



CHELtenham

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 14 September 2011

6.00 pm

Pittville Room, Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter (Vice-Chair), Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Penny Hall (Chair), Diane Hibbert, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Charles Stewart and Paul Wheeldon

The Council has a substitution process and any substitutions will be announced at the meeting

Agenda

1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THE 13 JULY 2011	(Pages 1 - 10)
4.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 10am on the fifth working day before the date of the meeting	
5.	MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE A. By Council B. By Cabinet	
6.	CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING Cabinet Member Sustainability Cabinet Member Built Environment	
7.	IMPERIAL AND MONTPELLIER GARDEN STRATEGY Discussion paper of the Cabinet Member Sustainability	(Pages 11 - 14)
8.	FLOOD PROTECTION UPDATE Discussion paper of the Senior Engineer (Land Drainage)	(Pages 15 - 16)
9.	NEW HOMES BONUS (INCLUDING ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME) Discussion paper of the Cabinet Member Built Environment	(Pages 17 - 22)

10.		JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMISSIONING PROJECT Discussion paper of the Cabinet Member Sustainability	(Pages 23 - 28)
11.		ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-12	(Pages 29 - 32)
12.		ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION	
13.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 23 November 2011	

Contact Officer: Beverly Thomas, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 13th July, 2011

6.05 - 8.05 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Penny Hall (Chair), Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Jacky Fletcher, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Charles Stewart and Paul Wheeldon
Also in attendance:	Rob Bell (Director of Operations), Gill Morris (Change and Sustainability Officer), Councillor John Rawson (Cabinet Member Built Environment), John Rees (Environmental Maintenance Manager) and Councillor Roger Whybornn (Cabinet Member Sustainability)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THE 11 MAY 2011

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 11 May 2011 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The following response was given to the public question received;

1.	Question from Mr. Ken Pollock
	Given (1) that Imperial Gardens as both lawns and flower-garden is so crucial to Cheltenham's image and amenity, and given (2) that the current proposal's assurance that 'good lawns can be maintained' has been seriously doubted in the recent public consultation (as is confirmed by the present declining state of the lawns, despite the questionable remedies such as 'drill seeding' which are now being attempted), would it not be reasonable for the councillors on Environment Scrutiny to add these issues to their current Agenda, and express a clear view either in support or against the currently proposed layout?
	Response from the Chair of the Environment O&S Committee (Councillor Hall)
	As Chair of the Environment overview and scrutiny committee I felt strongly that given the importance of the Imperial Gardens to Cheltenham, all

council members must have the opportunity to contribute to the debate on the revised layout design of the Gardens and had been lobbying for the post consultation debate to take place in full council and not be confined to the overview and scrutiny committees.

On Wednesday May 11th the Environment overview and scrutiny committee discussed the details of the consultation process and was in agreement that after the consultation it would be debated in full council on June 27th before the results of the consultation and the full council debate go to the cabinet for decision on July 26th.

The minutes of the council meeting on June 27th have now been published and record the debate that took place.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No items were referred to the committee.

6. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING

The Cabinet Member Sustainability, in light of the public question, started his update with news on Imperial and Montpellier Gardens. The matter was discussed at Council on the 27 June and the principle message had been the importance of good maintenance and restoration of turf. At the end of the season the Council would assess what restorative work was necessary and Cheltenham Festivals (CF) would pay any costs. Although a number of alternative design ideas had been suggested, he was confident that the proposed design was the right one. This sentiment had been reaffirmed by the endorsement given to the design by Friends of Imperial Square and Gardens, who had commended officers on the design. The spotlight had now been turned on Montpellier Gardens in a bid to avoid reproducing issues there and discussions were ongoing with CF. Drill seeding was the topic of much debate but this had to be undertaken at a suitable time of year and for the best results it needed to be done on good quality turf and as such some areas would need to be replaced.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- All relationships, as with that between the Council and CF, needed to be based on a level of trust and if the Council were reasonable in their assessment of the restorative work required he could see no reason why CF wouldn't agree.
- The use of existing notice boards in and around the gardens to communicate to the public on the usage of the gardens and detail any restoration work to be undertaken was a good one and this would be raised with officers.

The Chair reminded members that the committee were scheduled to consider the final design of Imperial Gardens at the next meeting (14 September) and agreed to schedule a review of the remedial issues after the next Festival season.

There was little update to offer in relation to the new waste scheme, which the Cabinet Member Sustainability felt was going well. Issues were being worked

through, the garden scheme take-up would be reviewed and the working group would be providing an update at the next meeting. The Local Authority Company was in the initial administrative stage and despite Tewkesbury Borough Council not having signed up to the agreement, joint working at the depot continued. A proposal to form a Joint Waste Board, joining waste authorities under a single committee would be tabled with the committee prior to Cabinet in October.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability and the Director of Operations gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- Various teams at the council were working together, along with the University to trial a new approach to addressing the annual waste issue in St. Pauls which occurred when the large number of students residing in the area, vacated for the summer.
- Benches had been removed from Lansdown following discussions with the Police and local PCSO's. A high volume of anti-social behaviour where the benches were located had caused local residents a great deal of disturbance and since their removal this had ceased. Officer did recognise that this created an issue for those that had put the benches to good use and were looking at relocating them in the near vicinity.

Councillor Wheeldon had reported large scale fly tipping in St. Pauls at 9.30am on Monday (11 July) and it was cleared by 12 noon the very same day, for which he thanked those involved.

There were three items on which the Cabinet Member Built Environment wished to brief the committee, North Place and Portland Street, parking and environmental improvements.

A North Place member seminar was held last Friday (8 July) for which there was good attendance by members. The four initial proposals had been evaluated by the panel and the scores would be reported to the Development Task Force on Friday (15 July) and subsequently Cabinet. The four schemes were all very different and he was confident that there were at least two credible candidates, a decision on which would be fairly swift. The two short listed schemes would be asked to draw-up their final proposals and Cabinet would make their decision on the preferred developer in October. Progress to date had been encouraging and he could see no reason for any movement within the current schedule.

The Cabinet Member Built Environment gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- Constitutionally the preferred developer decision was a Cabinet decision but regardless of the legalities the Cabinet Member Built Environment considered that given the gravity of the decision, it should be debated at Council. He would discuss this with his Development Task Force and Cabinet colleagues, suggesting that a special council meeting in October would be a sensible approach.
- A high profile, 3 week, public consultation would give residents and local businesses the opportunity to consider the proposals.

