information is provided to customers on not overfilling the bags and 2) training for employees on the correct handling of the bags.</p> <p>The size of the bag will limit the weight that the bag can hold and help manage the manual handling risk.</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, HR Operations Manager julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 26 4355</p>
Key risks	See Appendix A
Corporate and community plan Implications	<p>The garden waste scheme contributes to Cheltenham having a clean and well maintained environment and delivering improved outcomes for customers and communities whilst meeting financial targets.</p>
Environmental and climate change implications	<p>The diversion of waste from landfill delivers significant environmental benefit.</p>

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In July 2010 cabinet considered a report on proposed waste and recycling collection systems and approved a new fortnightly garden waste collection scheme with access expanded to all households (subject to site specific health and safety considerations).
- 1.2 The new scheme was approved as part of a programme of change that included the separate collection of kitchen food waste, increased recycling and alternate weekly collections of residual waste and recyclables. The overall effect of these changes has been a significant increase in recycling and composting. 50% of Cheltenham's waste was recycled or composted in the first quarter of 2011/12, an increase of 14% (or 1077 tonnes) when compared with the first quarter of 2010/11.
- 1.3 The new garden waste scheme has now been in operation for 9 months and the purpose of this report is to review the scheme and recommend improvements.

2. Background

- 2.1 The increased financial and environmental cost of landfill has led local authorities to seek affordable and sustainable alternative solutions for household waste collection and disposal.
- 2.2 The Gloucestershire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (GJMWMS), approved by cabinet in October 2007, prioritises waste reduction, re-use and recycling as key strategies to reduce waste to landfill. In line with the GJMWMS the council has promoted home composting as a means of waste reduction and diversion of waste from landfill. To support this we have made available subsidised home compost bins, information and advice to householders. In the first six months of 2011/12 a total of 169 home composting units were delivered to householders in Cheltenham. As this strategy begins to take effect the total volume of garden waste collected for composting will reduce.
- 2.3 The GJMWMS set targets for Gloucestershire to recycle and compost 50% of waste by 2014/15. This council's corporate strategy (2011/12 action plan) set a target of 46% recycling and composting as a key milestone towards the strategic target. This was an ambitious target and I am pleased to say that we are on course to achieve it with garden waste composting playing an important role.
- 2.4 The previous garden waste scheme was considered deficient in terms of equality of opportunity. There were a significant number of households not included in the scheme who did not benefit from it. These householders complained that they were not receiving a service their close neighbours benefited from, even though they paid the same level of council tax. Furthermore, because the service was fully subsidised it effectively meant that those householders who did not receive the service, including those who live in flats, contributed through their council tax payment to the cost of a service they did not receive. The new scheme aims to be open to every household in Cheltenham for a reasonable charge.
- 2.5 The previous scheme also had inherent health and safety risks due to excessive manual handling of heavy 120 litre bags. With reference to guidance provided by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) it was recommended that the manual handling risks associated with garden waste collections be significantly reduced through the use of wheeled bins. To provide wheeled bins to every existing user under the previous arrangements was unaffordable. At £18-00 a bin the total cost to the council would have been £756,000 and given the pressure on public sector spending this option had to be discounted.
- 2.6 The most equitable, cost effective option to address the above issues was to introduce a charge for the provision of the removal of garden waste on a fortnightly basis. Customers who subscribe to the service benefit from the provision of a sturdy, manoeuvrable wheeled container for their

garden waste and receive a collection every other week throughout the year.

- 2.7 The charge for the service was set at £3.00 per bin per month, payable yearly in advance. This compared well with charges made by other authorities. Charging at the point of collection means that only those householders requiring the service pay for it. As at the beginning of November 2011, just over 11,000 households have subscribed to the service with an average of 30 new orders being received each week since August. It is likely that more householders will subscribe in the spring of 2012.
- 2.8 The income received covers the cost of providing the service. The income received is less than that anticipated but running costs are lower than budgeted and the shortfall in garden waste income has been partly offset by increased recycling income.
- 2.9 Payment by direct debit is not currently available for this service but will be made available to customers from June 2012.

3. Consultation and feedback

- 3.1 Officers have consulted the public regarding the new scheme. 281 householders were interviewed to obtain their views on the garden waste recycling service and potential alternatives.
- 3.2 Of those persons consulted at the Swindon Road recycling centre or at one of the garden waste roadshows, almost 95% said they were aware of the scheme. Reasons given for not subscribing to the scheme were price (20%), not enough waste to fill a bin (26%), not being prepared to pay anything for the service (27%) and convenience of the Swindon Road recycling centre (13%).
- 3.3 Of those persons consulted who live in hard to access areas with limited storage space, only 68% were aware of the new service. Reasons given for not subscribing to the service were price (20%), not enough space for a bin (16%), not enough waste to fill a bin (32%), convenience of the Swindon Road recycling centre (12%) and having very little garden space (24%). Only 8% said that they were not prepared to pay anything for the service.
- 3.4 When those householders in hard to access areas with limited storage were asked if they would be interested in an alternative service using disposable paper sacks at a fixed charge of £36 per annum only 22% responded positively.
- 3.5 When those same householders were asked if they would be interested in an alternative service using disposable paper sacks on a pay as you use basis 48% responded positively.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1 In response to concerns about price and affordability I am proposing to offer a discount for a limited period of six months from now. I propose to offer a £2.00 per annum discount to all householders who renew their subscription before their annual renewal date during this period. To encourage use of the scheme I also propose that this discount be offered to all new customers who subscribe to the scheme during the same period. Apart from these temporary offers, the price for a garden waste bin will be frozen at £36.00 per annum.
- 4.2 In response to demand for an alternative service in hard to access areas with limited storage I propose to offer a service using compostable paper sacks provided on a pay as you go basis at a price of £1.25 per 75 litre bag, to be sold in rolls of 10. This service will be limited to the streets listed in Appendix B of this report. Unfortunately, it is not possible to offer the bag scheme throughout the town. The compostable bags (and consequently the garden waste contained within them) cannot be windrow composted along with the brown bin waste. The bagged waste will be treated via the more expensive in vessel composting process and must therefore be

collected separately.

4.3 Bags will be available for purchase at the Municipal Offices, the Central Depot in Swindon Road or can be delivered direct to the household for a charge of £0.50 per delivery. The scheme will be publicised via a leaflet drop to households in those streets where it will be available.

4.4 Re-usable bags, as per the previous scheme, were ruled out due to health and safety considerations. As the bags are only 75L and are disposable, the manual handling risks associated with these bags are considered to be acceptable, in contrast to those of the previous scheme described in 3.5.

5. Alternative options considered

5.1 Providing a fully subsidised service as before is not affordable or sustainable given current public sector finances.

5.2 A bag service at a fixed charge of £36.00 per annum has less support from householders who live in hard to access areas. It would also be more expensive to administer and thus be less cost effective.

6. Performance management –monitoring and review

6.1 The overall effectiveness and viability of the scheme will be monitored via the budget monitoring process and waste data flow records.

Report author	Contact officer: Rob Bell, Director Operations rob.bell@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264181
Appendices	1. Risk Assessment 2. List of streets for disposable bag scheme
Background information	1. Cabinet report 27 th July 2010, Proposed waste and recycling collection systems.

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-4	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
1.	Collection costs increase disproportionately in comparison to income	RB	4/11/11	2	3	6	R	Round scheduling to ensure one pass collection system	Feb 2012	BB	Div
2.	Householders not in hard to access areas and who do not have access to a pay as you use scheme may perceive inequality	RB	4/11/11	3	3	9	A	Ensure reasons for scheme differentiation are well publicised.	Feb 2012	BB	Div

Explanatory notes

Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-4 (4 being the greatest impact)

Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (6 being most likely)

Impact Description	Impact score	Probability	Likelihood Description	Likelihood Score
Negligible	1	0% - 5%	Almost impossible	1
Marginal	2	5% - 15%	Very low	2
Major	3	15% - 30%	Low	3
Critical	4	30% - 60%	Significant	4
		60% - 90%	High	5
		> 90%	Very high	6

Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

Guidance

Types of risks could include the following:

- Potential reputation risks from the decision in terms of bad publicity, impact on the community or on partners;
- Financial risks associated with the decision;
- Political risks that the decision might not have cross-party support;
- Environmental risks associated with the decision;
- Potential adverse equality impacts from the decision;
- Capacity risks in terms of the ability of the organisation to ensure the effective delivery of the decision
- Legal risks arising from the decision

Remember to highlight risks which may impact on the strategy and actions which are being followed to deliver the objectives, so that members can identify the need to review objectives, options and decisions on a timely basis should these risks arise.

Risk ref

If the risk is already recorded, note either the corporate risk register or TEN reference

Risk Description

Please use "If xx happens then xx will be the consequence" (cause and effect). For example "If the council's business continuity planning does not deliver effective responses to the predicted flu pandemic then council services will be significantly impacted."

Risk owner

Please identify the lead officer who has identified the risk and will be responsible for it.

Risk score

Impact on a scale from 1 to 4 multiplied by likelihood on a scale from 1 to 6. Please see risk [scorecard](#) for more information on how to score a risk

Control

Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

Action

There are usually things the council can do to reduce either the likelihood or impact of the risk. Controls may already be in place, such as budget monitoring or new controls or actions may also be needed.

Responsible officer

Please identify the lead officer who will be responsible for the action to control the risk.
For further guidance, please refer to the [risk management policy](#)

Transferred to risk register

Please ensure that the risk is transferred to a live risk register. This could be a team, divisional or corporate risk register depending on the nature of the risk and what level of objective it is impacting on

**Review of the Garden Waste Scheme
Cabinet - 6th December 2011**

Appendix B

Cudnall Street	Northfield Passage	Knapp Lane	Brandon Place
Oakland Street	Northfield Terrace	Millbrook Street	St James Place
Hamilton Street	Albion Street	Old Millbrook Terrace	Cassino Place
Overbury Street	Bennington Street	Great Western Road	Great Norwood Street
Chestnut Terrace	Oxford Passage	Millbrook Gardens	Gratton Street
Gladstone Road	Henrietta Street	Amos Close	Commercial Street
Longleat	St Georges Street	Queens Retreat	Bethesda Street
Coltham Fields	St Pauls Street South	St Georges Drive	Chapel Lane
Coltham Road	Normal Terrace	St Georges Place	Upper Bath Street
Coltham Close	King Street	York Terrace	Eclipse Terrace
Rosehill Street	Milsom Terrace	Little Bayshill Terrace	Norwood Road
Upper Park Street	Hereford Place	Royal Well Lane	Edward Street
Leighton Road	St Margarets Road	Royal Well Place	Suffolk Street
Duke Street	Monson Avenue	Royal Crescent	St Phillips Street
Princes Street	Dunalley Street	Imperial Lane	Kew Place
Victoria Terrace	Wellesley Road	Regent Street	Claire Place
All Saints Road	Marle Hill Parade	Rodney Road	Waterfield Close
Winstonian Road	Marle Hill Road	Cambay Place	Claire Street
Glenfall Street	Courtney Street	Bath Street	Naunton Parade
Victoria Place	Malthouse Lane	Wellington Street	Exmouth Street
Fairview Close	Dunalley Parade	Oriel Road	Hermittage Street
Fairview Road	Hanover Street	St Lukes Road	Francis Street
Fairview Street	Larput Place	Mitre Street	Naunton Terrace
St Annes Terrace	Hungerford Place	Sandford Street	Naunton Crescent
St Annes Road	Albert Street	St Lukes Place	Moorend Street
Berkely Street	Victoria Street	Montpellier Terrace	Moorend Crescent
Berkely Place	St Pauls Road	Back Montpellier Terrace	Croft Street
Witcome Place	Clarke Way	Suffolk Parade	Short Street
High Street	Vine Court	Montpellier Villas Road	Brooksdale Lane
St James Street	Russell Place	Montpellier Grove	Upper Norwood Street
Grosvenor Street	Cleeveland Street	Montpellier Retreat	Fairfield Street
Grosvenor Terrace	Russell Street	Daffodil Street	Croft Lane
Grosvenor Place South	Charles Street	Andover Road	Fairfield Road
St John's Avenue	Baker Street	Inkerman Lane	Fairfield Avenue
Sherbourne Street	Townsend Street	Hatherley Street	Fairfield Park Road
Gloucester Place	Whitehart Street	Lypiatt Street	Fairfield Walk
Trinity School Lane	Swindon Street	Saddlers Lane	Fairhaven Street
Jersey Street	Granville Street	Lypiatt Mews	Fairhaven Road
Columbia Street	Stoneville Street	Tivoli Mews	Roman Road
Union Street	Bloomsbury Street	Tivoli Street	Brevel Terrace
York Street	Market Street	Tivoli Lane	Grange walk
Sherbourne Street	Park Street	Princes Road	
Albert Place	Burrton Street	Oakfield Street	
Portland Square	Grove Street	Alexandra Street	
Winchcombe Street	Station Street	Albany Road	
Belmont Road	Devonshire Street	Dagmar Road	
Sheldon's Court	Elmstone Street	Tivoli Walk	
Regency Mews	New Street	Bakehouse Lane	
Fishers Lane	Chapel Street	Andover Walk	
Portland Street	Ambrose Street	Andover Street	
Warwick Place	Ambrose Place	Andover Lane	
North Place	Knapp Road	Tryes Road	