- The Development Task Force were aware that there was a need for almost 800 spaces on the site given the additional pressure that the loss of North Place and Portland Street would create in St. Pauls.

Parking issues had come to a head with the start of the 'Town Hall zone' statutory consultation by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC). A wider issue was the need for CBC and GCC to agree a joint parking strategy and perhaps there was a need to establish a CBC working group.

County Councillors Garnham and Noble had met with GCC officers who had assured them that the concerns that were being raised had been taken on board and whilst the consultation was ongoing, there was flexibility to amend the proposals. Councillor Garnham felt the meeting had been a positive step forward and hoped that rather than merely addressing parking and increasing revenue, the space would be managed and improved. The Cabinet Member was grateful to County Councillors Garnham and Noble for having taken this action. He felt this reiterated the need for a joint parking strategy and endorsed the formation of a working group on which CBC members were involved.

In response to a member question, the Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability suggested that the joint parking strategy would need to be completed by Autumn 2011.

The Chair was concerned by the current level of working groups and invited those members that felt they were able, to form part of the Joint Parking Strategy Working Group. Councillors Hall, McCloskey and Garnham volunteered.

Councillor Stewart voiced concerns that GCC were pushing resident parking proposals too hard and too fast to provide residents with sufficient opportunity to voice their concerns.

The final item the Cabinet Member Built Environment raised was environmental improvements, for which £160k had been earmarked in the budget outturn report. Given that the monies were to be put to a practical use his hope was that a flexible approach could be taken to the application process for the funding. Rather than set a funding limit the suggestion was that an indicative figure could be £20k, with a level of flexibility on this. He advocated that a discussion paper be presented to the committee at the September meeting.

7. SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE AIRPORT - GREEN POLICY 2010-2011

Councillor Wheeldon, a member of the Joint Airport Scrutiny Working Group (JASWG) introduced the report as circulated with the agenda. The development of the Airport's Green Policy formed part of the conditions of the Runway Safety Project and this was the second annual review.

Three key points contained within the report were, firstly, noise. In the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011, 587 complaints were received, of which 524 were from a small group of regular complainants. In an initiative to reduce the number of formal complaints received, the website is to be improved, to include details about the use of the Airport for military and emergency aircraft, especially out-of-hours. Councillor Wheeldon had personally lobbied the Civil

Aviation Authority to highlight the issue of silencers and the high level of formalities and expense associated with having them fitted to helicopters and small aircraft in the UK.

Whilst aircraft CO2 emissions were down, so were flights. There had been 7,000 less flights on the previous year and this was as a result of weather, the economic climate and a change of focus by the Airport from small light planes to business flights. Emissions from ground operations had also reduced and an innovative Green Travel Plan had been developed, but accurate baselines have still to be established. The Airport had been urged to establish baselines soon, as it is impossible to accurately measure performance without them.

Councillor Fletcher, a member of the Airport Board, advised members that there had been some further developments since the report was produced and circulated. Cycle parking sheds had now been erected. Given that Stagecoach were not prepared to reroute a bus to the Airport, a local company had indicated they would be interested and were awaiting the results of the survey, which at present were very positive. Aircraft silencers were an issue. At present, aircraft entering from the continent had to disable them on entry to the UK. Construction to the runway was now underway.

The members of the JASWG and the Climate Change and Sustainability Officer gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- The report highlighted that there were no timescales for a number of the recommendations and this, therefore, formed one of the recommendations. The next annual review would look back at the previous 12 months and assess progress and performance.
- The electricity consumption figures for 2009-10 could not be considered accurate as not all meters were being measured.
- The development of a comprehensive database of noise complaints would enable the Airport to pinpoint specific noise issues.
- The Airport did meet national regulations for noise.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the review report and the recommendations contained within it be accepted by the committee.

8. BUILT ENVIRONMENT COMMISSIONING PROJECT

Cabinet Member Built Environment introduced the paper as circulated with the agenda, which was an extensive report due to the complexity of the project.

Delivery of statutory services such as Planning were often taken as a given but the review was looking at outcomes and considering whether a service was being delivered in the most effective and efficient way. A number of opportunities were being discussed, which could include the devolution of powers to Parish Council's, though this would be problematic in areas of Cheltenham not served by a Parish Council.

One of the big issues being considered as part of the review was finance. The Government were receptive to councils setting their own fees, in order that they more closely reflect the costs of running the service. The exact detail of how

this would work was yet to be finalised, but the review group were aware of the new charging regime and hoped that the announcement would be made before the end of the review. The review would be forced to consider what level of support the council tax payers of Cheltenham could reasonably be asked to provide, which would be an issue if the Planning service was to be delivered solely on fees.

Systems thinking could identify significant efficiencies and whilst not necessarily financial savings it could help streamline the process without impacting the democratic process or customer service. There was a need to make the process more straightforward and therefore accessible for residents.

The Cabinet Member Built Environment hoped that the issue over fees would soon be resolved and the outcome of the review was a streamlined, more customer friendly service.

The Cabinet Member Built Environment gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- Whilst the general conclusion thus far had been that the service was a relatively efficient one, agreeing an accurate benchmark for cost was important.
- Building Control formed part of the joint scheme with Tewkesbury which had improved resilience and produced savings within the service. The support that some of these services provided to other areas of the Council was acknowledged and where a service was cost neutral, the need for change was not urgent.
- Fees were an important issue to get right and the structure needed to be balanced between householders and large scale developers.
- Redesign of the committee process and appeals would not be permitted to compromise public consultation/democracy, but it was possible to make the service more efficient at certain stages of the process.

In relation to fees, one member suggested that there was a case for increasing the fee for retrospective planning approval.

The Chair thanked the Cabinet Member Built Environment for the update. The committee looked forward to considering the final report.

9. STREET CLEANSING SATISFACTION

The Environmental Maintenance Manager introduced the paper as circulated with the agenda, which detailed the results of the survey used to measure the level of satisfaction with Town Centre cleansing operations by members of the public. The survey, by way of a questionnaire was carried out in the Regent and Beechwood Arcades over a 4 day period.

The results were shown in appendices 1 to 5 and generally were good, however, a number of residents responses were rather influenced by the change to the refuse collections and charging for garden waste collections, etc and scores were lower, presumably as they were unhappy with other aspects of the council.

The service was currently being reviewed in an effort to identify improvements and ultimately deliver a more efficient and effective service.