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 30

Review of the council's half-year performance 2011-12

Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 28 November 2011

Cabinet – 6 December 2011

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Corporate Services
Accountable officer	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnerships Manager.
Accountable scrutiny committee	Economy and Business Improvement
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	The performance review takes information and data from our performance management system to provide Cabinet with an overview of how the council is performing at the half-way point in the financial year. This enables cabinet members to input into discussions about how to resolve areas where there maybe performance concerns and also to recognise where performance is better than expected.
Recommendations	To note the corporate performance of the organisation at the end of Quarter 2.
Financial implications	There are no financial implications as a result of this report.
Legal implications	There are no legal implications as a result of this report
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	There are no HR implications as a result of this report
Key risks	<p>The business planning process helps the council manage risk in a number of areas, but particularly through creating a strategic framework for the management of projects and initiatives.</p> <p>If we do not respond to performance information, then we may not direct change and improvement in a positive direction.</p>

Corporate and community plan implications	This report sets out performance information relating to the delivery of corporate priorities in 2010-2011.
Environmental and climate change implications	None identified as a result of this report

1. Background

- 1.1** The council agreed the corporate strategy 2010-2015 in March 2010 which sets out our 5 objectives and 11 outcomes and what we want to achieve by 2015. In March 2011, the council subsequently agreed its 2011-12 action plan that sets out a range of milestones and indicators to measure performance in the current financial year.
- 1.2** The performance report takes information and data from our performance management system to provide elected members with an overview of how the council is performing. This enables elected members to input into discussions about how to resolve areas where there maybe performance concerns and also to recognise where performance is better than expected. This report summarises how the council performed at half-way stage in regard to the published milestones, performance indicators and outcomes set out in the 2011-12 action plan.

2. Performance Overview

2.1 Corporate Strategy milestones

In the 2011-12 action plan, we identified 46 milestones to track our progress. Out of these:

- 76% (35) of milestones are on target to be completed at the end of the year.
- 22% (10) of milestones are amber (not on track at the moment) though should be recoverable by the end of the year.
- 2% (1) milestone is red and is not anticipated to be recoverable by the end of the year.

The red milestones that is not on track is as follows:

Milestones	target date	commentary at end of Sept 2011
Officer group established for climate change adaptation	June 2011	This has not been progressed; thought needs to be given to the evolving structure of the council and whether establishing this group is still appropriate. Climate change is being built into the commissioning process and service providers will be required to provide evidence of activities they have undertaken as part of their performance review. The climate change member working group has also requested an impact assessment of climate change on council operations; it is likely this will be used as the basis for an annual report on activity.

The amber milestones that were not on track are as follows:

Milestones	target date	commentary at end of Sept 2011
Agree the structure of CBC partnerships flowing from new Leadership Gloucestershire structure.	Sept 2011	Proposed structures were consulted on over the summer and subsequently went to cabinet on 18th October.
Begin delivery of a training programme for our staff and community leaders that builds confidence within themselves to work with communities to address high risk safety issues Safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults	Sept 2011	Supporting external partners on safeguarding issues going well with the establishment of a new district safeguarding group. Training for staff not progressed as quickly, though arrangements now in place with local safeguarding board to facilitate training before Christmas.
Commence statutory public consultation on 'Developing Options'.	Sept 2011	Timetable slipped slightly but plans still in place to go out to consultation shortly after Christmas. Council subsequently agreed to go out to consultation on 10 Nov 2011.
Delivered 2011/12 Bridging the Gap (BtG) programme.	March 2012	Current BtG programme is amber; budget monitoring report to cabinet on 18 October showed a potential over-spend of £476k.
Develop a joint commissioning strategy with our partners based on a set of shared outcomes.	Sept 2011	Revised needs analysis will be developed in the autumn, CSP will consider needs, priorities and collective outcomes at its meeting on 15 Dec.
Develop traffic modelling subject to GCC capital position.	Feb 2012	Bid to sustainable travel pot was knocked back, bid will be re-submitted in Feb 2012
Funded carbon reduction schemes installed.	March 2012	Funded schemes are being progressed but the installation timetable in some cases has slipped.
Implement the GO system in the partner organisations.	March 2012	User assessment testing at Forest has thrown up some challenges that has pushed back their go-live date to December 2011.
Increase membership of business pride and interact with these businesses at a minimum level of once a month.	March 2012	Business pride newsletters have not been circulated as regularly as planned due to staffing issues. The new economic development officer is getting the business pride project back on track with another edition going out in November.
To hold a resilient communities event to showcase examples of local community action and to agree how CBC and other organisations can support and build on these to help deliver improved outcomes for local people within the context declining public finances	July 2011	Working with Transition Town Cheltenham to hold a week-long community event in the Gardens gallery at the end of November.








2.2 Performance indicators

In the 2011-12 action plan, we identified 49 key indicators to track our progress. Out of these:

- 36 were indicators which CBC is directly accountable for and targets have been set.
- 13 were community-based indicators which others are accountable for and no targets were set in the action plan.

Out of the 36 CBC indicators the following 7 are currently red, meaning that they are currently not on target.