The Environmental Maintenance Manager and the Director of Operations gave the following responses to questions from members of the committee;

- 'crews bar 61' within the report referred to a crew consisting of two men with a vehicle undertaking other duties.
- The town centre was cleaned everyday, up to 3 times a day, with the most significant effort being put into the early morning clean. Unfortunately officers were unable to prevent littering between visits, though the future aim was to dovetail enforcement with operations to change the behaviour of those that litter.
- The Councils responsibility for clearing litter from along the A40 ended just before the M5 junction, but this area was often addressed by the County Council.
- The annual steam-clean of certain areas equated to a significant spend for the service and chewing gum was a major issue for the council, as it was for many authorities across the country. The Tidy Britain group were lobbying hard to get manufacturers of chewing gum to pay a levy towards the clear up operations or develop a non-stick gum.
- Officers worked with residents to clear cars in an area in order to undertake a complete deep clean and also tried to work with GCC to clear gullies. It took an hour in total and residents would be impressed by the results.
- The bi-annual Place Survey, on which the council used to rely to measure public opinion of services such as street cleansing had now ceased. There was no doubt an issue when undertaking a survey in the town centre that people would refer to the town centre rather than the street where they lived. Locations outside the town centre could be considered in future.
- The questionnaire was attached to over 800 individuals in a mail-out by the Chamber of Commerce and only 2 responses were received.
- There was a dedicated rapid response team for the town centre, though, all street cleansing teams had mobile communications and could address issues during working hours. Members needed to consider that street cleansing was very objective.
- Removal of weeds from gullies was the responsibility of Gloucestershire Highways, however, two sprays a year were included in the councils service level agreement. A contact herbicide spray was used in around April and again in September, but this would only kill what it touched and would not affect anything that was yet to germinate. When to carry out such services was always a dilemma and in an ideal world, the Council would like to undertake four sprays a year, but Gloucestershire Highways would not fund any more than two.
- Chewing gum boards had been considered in the past, but this was certainly something that could be trialed in the high street for a nominal sum.
- There were no notices prohibiting the feeding of birds but this was discouraged and whilst action could be taken against individuals, the council could attract negative press for taking such action.

- There were informal arrangements already in existence by way of residents who reported issues in their neighbourhood. There were also a range of communication channels for reporting issues (website, email, phone, etc). The service could consider more formal arrangements with individuals within a neighbourhood.
- The service could purchase a machine to remove chewing gum, but this would be very costly and require manpower. Multi-functional machinery was often purchased that met many needs.
- There was a voluntary code of practice for Cheltenham businesses to sign up to. One of the more successful was 'food on the go' which saw, for example, Burger King, providing and maintaining a litter bin.
- The service consisted of 20 staff in total, however, unfortunately there were currently 4 vacancies being filled by agency staff.
- When the cleansing service moved from a regular to a responsive service the Director of Operations understood that the information on the website had been changed. He apologised that this was not the case and would ensure the issue was rectified as soon as possible.
- The survey had been more labour intensive than the Place Survey but it had been a worthwhile exercise as it had highlighted certain issues and would aid the current review of the service.
- Details of the operational service changes as a result of the review would be reported to the committee in May 2012.

The Chair accepted that the service was no longer in a position to offer regular cleansing teams but felt that when they did respond to issues, the results were of high standard.

10. ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-12

The Chair referred members to the work plan as circulated with the agenda.

Councillor Fletcher suggested that the committee may like to reconsider the plastic bag issue after her recent observations that the use of plastic bags was on the increase. The committee agreed for this item to be added to the work plan. The Chair proposed that this be scheduled for November.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION

There were no urgent items for discussion.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 14 September 2011.

Penny Hall
Chairman

MATTERS ARISING FROM ENVIRONMENT O&S MEETING: 13 JULY 2011

Agenda No.	Item	Action required	Officer / Member	Completed
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Consider use of existing notice boards in parks and gardens to display communications detailing the usage of the space and any remedial works required and/or in progress	Rob Bell	✓
Action taken: This is being considered by Officers.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Schedule a review of the remedial work to Imperial Gardens after the 2012 Festival season	Saira Malin	✓
Action taken: This has been added to the work plan.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Consider the implementation of an annual plan to address the annual litter issues in St. Pauls when students vacate residences for the summer	Rob Bell	✓
Action taken: This is being considered by Officers.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Benches from Lansdown to be resituated in the vicinity from which they were removed	Rob Bell	ongoing
Action taken: Consultation underway to identify a suitable location for the street seat.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Consider a special Council meeting in October to debate the preferred developer for the North Place and Portland Street site.	Mike Redman	✓
Action taken: A member seminar has been arranged for 1.30pm on Monday 10 October 2011.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Arrange meetings of the newly established Joint Car Park Strategy working group (to include Councillors Hall, McCloskey and Garnham)	Owen Parry	✓
Action taken: Meetings of the Working Group have been arranged.				
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Schedule an environmental improvement (discussion paper) on the work plan for the September meeting of the ENV O&S committee	Saira Malin	✓
Action taken: This has been added to the work plan.				
9	Street	Consider alternative venues across Cheltenham when next	Rob Bell	✓

MATTERS ARISING FROM ENVIRONMENT O&S MEETING: 13 JULY 2011

Agenda No.	Item	Action required	Officer / Member	Completed
	cleansing satisfaction	undertaking a street cleansing survey		
Action taken: Alternative venues will be considered for the survey in 2012.				
9	Street cleansing satisfaction	Trial chewing gum boards in the high street	Rob Bell	ongoing
Action taken: Officers are in talks with suppliers to trial two boards in the town centre.				
9	Street cleansing satisfaction	Consider the request for formal arrangements with individuals in neighbourhoods who can co-ordinate requests for street cleansing, etc	Rob Bell	✓
Action taken: This is being considered by Officers.				
9	Street cleansing satisfaction	Schedule a street cleansing update post review for the May 2012 meeting of the ENV O&S committee to consider the operational changes to the service	Saira Malin	✓
Action taken: This has been added to the work plan.				
10	Work plan	Schedule plastic bag review on work plan for the November meeting of the ENV O&S committee	Saira Malin	✓
Action taken: This has been added to the work plan.				

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Committee – 14 September 2011

Imperial and Montpellier Gardens Strategy

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed.

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 This paper has been written to update members on progress with the redesign of Imperial Gardens. It contains the proposed phasing of the main design elements, approximate time tabling, and progress with grass re-instatement since the last festival took place in Imperial Gardens. Design Proposals, and pictures of the current state of grass re-instatements in Imperial Gardens will be on display during the meeting.

2. Background and History

- 2.1 Previously, Imperial Gardens has been the main public park used by the Cheltenham Festivals. Starting from 2012, it is proposed that the Jazz Festival will take place in Montpellier Gardens in May and the Science Festival in Imperial Gardens in June. Starting in October this year, the Literature Festival will take place in both Gardens.

- 2.2 At its meeting of 26th July 2011 Cabinet resolved the following:

- 1) That authority be delegated to the Director of Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Sustainability and the Council leader, to go forward with a tendering process to undertake the first phase of the proposed works in Imperial Gardens
- 2) That tentage designs for Montpellier gardens be restricted to 4700M2, (excluding walkways and gazebos) and that authority be delegated to the Director Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member Sustainability to agree the exact figure.
- 3) At the same time, authority be delegated to the Director (Operations) in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Sustainability and the Council leader to go forward with a tendering process for infrastructure in Montpellier Gardens.
- 4) That authority be delegated to the Director (Operations) in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Sustainability and the Council leader, to submit the relevant sections of the scheme for planning approval and listed building consent.
- 5) The final decision to go ahead with works in Imperial Gardens and Montpellier Gardens is to be referred back to Cabinet for decision on the 18th October 2011 in time for completion of works over the winter 2011/12.

3. Phasing of Works

3.1 Initial Cost estimates and available budget will allow the following elements to be priced for inclusion in Phase 1:

- Upgrade to electricity, water and foul water services.
- Modifications to Eastern entrance to accommodate higher loadings and setting down area.
- Landscape enhancement to Gardens Bar area, and side of town hall.
- Self binding gravel to side of town hall.
- Landscape refurbishment to Skillicorne Gardens (excluding shelter).
- Leveling, returfing and creation of new seasonal bedding layout.
- Rose / Shrub (sustainable) planting to existing shrubberies.
- Tree planting to central path.

3.2 Works to be deferred to later phases, and not yet funded:

- Skillicorne Gardens shelter.
- Pedestrian entrances to SE and NE corners of Imperial Gardens.
- Extend use of Natratex decorative surface to remaining macadam paths in Imperial Gardens.
- Introduction of heritage railings to boundary of Imperial Gardens

4. Next steps and timing

4.1 Applications have been made for planning and listed building consent where required. At the time of writing this report construction drawings and specifications are being finalised for the landscape construction elements and will be incorporated into three separate work packages for quotation by local contractors and returned by the end of September.

4.2 It is anticipated that work will start on site once the Literature Festival has vacated Imperial Gardens in mid October and will commence with the laying out of the proposed floral bedding scheme - with the intention of planting it up for Spring 2012. This will be followed by Skillicorne Gardens, the garden bar paved area, and eastern entrance modifications. Planting of Skillicorne Gardens, shrubberies and new trees will take place in late Winter / early Spring by in-house teams. All works are planned for completion before the Science festival in May 2012. A more detailed timetable will be produced once contracts have been awarded and lead in times for labour and materials are known.

5. Grass Reinstatement

- 5.1** From 2012 onwards it is proposed that substantial turf reinstatements are undertaken in both Imperial and Montpellier Gardens immediately following the Literature festival in October and extensive drill seeding prior to the construction of Jazz and Science Festival marquees in April and May.
- 5.2** As an interim measure this year a combination of turfing and drill seeding has be implemented to reinstate badly affected areas in Imperial Gardens. Pictures of these reinstatements will be on display before and after the scrutiny meeting along with the design proposals.

Background Papers	Environment Scrutiny Committee, 2nd March 2011 - Imperial and Montpellier Gardens Strategy Cabinet, 15 th March 2011- Imperial and Montpellier Gardens Strategy Council, 27 th June 2011 - Imperial Gardens Outline Design and Consultation E&BI Scrutiny Committee, 18 th July 2011 - Imperial and Montpellier Gardens Strategy Cabinet, 26 th July 2011- Outline Design and Consultation
Contact Officer	Adam Reynolds, Green Space Development Manager 01242 774669, adam.reynolds@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member Sustainability, cllr.roger.whyborn@cheltenham.gov.uk
Scrutiny Function	Environment

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 14

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

14 September 2011

Flood Protection Update

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 To provide an update on flood risk management progress since last reviewed by the committee in January 2010.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 During the period, significant progress has been made. Major flood mitigation schemes have been constructed and various studies have been undertaken. A successful grant aid application was made for property level flood protection measures in the Whaddon area and a further funding application is under consideration for a scheme in the Charlton Kings / Hearne Brook catchment.

3. Summary of evidence/information

3.1 Schemes constructed during the period

- Warden Hill Flood Relief Works
 - Defra Grant Aid funded – Total Award £820k
 - Partnership funding (Glos County £50k; CBC £50k)
 - Substantially completed August 2011
 - Providing an improved standard of flood protection to approximately 130 properties
- Prestbury Flood Alleviation Scheme
 - An EA scheme funded in partnership with the County Council and CBC
 - Construction costs circa £600k; CBC and GCC contributing £100k each
 - Substantially completed August 2011
 - Providing an improved standard of protection to nearly 60 properties

3.2 Studies undertaken

- Hearne Brook Catchment Study
 - Study was Defra grant aid funded – Awarded £59k
 - Halcrow Group Ltd commissioned
 - Option appraisal and cost benefit analysis submitted to EA in August 2011
 - The EA are now considering including this scheme in their Medium Term Plan making it eligible for grant aid funding.
- Cheltenham Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP)

Page 16

- A County driven project (with Defra funding)
- A SWMP is a framework to help local partners with responsibility for surface water and drainage to work together to understand the causes of surface water flooding and agree the most cost effective way to manage surface water flood risk in the area.
- Following competitive tendering, Halcrow were commissioned by the County to undertake the study in association with the local partners forming the steering group:
 - Glos County
 - CBC
 - STW
 - EA
 - Halcrow and sub consultants
- During the SWMP process, the following areas were identified for detailed assessment:
 - Whaddon, Lynworth and Prestbury
 - Balcarras Road / East End Road
 - Sandy Lane and Pilley
 - Tivoli and The Park
- A draft SWMP including an “Implementation and Action Plan” is due out in October of this year. It will provide an overview of flood risk and an action plan for each of the detailed assessment areas.