EBI 28 November 2011 Cabinet 6 December 2011		Q2 2011-12 Performance
	Page 3 of 9	Last updated 24 November 2011

Indicator	Status	Target	Actual (30 Sept 2011)	Commentary
Attendances during the annual Summer of Sport initiative		1,554	1,426	Delivered during July/August only. Attendance number is slightly below target but represents an excellent attendance over a five week period. The structure of the programme was changed this year, and was delivered at significantly lower cost to CBC
Business Pride membership (quarterly)		630	511	Business Pride database has not been refreshed recently due to staffing issues. New economic development worker in post now who will working to increase membership.
Number of community street re-design projects implemented		1	0	The street re-design project has received a boost through the allocation of new homes bonus funding, so although no projects are underway yet. Cabinet agreed on 18 October to fund 15 projects through this funding.
Number of people accessing the AGM engagement programme (quarterly)		4,537	1,565	These figures are in relation to July / August off-site visits at schools and events (as part of the Outreach Team) at various clubs and venues in and around Cheltenham.
number of Under 16 swims (quarterly)		15,600	15,169	attendances marginally below target due to the closure of the teaching pool over a number of days in the quarter restricting child swim access
Percentage of staff appraisals completed		100	95	As at end of September we had a 95% appraisal return. Individuals and managers have been contacted to ascertain when the outstanding appraisals will be completed.
Proportion of planning decisions upheld at appeal (quarterly)		67.0%	46.7%	Five of the 17 appeals that were upheld referred to the same site. Two of these were enforcement appeals.

Review of outcomes Q2 2011-12 at the end of Sept 2011

Outcomes	what's working well	what's not going so well
Cheltenham has a clean and well-maintained environment.	The food waste and alternate weekly collections was rolled out in April 2011. This enabled recycling and composting rates to hit 50% at the end of quarter 1.	There is a shortfall in Garden Waste bin sales with an anticipated sale of 11,500 Garden waste bins at year end based on current sales data. However, a promotional campaign and operational reorganisation is underway to address this position.
Cheltenham's natural and built environment is enhanced and protected.	Good progress has been made by the Cheltenham Development Taskforce in bringing forward the regeneration of town centre sites; decisions were made to appoint Augur Buchler Partners Limited as the preferred bidder to undertake the redevelopment of the North Place and Portland Street sites.	The timetable to go out to consultation on the joint core strategy slipped slightly but plans still in place to go out to consultation shortly after Christmas. Council subsequently agreed to go out to consultation on 10 Nov 2011.
Carbon emissions are reduced and Cheltenham is able to adapt to the impacts of climate change.	The council's commissioning framework now includes climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and this will be incorporated into the built environment service specification.	Work to embed climate change adaptation across the whole work of the council has been slower than hoped.
Cheltenham is able to recover quickly and strongly from the recession.	Cheltenham appears to be coping well in these difficult times, with comparatively low rates of vacant units in the town centre and footfall is holding up.	Unemployment rates in Cheltenham, which were coming down, are increasing again. The claimant rate at end of Sept stood at 3.0%.
We attract more visitors and investors to Cheltenham.	Visitor numbers to the Tourist Information Centre increased during July and August specifically in relation to requests for information on days out in and around Cheltenham. Work is progressing at the county-level to improve tourism offer across the county.	There have been technical problems measuring the number of visitors to the tourism website preventing this measure from being reported.
Communities feel safe and are safe.	Police officers are now embedded within the council jointly working on many levels, including street scene enforcement and licensing, as well as issues involving anti-social behaviour. Police staff are now in attendance in the foyer at the municipal offices for at least 2 hours per day, 5 days a week to encourage contact not only with members of the public but with CBC officers as well.	Maiden data shows that all crime levels have risen 2.3% this year to date compared with this time last year, although are still lower than this point in 09/10 and 08/09. The change is due to the rise in acquisitive crime, and in particular domestic burglary which has risen 48.8% year to date compared with last year.

Outcomes	what's working well	what's not going so well
<p>People have access to decent and affordable housing.</p>	<p>Building work on the St. Pauls regeneration scheme began and good progress is being made.</p> <p>The number of households in temporary accommodation continue to remain at historically low levels. There is still concern that numbers in temporary housing will increase, particularly amongst larger families, as private rented accommodation becomes less affordable. However, the Housing Options Service is working hard to still identify affordable private rented accommodation for households under threat of homelessness.</p>	<p>The temporary loss of staffing to support housing enabling is being addressed and will hopefully be resolved early in the new year.</p>
<p>People are able to lead healthy lifestyles.</p>	<p>Leisure@ has seen attendances for the first half of the year at 3,000 ahead of target. Financial performance in terms of income shows that the business is on target with income marginally ahead of target. The business has benefitted from increased hall hires, coached schemes and group exercise programme receipts which have helped to offset the poorer than expected results on membership receipts (this links to old contract schemes which are now coming to an end).</p> <p>The sports, play and healthy lifestyles team provided an extensive programme of sport and play activities delivered during the 5 week summer holidays, including the Summer of Sport programme resulting in the following - 1,491 attendances at PlayZone playschemes, 4,766 recorded Play Ranger visits and 1,426 attendances at the Summer of Sport programme.</p> <p>A significant level of work is taking place through a countywide task force, to support the Olympic Torch Relay coming through the streets of Cheltenham on 23rd May 2012 and the organisation of a large scale Celebration Event within the Borough.</p>	<p>Attendance numbers at the summer playschemes was slightly below target but represents an excellent attendance over a five week period. The structure of the programme was changed this year, and was delivered at significantly lower cost to CBC</p>
<p>Our residents enjoy a strong sense of community and involved in resolving local issues.</p>	<p>In terms of neighbourhood management, 11 out of 13 neighbourhood management areas now coordinated by local communities</p>	<p>Working with Transition Town Cheltenham to hold a week-long community event in the Gardens gallery at the end of November.</p>