3.3 Property Level Flood Protection (PLFP) – Whaddon Area

A successful grant aid application for PLFP was made for 24 properties in the Whaddon area of Cheltenham and an award of £102,200 was made by Defra in May of this year. Consultants Pell Frishmann (Exeter office) have been commissioned to project manage the required property survey works and the production of reports for each property detailing the proposed protection measures. Subsequent to this, a competitive tendering process will be undertaken for the implementation phase. Work is programmed for completion this financial year.

3.4 General Watercourse Maintenance and Improvements (2011/2012)

Continues with the annual budget of £15k and the balance of the £90k enhanced maintenance budget set for the 3 year period 09/10 to 11/12.

Background Papers	None
Contact Officer	Geoff Beer, Principal Engineer, 01242 774984, geoff.beer@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Cllr John Rawson Cabinet Member Built Environment
Scrutiny Function	Environment

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

14 September 2011

New Homes Bonus Environmental Improvements Programme

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 To update the committee on proposals for administering 'New Homes Bonus' funding which has been allocated by Council to local environmental improvements.
- 1.2 A list of schemes which the Cabinet is minded to support will be separately circulated to Environment O&S members on Friday 9th September.
- 1.3 Cabinet would welcome the early views of the Environment O&S Committee about which schemes should be a priority for support, subject to assurances to be secured about governance and delivery arrangements.

2. New Homes Bonus 2011

- 2.1 The Council has recently received its first allocation of the New Homes Bonus (NHB) from central government.
- 2.2 NHB has been designed to address the disincentive within the local government finance system for local areas to welcome growth. Until now, increased housing in communities has meant increased strain on public services and reduced amenities. NHB reduces this disincentive by providing local authorities with the means to help mitigate the strain the increased population causes. This should ensure that the economic benefits of growth are returned to the local authorities and communities where growth takes place. In addition, in doing so, NHB is intended to engender a more positive attitude to growth, and create an environment in which new housing is more readily accepted.
- 2.3 The Bonus commenced in April 2011, and will match fund the additional council tax raised for new homes and long term empty properties brought back into use, with an additional amount for affordable homes, in each of the following six years.
- 2.4 Cheltenham's first allocation of NHB amounts to £290,275 and Council agreed on 27th

June, 2011, that this will be used to create 2 funds for the following uses:-

- 2.5 Environmental improvements** - £130,000, supplemented by £30,000 from the civic pride reserve, to provide a total fund of £160,000 for small environmental works. Bids from within council departments will be made and decided by Cabinet in the autumn. The aim will be to tackle environmental issues in packages costing around £15,000 or so a time. An initial request has been made, and supported by Cabinet, for £10,800 to purchase larger waste bins for the council's parks to remove the need to use wheelie bins to cope with the summer peak in activity, plus replacement bins adjacent to Imperial gardens to complement the re-paving scheme.
- 2.6** Criteria for applying and administering the environmental improvements fund are currently being refined and will be the basis for prioritisation and associated recommendations by officers. Funding is likely to be distributed in 2 phases during the year.
- 2.7** The environmental improvements fund will be subject to a bidding process by internal Council departments, with bids signed off by a member panel drawn from the Cabinet.
- 2.8 Promoting Cheltenham** – this fund is being dealt with via separate arrangements which have already been reported to the E&BI Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet and are not therefore covered in detail by this report. However, for information, this funding comprises £160,275, supplemented by £18,731 of unspent LAA performance reward grant, giving a total fund of £179,006, for economic development purposes to help tackle the recession and promote the town as a place in which to do business, by sponsoring activities and events which will attract visitors and trade. It will include cultural activities such as the festivals and tourism activities.

3. Next Steps

- 3.1** It is proposed that Cabinet will approve prioritised bids and related governance arrangements, which are being resourced through the New Homes Bonus allocation for 2011-12.

Background Papers	Council report entitled 'Financial outturn 2010/11 and budget monitoring to May 2011' – 27th June, 2011
Contact Officer	Mike Redman, Director Built Environment, 01242 264160, mike.redman@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Cllr John Rawson, Cabinet Member for Built Environment

**Cheltenham Environmental Fund
Draft Project List for Discussion**

**Provisional Ranking
Total available £149,200**

Rank	Project Name	Project Description	Maximum Funding Sought	Cumulative Funding
1	Bath Road - Connect My Street	Cheltenham Connect are leading the project to improve pedestrian movement, increase cycle parking and enhance street scene. Now linked to GCC highway safety scheme. Design is well advanced - consultation shows high level of public support. Working group well organised and can deliver. This funding would give an opportunity to improve GCC's "basic" proposals.	£15,000	£15,000
2	Community tree maintenance	Increase publicity/encourage active public involvement in new/young tree maintenance + watering throughout town	£2,000	£17,000
3	St Paul's Street Scene	Small scale street enhancements (planting, painting, murals) co-ordinated by St Paul's Residents Association in partnership with University of Gloucestershire.	£5,000	£22,000
4	Improvements to road barriers in Humber and Mersey Roads	To visually improve necessary road barriers which are unattractive and unsightly as made of concrete and steel girders. Funding would be used for works to enable improvements to be made to the appearance of barriers and bollards at the two locations to enable planting. Public consultation complete; good support. £3,000 secured. Partnership with Oakley N'hd p/ship	£7,000	£29,000
5	Allotment water butts	Supply guttering and water butts to all council allotment sheds to reduce water bills and promote environmental awareness.	£10,000	£39,000
6	Moving Spaces	Joint project (CBC, University of Gloucestershire and Cheltenham Literature Festival) to help understanding of how spaces might change under Civic Pride. Temporary installations designed by UoG BA Landscape Students in town centre streets and spaces during Literature Festival. Design & licences in place. Funding would purchase materials.	£500	£39,500
7	Pittville Park Improvements	Pittville Park enhancements to improve pathways and signage (at junction points, to point people in direction of various features of the park), to improve the environment and bio-diversity through planting, wildlife fringe around Ag Gardner play area. Possible inclusion of clearing of self-seeded trees at lake fringe.	£18,000	£57,500
8	Pilley Bridge Nature Reserve	Development of western end of Pilley Bridge nature reserve: undertake tree work and other clearance / renovations of the reserve, including to install seating, develop planting and structures etc for animals and insects so that it is a haven for both humans and urban wildlife.	£15,000	£72,500
9	Cheltenham Cycle Infrastructure	To remove major barriers to cycling in Cheltenham. A number of options have been identified by the Cheltenham Cycle Forum and Cycle Campaign.	£15,000	£87,500
10	George Reddings Way and Pilgrove Way Green Space enhancement	Seating, tree planting wild flower planting to improve biodiversity on green space. New play equipment.	£15,000	£102,500
11	Pittville Gates and Railings Restoration	Restoration and partial rebuilding of the historic and listed Pittville Gates and gate piers, including repair of all metal work and improvements to surrounding area, for the benefit of residents, businesses, visitors and future generations of Cheltonians.	£20,000	£122,500

**Cheltenham Environmental Fund
Draft Project List for Discussion**

**Provisional Ranking
Total available £149,200**

Rank	Project Name	Project Description	Maximum Funding Sought	Cumulative Funding
12	Restoration of Neptune's Fountain	A full restoration of the listed and historic Neptune's Fountain, including the structure and the services, and new landscaping and an interpretation board explaining the history and design of the fountain feature. The initial work is the engage of a conservator to assess the fountain and recommend the necessary works.	£8,000	£130,500
13	Montpellier + Pittville Park Lower	Creation of self guided tree trail publication	£1,500	£132,000
14	Sandford Ornamental garden	Selective tree tree removals+ replanting	£8,000	£140,000
15	Brizen Rec	Remove trim trail apparatus and replace with a natural play area and nature / bio-diversity enhancements	£15,000	£155,000
16	Multiple Parks + open spaces	Increased tree watering + mulching for this + 2 previous years planting	£4,000	£159,000
17	Restoration of Rock Garden in Sandford Park	To refurbish rock garden in Sandford Park. The funding would be used to investigate and produce a planting plan, fund the plant material and pay for the planting and establishment maintenance through Cheltenham Community Projects social enterprise who have already undertaken maintenance and repair works to seats in the park.	£8,000	£167,000
18	Hesters Way Park	Removal of self sown/unwanted specimens and replanting of exotic species with original likely intended species	£20,000	£187,000
19	Improvements to road barrier in Clyde Crescent	To visually improve necessary road barriers which are unattractive and unsightly as made of concrete and steel girders. Funding would be used for works to enable improvements to be made to the appearance of barriers and bollards at the two locations to enable planting. Partnership with Oakley N'hd p/ship	£5,000	£192,000
20	Honeybourne Line CCTV Project	To install CCTV cameras along the Honeybourne Line to improve safety for users, reduce ASB and stop the line being used as an easy escape route for criminals, as it is currently contributing to the significant domestic burglary problem in Cheltenham. Phase 1 is to install the first 7 cameras between the Railway Station and Jubilee Bridge (by Waitrose).	£15,000	£207,000
21	Street trees	Top-up the street tree replacement programme (joint with GCC).	£5,000	£212,000
22	Grosvenor Terrace Green Enhancements	Enhancement and greening of Grosvenor Terrace Car Park and Grosvenor Terrace Lane leading to the High Street to enhance the visitors experience and stimulate social, economic development in the area.	£15,000	£227,000
23	Edward Wilson Statue	Restoration and conservation of the historic and listed bronze Edward Wilson statue in the Long Gardens, including a new interpretation board and bronze plaque. 2012 is the centenary Wilson's historic trip and this work will educate visitors and residents to our famous former resident.	£3,000	£230,000
24	Montpellier Street/Montpellier Walk	Redesign south end Montpellier Street and Montpellier Walk to enhance pedestrian crossing movements and resolve bin storage arrangements. Links to Parking Review (which may release some funds). Funding for initial interventions.	£15,000	£245,000

**Cheltenham Environmental Fund
Draft Project List for Discussion**

**Provisional Ranking
Total available £149,200**

Rank	Project Name	Project Description	Maximum Funding Sought	Cumulative Funding
25	Adult fitness equipment for Naunton Park	Adult outdoor fitness equipment for Naunton Park, as requested by Friends group. CBC could fund 3 larger piece of equipment and the friends could raise funds for smaller items.	£15,000	£260,000
26	Jenner Gardens	The funding will be used to commission a statue of Edward Jenner, the pioneer of vaccination, for Jenner Gardens, just off the Lower High Street. Since its renovation Jenner Gardens has proved popular with visitors researching family history - both locals and from overseas. The statue of Edward Jenner will help to promote a significant element of Cheltenham's heritage - Jenner's work led to the eradication of smallpox. An award of funding for this project would result in Cheltenham having a public memorial to Jenner, which currently it does not have.	£15,000	£275,000
27	Regent Street Streetscape enhancements	Carry out enhancements and greening to Regent Street and the entrances into Regent Street car park, to improve the streetscape and develop social, environmental and economic sustainability.	£10,000	£285,000
Total Bids			£285,000	

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 22

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment O&S Committee – 14 September 2011

Joint Environmental Services Commissioning Project

This note contains the information to keep Members informed of matters relating to the work of the Committee, but where no decisions from Members are needed.

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 The committee requested information before the matter is referred to Cabinet on 13th October 2011.

2. Background and History

- 2.1 As part of its commissioning strategy Cheltenham has invested time and effort in collaborative working and is considered by partners to be committed, open and positive. The proposal to form a jointly owned Local Authority Company contributes to the council's sound platform for partnership working to deliver improved outcomes and value for money.
- 2.2 A cornerstone of the commissioning strategy is the separation of commissioning from provider activities. This allows service change and development to be driven transparently by the needs of Citizens and users rather than by the internal needs of the service provider. The creation of a Local Authority Company as a service provider satisfies these principles.
- 2.3 The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2007 – 2020 makes a clear commitment to partnership working including the development of service delivery partnerships with other authorities and the private sector.
- 2.4 Both Cheltenham Borough Council (Cheltenham) and Cotswold District Council (Cotswold) have been examining options for joint working in waste services as members of the Gloucestershire Waste Partnership. Both council's have considered and accepted a detailed business case to deliver efficiency and operational savings through a jointly owned local authority company. The benefits, financial and non financial, were detailed in the report to Cabinet on 21 June 2011.
- 2.5 It is intended that the company be operational from April 2012, with Cheltenham service delivery transferring in April 2012 and Cotswold service delivery transferring in August 2012 when their current arrangement expires.