Outcomes	what's working well	what's not going so well
	<p>The CHAMPS network is going well; 46 champs have now been trained. Parish Councils have been consulted about their future role in the planning system. Transition Town Cheltenham is going well with over 100 people now engaged</p> <p>22 Community Pride projects were supported with £30k worth of grants.</p>	
<p>Arts and culture are used as a means to strengthen communities, strengthen the economy and enhance and protect our environment.</p>	<p>The closure of the site commenced from 1 April 2011 with the start of the de-canting programme for the collections, offices and other facilities - and this was completed by 25 July 2011. The main building contract has been awarded to ISG who started on site from 11 August 2011. The build programme is scheduled to last for 60 weeks, and the hand-over of the new building will be on 27 September 2012. Current work includes the installation of internal / external hoardings, asbestos removal and the demolitions programme. Ground work is projected to start from the end of October.</p> <p>Off the Wall, on the Move was successfully launched from April 2011 with the closure of the Art Gallery & Museum for the start of the de-canting programme. A series of events and exhibitions have been held in and around Cheltenham with: Fine Form, the Horse Parade, Stanley's Story and Shot in Cheltenham. Family events and Museum Take-Away (schools loan box service) are being hosted from 3 St. Georges Place (now known as the Outer Space), and these will continue off-site until autumn / winter 2012.</p> <p>The launch of the Phase III Fundraising Campaign has commenced with the hosting of a public fundraising campaign on the Art Gallery & Museum's (revised) website. The Corporates launch is being planned for November 2011 and Spring 2012. Further applications are being made to other trusts and foundations over the next few months.</p>	<p>Less than anticipated numbers attending the outreach programme.</p>

Outcomes	what's working well	what's not going so well
<p>The council delivers cashable savings, as well as improved customer satisfaction overall and better performance through the effective commissioning of services.</p>	<p>GO Programme - good progress since last update. However, go-live dates for Forest of Dean moved to December and West Oxfordshire will be in January. Implementation projects for all council partners in place and working well. Current programme status is amber due to slippage but expected to revert back to green once revised programme plan approved by programme board.</p> <p>Leisure and Culture Commissioning Review - Cabinet endorsement to recommendations in July which prompted organisation of consultation events to conclude in October.</p> <p>Bridging the Gap - Current year budget monitoring indicates shortfall in 2 key areas and remedial action is being taken by the leadership team to address this in year. Work continuing with the Cabinet to identify proposals for 2012-13 and these will form part of the budget report to be considered later in the year.</p> <p>In terms of sickness absence figures, we are currently at 1.79 days, under the target of 1.88 days which is a real positive. Officers are finalising a draft action plan for targeted action in the operations area.</p>	<p>As at 12th September CBC had a 95% appraisal return against a target of 100%. Individuals and managers have been contacted to ascertain when the outstanding appraisals will be completed.</p>

Background Papers	2010-2015 Corporate Strategy, Report to Council, 29 th March 2010.
Contact Officer	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnerships Manager. 01242 235354. richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Cllr. Steve Jordan, Leader of the Council Cllr. Colin Hay, Cabinet Member Corporate Services
Scrutiny Function	Economy and Business Improvement

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 40

**Cheltenham Borough Council
Cabinet – 6th December 2011
Council - 12th December 2011
Treasury Mid-Term Report 2011/12**

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Finance & Community Development , Councillor John Webster
Accountable officer	Director Resources , Mark Sheldon
Accountable scrutiny committee	Economy & Business Improvement
Ward(s) affected	None
Key Decision	Yes
Executive summary	The Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/12 has been determined by the adoption of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management 2009, which includes the requirement for determining a treasury strategy on the likely financing and investment activity for the forthcoming financial year. The Code also recommends that members are informed of Treasury Management activities at least twice a year. This report therefore ensures this authority has adopted the code and complies with its requirements. The report has highlighted a need to change some of the Council's current Prudential Indicators and it is a requirement for Council to approve these changes. These are in respect of the additional HRA debt which the Council will be required to take on under the HRA Self Financing proposals. The proposed additional debt as set out in the Self-Financing consultation is for Cheltenham Borough Council to take on additional £27.881m.
Consultation	The Treasury Management Panel met to consider this report on 21 st November 2011 and have made the following recommendations as indicated below.
Recommendations	<p>Members are requested to approve the following recommendations to Cabinet following consultation with the Treasury Management Panel on 21st November 2011:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. note the contents of the summary report of the treasury management activity during the first six months of 2011/12. 2. approve the new limits set for the Authorised Borrowing Limit to £109m and the Operational Boundary for Borrowing for 2011/12 to £99m which takes into account the additional HRA debt allocation as detailed in section 5.

Financial implications	All financial implications are detailed throughout the report Contact officer: Andrew Sherbourne, andrew.sherbourne@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264337
Legal implications	None specific arising from the report recommendations. Contact officer: Peter Lewis, peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01242 264216
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	No direct HR implications arising from this report Contact officer: Julie Mccarthy , julie.mccarthy @cheltenham.gov.uk. 01242 264355
Key risks	
Corporate and community plan Implications	
Environmental and climate change implications	

1. Background

- 1.1 The Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/12 has been determined by the adoption of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management 2009, which includes the requirement for determining a treasury strategy on the likely financing and investment activity for the forthcoming financial year. The Code also recommends that members are informed of Treasury Management activities at least twice a year. This report therefore ensures this authority has adopted the code and complies with its requirements, one of which is the provision of a Mid-year Report to Members.
- 1.2 The government are pushing through major changes which will have a big impact on the way the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is financed in the future. The effect of these changes are reflected in section 5 of this report.

2. Economic update for the first six months

- 2.1 The following key points have been provided by the councils Treasury Advisors, Arlingclose Ltd.
- 2.2 Global growth prospects deteriorated considerably over the six months to September, moving from an expectation of modest growth to the risk of a double-dip recession. In the UK the first quarter growth was 0.5% and in the second quarter was 0.2%.
- 2.2 Inflation remained stubbornly high as the annual CPI was 4.5% in August 2011. The Bank of England believed the elevated rate of inflation reflected the temporary impact of several factors, the increase in the VAT rate to 20%, past increases in global energy prices and import prices.
- 2.3 Weakness persisted in the job market as unemployment rose to 7.9%. Job creation was unable to

absorb the 90,000 quarterly increase in job seekers. With average earnings growth of 2.9%, scarce availability of credit, stagnant house prices, all combined to lower disposable income, squeezed household spending power and leaving consumer confidence fragile.

- 2.4** Central bankers' policies were driven by the feeble growth outlook rather than the upward trend in inflation. The Bank of England's August Inflation Report downgraded the growth forecast even as it acknowledged energy prices could push the annual CPI to 5% before inflation fell back to the 2% target over the medium-term. The UK's strategy of combining low interest rates for two and a half years and Quantitative Easing at £275bn with tight fiscal policy supported the rebalancing of the economy and also commanded support in the markets.
- 2.5** The European sovereign debt crisis deepened. The agreement in July to address Greece's economic problems and increase the mandate for the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) only bought time for the Eurozone as market pressure increased in Italy and Spain, but did little to address the issue of overburdened sovereign balance sheets.
- 2.6** The economic uncertainty resulted in analysts postponing the likelihood of an increase in the UK Bank Rate until late 2012.

3. Portfolio position 1/4/2011 to 30/9/2011

Movements in the Council's borrowing during the first six months of 2011/12 financial year can be seen in the table below. Long term loans are deemed to be those repayable over a period of more than one year.

Source of Loan	Balance at 1 April 2011 £	Raised during Apr-Sept £	Repaid during Apr-Sept £	Balance at 30 Sept 2011 £
Temporary Borrowing				
- Building Societies	5,000,000	0	5,000,000	0
- Banks	0	0	0	0
- Local Authorities	8,000,000	68,540,000	65,840,000	10,700,000
Temporary Investment	323,759	774,419	1,055,878	42,300
Total Short Term Borrowing	13,323,759	69,314,419	71,895,878	10,742,300
Long Term Borrowing				
- Public Works Loan Board	11,000,000	1,400,000	3,792	12,396,208
- Market Loans	15,900,000	0	0	15,900,000
Long Term Borrowing	26,900,000	1,400,000	3,792	28,296,208
Total External Borrowing	40,223,759	70,714,419	71,899,670	39,038,508

- 3.1** In February 2011 the Council's borrowing costs for 2011/12 was estimated to be £1,212,600. This is now forecast to be £1,216,700. Temporary borrowing of £68.54m at an average interest rate of 0.40% has occurred between 1st April and 30th September 2011 to meet temporary cash flow shortfalls against a forecasted rate of 0.38%.
- 3.2** The calculation for the HRA Item 8 Debit last February estimated the consolidated rate of interest to be 3.08% on all borrowing for this financial year. However due to the council's weighted average borrowing estimated to be lower than the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR), which is a measure of the authorities underlying need to borrow for capital purposes, a different formula is required to calculate the HRA Item 8 Debit than what was used previously. This has reduced the consolidated rate of interest to around 2.80%. This could result in £46,900 less interest being payable by the HRA to the General Fund for 2011/12.
- 3.3** New borrowing of PWLB fixed rate loans increased by nearly 1% in October 2010 however the PWLB remained an attractive source of borrowing for the Council as it offers flexibility and control. The large downward move in gilt yields in the second quarter resulted in PWLB rates falling. The Council funded £1.4m of its capital expenditure on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Homes for the new homes built in Brighton Road. An annuity loan of 50 years was taken out at a rate of 4.52%. This is cost neutral to the General Fund as CBH are repaying the loan and interest payments. Further PWLB borrowing is forecast to occur again later in the financial year to fund the Everyman Theatre renovation and for further CBH new builds in the St. Paul's ward. An update on these loans will appear in the Outturn Report at year end.

4. Investments

The DCLG's Guidance on Local Government Investments in England gives priority to security and liquidity and the Council's aim is to achieve a yield commensurate with these principles.

Security of capital remained the Council's main investment objective. This was maintained by following the Council's counterparty policy as set out in its Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/12 approved by Council on the 11th February 2011. This restricted new investments to the following

- Debt Management Office (DMO)
- Other Local Authorities
- UK Banks – Minimum long term rating of A+ or equivalent across all three rating agencies (Fitch, Standard & Poors and Moody's)
- Other - Cheltenham Festivals/Gloucestershire Airport Company, Everyman Theatre and Cheltenham Borough Homes

Counterparty credit quality is assessed and monitored with reference to :-

- Credit ratings
- Credit Default Swaps
- Share Price

Using Arlingclose's suggested creditworthiness approach in the current economic climate it is considered appropriate to keep investments short-term and more recently only up to six months for

new investments.

4.1 Investments - Movements in the Council's investment portfolio during the first six months of 2011/12 can be seen in the table below.

Source of Loan	Balance at 1 April 2011 £	Raised during Apr-Sept £	Repaid during Apr-Sept £	Balance at 30 Sept 2011 £
Short term Lending				
- Building Societies	0	0	0	0
- Banks	7,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	7,000,000
Bank of Scotland Call A/C	900,000	40,250,000	41,150,000	0
Debt Management Office	0	0	0	0
Total Short Term Lending	7,900,000	42,250,000	43,150,000	7,000,000
Icelandic Banks In administration	Balance at 1 April 2011 £	Raised during the year £	Repaid during the year £	Balance at 30 Sept 2011 £
- Kaupthing Singer & Friedlander	1,410,000	0	150,000	1,260,000
- Glitnir	3,000,000	0	0	3,000,000
- Landsbanki	5,000,000	0	0	5,000,000
Total Icelandic Banks	9,410,000	0	150,000	9,260,000
Total External Investments	17,310,000	42,250,000	43,300,000	16,260,000

4.2 In February 2011 the Council's Investment income for 2011/12 was budgeted to be £175,700. The average cash balances representing the council's reserves and working balances, was £8.173m during the period. The UK Bank Rate has been maintained at 0.50% since March 2009 and is not expected to rise until late 2012 or beyond. The Council anticipates an investment outturn of £172,500 at a rate of 2.44% for the whole year. Security of capital has remained the Council's main investment objective. This has been maintained by following the Council's counterparty policy as set out in its Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2011/12.

4.3 The lack of real progress in resolving the sovereign debt crisis in Europe began to affect even the

stronger Eurozone nations and their banking systems. Having reviewed all credit indicators the Council, advised by Arlingclose, believed that there were no solvency issues with the banks on the recommended lending list however the share price moves were too sharp to ignore and a prudent response to the tensions and negativity in the markets was required. The Council responded to the advice given by Arlingclose by first scaling back maturities for any new investments and then as further advised by Arlingclose, suspending Clydesdale Bank, Lloyds Banking Group, Royal Bank of Scotland and Nationwide Building Society from the lending list in early October 2011 as those organisations did not meet the Council's minimum criteria of A+ or equivalent. The situation will be reviewed again in February 2012.