3. What is in Scope.

- 3.1 At the Cabinet meeting in June members recognised that the services in scope identified in section 3 of the business case in respect of Cheltenham which are not in scope for the other partner (namely public toilet cleaning, grounds maintenance and management and maintenance of cemeteries and crematorium) be regarded as purely indicative at that stage and to be tested by a separate commissioning study

the result of which will be reported back to Cabinet. A small cross party member working group was established to undertake this task. It was acknowledged that within the timescales it was not possible to undertake a commissioning exercise for these service outcomes. However the review group took a pragmatic approach and considered the inherent synergies between waste management services, street cleaning, other cleaning and grounds maintenance and subsequent cost and service efficiencies. They also have started to develop a set of outcomes against which the SLA could be assessed. They will be reporting back to Cabinet in October on how the services can be taken forward in the future but have agreed that the grounds maintenance and toilet cleaning are in scope.

3.2 It is therefore proposed that the following services are in scope for delivery by the Local Authority Company

- Waste collection
- Recycling collection
- Organic waste collection (food and garden)
- Servicing of neighbourhood recycling sites
- Operation of the Swindon Road recycling centre
- Street cleaning
- Public toilet cleaning
- Grounds maintenance

3.3 These services make up a significant proportion of the Operations Division. Those services currently within the Operations Division which are not in scope for the Local Authority Company are:

- Green space development including allotments
- Public protection (including streetscene enforcement)
- Bereavement services (cemeteries and crematorium)
- Customer contact centre

3.4 These services will transfer to either the Built Environment or Wellbeing and Culture Divisions, with the exception of customer services which will transfer to Frontline Customer Services in the Resources Division.

3.5 The member working group will continue to review the range of services that contribute to the management and maintenance of green space in Cheltenham. The other out of scope services will be subject to commissioning review in accordance with the service commissioning timetable.

4. Legal Structure of the Local Authority Company.

- 4.1** The proposal is for Cheltenham and Cotswolds to establish a Local Authority Company limited by shares with each council having 50% of voting rights. Both sets of shares will have the same rights and powers. As a result the company will be regarded as a local authority controlled company and as a consequence will not be subject to E.U. procurement rules.
- 4.2** The company will be formed in such a way as to allow other councils to join at a future date. It is important to facilitate growth in order to deliver economies of scale, increased efficiency savings and improved outcomes. Overall control of the company will be exercised by shareholder councils in accordance with the Articles of Association and the Shareholder Agreement.
- 4.3** The Shareholder Agreement is a key document in defining the balance of power between the councils as shareholders and the Local Authority Company directors. At a practical level it is important that the shareholders and Local Authority Company management are clear how their relationship is to be conducted. The Shareholders Agreement provides the framework for the ongoing relationship.
- 4.4** Key clauses of the Shareholder Agreement are:
- 4.4.1** Funding- the company will be funded through payments from clients of the business in respect of delivery of services ie from this council for delivery of the services referred to at para. 3.2 above and from Cotswold for services provided by the company
- 4.4.2** Reserved Matters-The Board of Directors require the unanimous approval of the Shareholders before taking any decisions in relation to any of the following matters):
- Varying in any respect the Articles of Association or the rights attaching to any shares in the company.
 - Permitting the registration of any additional Shareholder of the Company
 - Passing any resolution for its winding up or presenting any petition for its administration (unless it has become insolvent)
 - Adopting or amending the business plan in respect of each financial year
 - Forming any subsidiary or acquiring shares in any other company or participating in any partnership or joint venture (incorporated or not)
 - Amalgamating or merging with any other company or business undertaking
 - Entering into any arrangement, contract or transaction over a stated value
 - Agreeing the appointment and appointment terms (including remuneration) of all directors of the Company other than Shareholder appointed directors
 - Agreeing any remuneration terms for Shareholder appointed directors

 - Entering into any arrangement, contract or transaction which is not within, ancillary or incidental to the company's business or is otherwise than on arm's length terms
 - Increasing, reducing, sub-dividing, consolidating, re-denominating, cancelling, purchasing or redeeming any of the capital of, or allotting or issuing any shares or other securities in the capital of, the company

- Altering any rights attaching to any class of share in the capital of the company, or creating any option, warrant or any other right to acquire or subscribe for any shares or other securities in the capital of the company
 - Declaring, authorising or making dividends or distributions of assets of any kind to a Shareholder
- 4.4.3** Board of Directors- to be not less than 4 with each Shareholder entitled to appoint and remove 1 director to the Board
- 4.4.4** Business Plan- to be prepared by the Company and must be unanimously approved by the Shareholders
- 4.4.5** Accounts- to be provided by the company as set out in the agreement
- 4.4.6** Business activities- the Shareholders will consider the company as a potential supplier for all activities within the scope of the Business Plan
- 4.4.7** Transfer of shares- only by unanimous consent of all shareholders and only to another public body
- 4.4.8** Issue of further shares- only by unanimous approval of all the shareholders
- 4.4.9** Dividends-no dividends or distributions except by the unanimous agreement of the shareholders
- 4.4.10** Termination of agreement- only by agreement, winding up or if there is only a single shareholder and if wound up, the parties will agree a suitable basis for dealing with the interests and assets of the company
- 4.4.11** Default- if the default is capable of remedy then the shareholder will be required to remedy the breach within 20 days but if they fail to remedy the default the non defaulting shareholder may hold a meeting and require the defaulting shareholder to take specific action and if they fail to take that action the non defaulting shareholders may remove the voting rights of the defaulting shareholder and any director appointed by the defaulting shareholder
- 4.4.12** Disputes- the directors will try to resolve the dispute within 2 weeks and if that fails the shareholders will nominate representatives to try to resolve the dispute within another 2 week period and if that fails the matter is referred to an arbitrator and/or to court for resolution.
- 4.5** The business of the company consists of executive functions and so it is for the Leader to decide whether to reserve decisions to himself or whether to delegate some or all of those decisions. The joint programme board considered this matter carefully and concluded that it would be appropriate for decision making to be retained by the Leader. The reason for reaching this conclusion lies in the fact that it is necessary for both councils to agree matters reserved to the shareholders and if this involved arranging Cabinet meetings on each occasion, then it may lead to delays and prejudice the efficient operation of the company. If the Leader retains these decisions it will expedite decision making for the benefit of the shareholder councils and the company.