- 4.4 Included within the investments of £16.26m as at 30th September 2011, the Council has £9.26m deposited in the collapsed Icelandic banks. The Council has received £150,000 from the administrators of Kaupthing Singer & Friedlander in the first half of this financial year, which relates to 5p in the pound and another 5p in the pound payment was received in October 2011. To date the Council has now received 63p in the pound. The administrators currently estimate that total distributions should be in the range of 78p to 86p in the pound.
- 4.5 Recently the Icelandic Supreme Court has upheld the District Court decision that the test cases involving Local Authority deposits with Landsbanki and Glitnir banks as having priority creditor status. This means that local authority deposits will be at the front of the queue when the Winding Up Boards (WUB's) of the two banks start to make the repayments. It is expected that we will receive back 98% of the Landsbanki deposits and a 100% of the Glitnir deposits.

5. Reform of Council Housing Finance

- 5.1 The government are pushing through major changes which will have a big impact on the way the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is financed in the future. In its publication 'Implementing Self-Financing for Council Housing' issued in February 2011, the DCLG set out the rationale, methodology and financial parameters for the initiative. Subject to the Localism Bill receiving Royal Assent and a commencement order being passed, final self-financing determinations are expected towards the end of January 2012 and the proposed transfer date is 28th March 2012.
- 5.2 The self-financing model provides an indicative sustainable level of opening housing debt. As the Council's debt level generated by the model is higher than the Subsidy Capital Financing Requirement (SCFR), the Council will be required to pay the CLG the difference between the two, which is £27.881m as set out in the self-financing consultation paper issued on the 21st November 2011. This will require the Council to fund this amount in the medium term through external borrowing/internal resources. On the 20th September 2011, following an announcement by HM Treasury, the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) confirmed that the interest rate offered to local authorities would be temporarily reduced to allow councils to borrow at lower levels for their one-off HRA reform settlement payment. This will enable the Council to borrow at around 13 basis points above the equivalent gilt yield (currently rates are 1% above the gilt yield) to fund the HRA transaction. These lower rates will only be available on 26th March 2012.
- 5.3 As a consequence of the increase in debt due in March 2012 it is necessary to increase the Prudential Indicators for 2011/12 for the Authorised Borrowing Limit from £81m to £109m and the Operational Boundary for Borrowing from £71m to £99m to comply with the Prudential Code. The Authorised Limit is the possible maximum level of borrowing that may be needed to be incurred and any limit above is prohibited. The amount set reflects a level of borrowing which, although affordable in the short term may not be sustainable. The Operational Boundary for external debt is based on the most likely, prudent but not worst case scenario, without the additional headroom included within the authorised limit. This limit represents a key management tool for in year monitoring.

6. Prudential Indicators

6.1 During the financial year to date the Council has operated within the treasury limits and Prudential Indicators set out in the Council’s Treasury Policy Statement and Annual Treasury Strategy Statement.

7. Outlook

7.1 At the time of writing this activity report in November 2011, given the precarious outlook for growth it is believed the Bank of England would only raise rates after there was firm evidence that the economy had survived the fiscal consolidation. Therefore, the outlook is for official interest rates to remain low for the foreseeable future.

	Dec-11	Mar-12	Jun-12	Sep-12	Dec-12	Mar-13	Jun-13	Sep-13	Dec-13	Mar-14	Jun-14	Sep-14	Dec-14
Official Bank Rate													
Upside risk	--	--	--	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.5	0.75	1	1.25	1.5	1.75	1.75
Central case	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Downside risk	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

8. Performance management

8.1 In compliance with the requirements of the Treasury Management CIPFA Code of Practice this report provides members with a summary report of the treasury management activity during the first six months of 2011/12. None of the Prudential Indicators have been breached and a prudent approach has been taken in relation to investment activity with priority being given to security and liquidity over yield.

Report author	Contact officer: Mark Sheldon, mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk 01242 264123
Appendices	none
Background information	Treasury Management Strategy, Council February 2011

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 48

Cheltenham Borough Council

Cabinet – 6 December 2011

Purchase and Installation of 7 CCTV cameras together with supporting infrastructure – Honeybourne Line – Cheltenham Railway Station to Jubilee Bridge

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Housing and Safety, Councillor Klara Sudbury
Accountable officer	Sonia Philips, Director, Well Being & Culture
Accountable scrutiny committee	Social and Community
Ward(s) affected	Lansdown, St Peter's
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>For at least the past 12 months, there has been a consistent increase in dwelling house burglaries across the town. Operations to address this have been instigated by police and supported by the Cheltenham Community Safety Partnership. The location of many of these burglaries alongside intelligence strongly indicates that the Honeybourne Line is used by criminal elements to gain access to houses to commit burglaries and also to aid their escape with stolen property. This is particularly the case with regard to the stretch between Cheltenham Railway Station and the Jubilee Bridge which is considered to be the highest priority. In addition the Honeybourne Line is also subject to anti-social behaviour and other acts of criminality. There are no cctv cameras installed along the line at the present.</p> <p>To assist with these operations and to help identify offenders and subsequently reduce the number of burglaries occurring, police, Cheltenham Borough Council and other members of the Community Safety Partnership strongly support the installation of cctv cameras along this stretch of the Honeybourne Line. The current suppliers of cctv equipment and maintenance contractor for the council, Delaware Communications Ltd, have already carried out a feasibility study and preparatory work along this location at no cost to the council and have submitted a quote of £62,408.00 to supply and install the required equipment. Funding activity has taken place and a total of £65,000 from different funding streams has been committed to allow this urgent work to be carried out.</p>
Recommendations	To accept the quote of £62,408.00 and agree the Waiver to authorise Delaware Communications to supply the equipment and carryout this installation