- 4.6** The Articles of Association constitute a contract between the shareholder councils and the company. The articles set out the key framework for the company's governance structure by setting out the composition of the board of directors and who the shareholders are. In addition, the articles set out the procedural rules for both directors and members, holding meetings and making decisions.
- 4.7** Key Articles are as follows:
- 4.7.1** Objects- to provide services to public bodies
 - 4.7.2** Liability is limited to amount, if any, unpaid ie £1
 - 4.7.3** Decision making- by majority unless they agree that it should be unanimously
 - 4.7.4** Quorum- is 2 comprising at least one director appointed by each shareholder
 - 4.7.5** Casting vote- chair will not have a casting vote
 - 4.7.6** Conflicts of interests- these relate to interests in proposed transactions or arrangements with the company
 - 4.7.7** Appointing directors- each shareholder may appoint a council officer as a director and each shareholder may have one appointed director
 - 4.7.8** Shareholder meetings- quorum requires one council representative of each shareholder present
 - 4.7.9** Indemnities for the directors- paid for by the company

5. Service Level Agreement and Monitoring Arrangements

- 5.1** A detailed service level agreement will be in place for each service that is in scope. This will be based on current service design, policy and quantitative and qualitative standards.
- 5.2** Contained within the service level agreement will be key performance indicators and targets. The company will be required to supply the relevant information to the council for audit and scrutiny. Officers of the company and the council will meet on no less that a quarterly basis to review performance information and agree any change to the service.
- 5.3** A representative of the company will be required to attend overview and scrutiny committee, working groups or Cabinet if requested to do so.

6. Council Depot and other Assets

- 6.1** The company will lease all or part of the Swindon Road depot and will use this as its head office and base for Cheltenham operations. As a separate legal identity this will require a formal lease for land and buildings and property services have been instructed to draft heads of terms. A separate depot will be used for Cotswold operations but there will be some degree of sharing according to identified capacity

and operational effectiveness.

- 6.2 Other assets will be identified and valued and will be made available to the company either through a lease (vehicles), service level agreement (ICT equipment) or purchase.

7. Support Services

- 7.1 The company will be supported as detailed below and these arrangements will be the subject of separate service level agreements.

- Finance, HR, Payroll, Health and Safety - Go.
- Legal - One Legal
- Audit - Audit Cotswolds

8. Next Steps

- 8.1 The views of the committee will be feedback to the project team and Cabinet. Cabinet will consider the final report on joint working in environmental services on 13th October 2011. Cotswold Executive will also receive a report on the same day.

Background Papers

Cabinet 15th March 2011 Joint Working in Waste and Environmental Services

Rob Bell, Assistant Director, Operations

01242 264181, rob.bell@cheltenham.gov.uk

Accountability

Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member Sustainability,
01242 231458,
cllr.roger.whyborn@cheltenham.gov.uk

Scrutiny Function

Environment

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Meeting Date: 14 September 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 11 August 2011				
Deadline for papers: 2 September 2011				
Joint Environmental Services Commissioning Project	Scrutiny	Consider and comment upon proposals to establish a LA Company with Cotswold Council in order to deliver a range of environmental services prior to Cabinet (13 October)	Discussion paper	Rob Bell, Director of Operations
Imperial and Montpellier Gardens	Scrutiny	Latest detail of work planned for Phase 1, work expected to be included in Phase 2, proposed work programme and update on reinstatement	Discussion paper	Adam Reynolds, Green Space Development Manager
New Homes Bonus inc. Environmental Improvements programme	Scrutiny	Consider the proposed targets, monitoring and approach to minimising the number of long term properties in the town – making an optimum contribution to securing New Homes Bonus payments and details of what the funding will be used for	Discussion paper	Mike Redman, Director of Built Environment
Flood Update	Update	Update to include details of the flood defence work in Whaddon	Discussion paper	Geoff Beer, Senior Engineer (Land Drainage)

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Meeting Date: 23 November 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 13 October 2011				
Deadline for papers: 11 November 2011				
Budget consultation 2012-13 (if necessary)	Scrutiny	Review interim budget proposals 2012-13 and comment (if necessary)	Discussion paper	Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources
Waste Strategy – post implementation inc. review of garden waste	Scrutiny	Review the implementation of the new strategy and lessons learned	Report	Beth Boughton, Waste and Recycling Manager
Cheltenham Development Task Force	Update	Progress in the last 12 months and future plans	Presentation	Jeremy Williamson, Managing Director – Cheltenham Development Task Force
Cheltenham Car Parking Strategy and related enforcement (Glos. County and CBC)	Update	Consider and agree draft strategy prior to Cabinet (tbc)	Report	Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability
Plastic Bags	Scrutiny	Consider the issue of plastic bags by retailers	Tbc	Tbc
Meeting Date: 18 January 2012				
Chairs Briefing: 14 December 2011				
Deadline for papers: 6 January 2012				
Budget proposals 2012-13	Scrutiny	Review final budget proposals 2012-13 prior to Council (10 February)	Discussion paper	Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources
Meeting Date: 29 February 2012				
Chairs Briefing: 26 January 2012				
Deadline for papers: 17 February 2012				
DRAFT Corporate Strategy 2012-13	Scrutiny	Review DRAFT strategy for 2012-13 prior to Cabinet (13 March)		Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnership Manager
Meeting Date: 30 May 2012				
Chairs Briefing: tbc				
Deadline for papers: 18 May 2012				

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Flood Update	Update	Biannual update on flood prevention in Cheltenham	Discussion paper – tbc	Geoff Beer, Geoff Beer, Senior Engineer (Land Drainage)
Street Cleansing	Update	Consider the outcomes of the service review	Discussion paper	John Rees, Environmental Maintenance Manager
Meeting Date: 11 July 2012				
Chairs Briefing: tbc				
Third annual review of the Gloucestershire Airport – Green Policy	Scrutiny	Review of the Green Policy	Report	Gill Morris, Climate Change and Sustainability Officer
Deadline for papers: 29 June 2012				
Items to be added at a future date				
Joint Core Strategy - developments	Update	Awaiting confirmation re: schedule of updates for 2011-12	tbc	Tracey Crews, Spatial Planning Manager
Green Travel Plan	tbc	Awaiting confirmation re: relevance of item from Lead Officer	tbc	Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability
Paving slab repairs?	Tbc	Consider cost constraints of replacing paving slabs like for like?	Tbc	Tbc
Imperial Gardens (after 2012 Festival season)	Scrutiny	Assess remedial works to Imperial Gardens after 2012 festival season	Tbc	Rob Bell, Director of Operations

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 32