Financial implications	<p>A total of £65,000 funding is available to cover the cost of this contract, made up of contributions from external organisations, the use of the council's CCTV camera capital budget and the allocation of new homes bonus grant. Revenue funding for the 7 additional cameras (estimated at £500 per annum) is included in the contract costs for the first year, but would need to be built into revenue budgets in future years, or funded from external contributions received.</p> <p>Contact officer: Sarah Didcote, Sarah.Didcote @cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264125</p>
Legal implications	<p>The constitutional requirements are set out in the Waiver Report attached hereto. The Contract with Delaware can be varied to include the provision of the new cameras and their maintenance.</p> <p>Contact officer: sarah.halliwell@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272692</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	<p>There are no implications for Human Resources.</p> <p>Contact Officer:- Julie McCarthy, HR Operations Manager, Julie.McCarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355</p>
Key risks	<p>If the additional cctv cameras are not installed there is a risk that burglary figures may continue to rise which will generate negative publicity and threaten the requirement to ensure communities feel safe in their neighbourhoods.</p>
Corporate and community plan Implications	<p>Will help to support and deliver Objective and Outcome :- Communities feel safe and are safe</p>
Environmental and climate change implications	<p>None Identified</p>

1. Background

- 1.1** The current Town Centre CCTV System comprises of 61 cameras monitored by police from the cctv control room located in Divisional Police Headquarters, Lansdown Road, Cheltenham. For at least the past 12 months, there has been a consistent increase in dwelling house burglaries across the town. Operations to address this have been instigated by police and supported by the Cheltenham Community Safety Partnership. The location of many of these burglaries alongside intelligence strongly indicates that the Honeybourne Line is used by criminal elements to gain access to houses to commit burglaries and also to aid their escape. This is particularly the case with regard to the stretch between Cheltenham Railway Station and the Jubilee Bridge which is considered to be the highest priority. In addition the Honeybourne line is also subject to anti-social behaviour and other acts of criminality. There are no cctv cameras installed along the line at the present.
- 1.2** To assist with these operations, help identify offenders and subsequently reduce the number of burglaries occurring, Police, Cheltenham Borough Council and other members of the Community Safety Partnership strongly support the installation of cctv cameras along this stretch of the Honeybourne Line. The current suppliers of cctv equipment and maintenance contractor for the council, Delaware Communications Ltd, have already carried out a feasibility

study and preparatory work along this location at no cost to the Council and submitted a quote of £62,408.00 to supply and install the required equipment. Funding activity has taken place and a total of £65,000 from different funding streams has been committed to allow this urgent work to be carried out.

2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 To ensure compliance with the Cheltenham Borough Council standing orders rule 10.1 III and 10.2 iv requesting a waiver of contract rule 3.6 (Tender Procedure) in order to extend contract arrangements with the incumbent supplier to ensure continuity of the town centre CCTV coverage and the integrity of the complete system

3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 None

4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1 None

5. Performance management –monitoring and review

- 5.1 Not applicable

Report author	Trevor Gladding, Community Protection Manager, Trevor.Gladding @cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242264368
Appendices	1. Risk Assessment 2. CCTV Waiver Report
Background information	1. None

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-4	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	If the additional cctv cameras are not installed there is a risk that burglary figures may continue to rise which will generate negative publicity and threaten the requirement to ensure communities feel safe in their neighbourhoods.	Community Protection Manager	17.11.11.	2	2	4	Accept	Ensure equipment and infrastructure installed as a matter of urgency	31.3.12.	Community Protection Manager	

Explanatory notes

Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-4 (4 being the greatest impact)

Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (6 being most likely)

Impact Description	Impact score	Probability	Likelihood Description	Likelihood Score
Negligible	1	0% - 5%	Almost impossible	1
Marginal	2	5% - 15%	Very low	2
Major	3	15% - 30%	Low	3
Critical	4	30% - 60%	Significant	4
		60% - 90%	High	5
		> 90%	Very high	6

Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

Contract for Additional CCTV Equipment

Waiver Report Author: Trevor J Gladding 8 November 2011
--

Reason for report

<p>To comply with the Cheltenham Borough Council standing orders rule 10.1 III and 10.2 iv requesting a waiver of contract rule 3.6 (Tender Procedure) in order to extend contract arrangements with the incumbent supplier to ensure continuity of the town centre CCTV coverage and the integrity of the complete system.</p>

Summary of works –

<p>The supply and installation of 7 new cctv cameras together with all necessary supporting infrastructure along the Honeybourne Line between Cheltenham Railway Station and the Jubilee Bridge, to allow monitoring of the cameras to be carried out as part of the town centre cctv system from the cctv control room located within Cheltenham Police Station.</p>

Price Quotes

<p>The name address and company registration number of the company are: Delaware Communications PLC, Open View House, Chesham Close, Romford, Essex, RM7 7PJ. Company registration No: 1969097</p>

<p>The price quoted is: £62,408.00 – the supply and Installation of an additional 7 cctv cameras together with supporting infrastructure.</p>

<p>The reason(s) a waiver is required is/are:</p>

<p>Constitution Part 4i – Contract Rules 9.2 (b) “works to be executed or goods, services or materials to be supplied consist of repairs to the supply of parts of existing proprietary machinery, equipment, hardware or plant, and the repairs or supply of parts cannot be carried out practicably by alternative contractors”</p>

<p>9.2 ei “goods & services to be purchased or works executed are required as a matter of urgency”</p>
--

<p>As Delaware are our current contractor holding a contractor until 2014, it would not be appropriate to introduce a further supplier as access to control rooms and equipment is limited to only one supplier.</p>
--

With a waiver of this value contract rule 9.1 (i) states that "Cabinet for Contracts over £50,000 must sign off the waiver report"

In 2009 following tender processes, Delaware were awarded a further 3 year CCTV Maintenance Contract from 1 July 2009 until 30 June 2012, with the option for Cheltenham Borough Council to extend this contract for a further 24 months until 30 June 2014. Because of the experience and knowledge gained of the whole cctv network/system Delaware are now able to complete the installation of additional cctv equipment as well as further replacement work at minimal cost whilst carrying out normal maintenance work with minimum disruption to the system.

Delaware staff have been vetted by Police re their suitability to be admitted to police buildings unsupervised or otherwise to carry out cctv upgrades or repairs at any time. This process usually takes around 3 months to complete and would cause unacceptable delays should other contractors become involved together with access agreements to equipment which is subject to the current maintenance contract with Delaware Communications LTD.

Recommendation

To accept the quote as detailed above totalling £62,408.00

Recommendation approved by

*(Assistant Director

Signed: *Sana Paully*

Recommendation approved by

*Strategic Director

Signed: *Deaton*

Recommendation approved by

*Cabinet

signed:

* Delete if not applicable