



CHELTENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 23 November 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 14 SEPTEMBER 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.	CHELTENHAM CAR PARKING STRATEGY Discussion paper of the Head of Integrated Transport & Sustainability	(Pages 11 - 24)
8.	REVIEW OF GARDEN WASTE SCHEME Discussion paper of the Director of Operations	(Pages 25 - 30)
9.	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW WASTE AND RECYCLING SCHEME - REVIEW AND LESSONS LEARNED	(Pages 31 - 34)

		Discussion paper of the Waste & Recycling Manager	
10.		CLIMATE CHANGE MEMBER WORKING GROUP Discussion paper of the Climate Change Working Group	(Pages 35 - 40)
11.		ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-12	(Pages 41 - 44)
12.		ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION	
13.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 18 January 2012	
		Briefing Notes (for information only) 1. Pittville Community Bridge update 2. Sponsorship of roundabouts update	

Contact Officer: Saira Malin, Democracy Officer, 01242 775153
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 14th September, 2011

6.00 - 8.05 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Penny Hall (Chair), Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Jacky Fletcher, Diane Hibbert, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Charles Stewart and Paul Wheeldon, Duncan Smith (Substitute for Rob Garnham)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

The Executive Director had given her apologies and the Director of Operations attended in her place.

Councillor Rob Garnham had given his apologies. Councillor Duncan Smith had been nominated as his substitute.

The Chair welcomed back Beverly Thomas, Democracy Officer, who had been on maternity leave.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THE 13 JULY 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 13 July 2011 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters were referred to the committee.

6. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING

The Cabinet Member Built Environment informed members of the following :

- the timescale for the North Place/Portland Street development had been brought forward with the report now going to Council on 10 October and then Cabinet on 18 October. This would enable the Council to have an input into the process and guide Cabinet in its decision.
- the report on the National Planning Policy Framework was due to go to Cabinet on 18 October. The consultation raised points of detail but the

big themes included sustainability and brownfield policy and any representations would be focused on these themes.

- 2 members were sought for the garden development SPD working group. These should not be existing planning committee members.
- members welcomed the opportunity for Council to have an input into the North Place/Portland Street development.

In response to a query on a proposed street racing event in the town centre in 2012 the Cabinet Member requested an email to be forwarded to him in order to investigate further as he was unaware of such an event.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability made the following points :

- the recycling rate for the first 3 months of the current financial year was just under 50 % compared to 35 % the same period last year which meant a corresponding decrease in tonnages sent to landfill.
- the waste and recycling working group was due to meet shortly before it reported to Environment O & S in November

Members were encouraged by the recycling rates but aired their concerns regarding the projections for the uptake of the green waste scheme not being fulfilled. The Cabinet Member Sustainability informed members that there had been a total of 11 000 sign ups to date against a target of 20 000 by the end of the financial year. CBC was actively looking at the situation and a marketing scheme would be undertaken in the coming months. The Director of Operations explained that from experience from other local authorities there was traditionally another spike in demand in the autumn and then again in the early spring. The marketing scheme involved roadshows at the recycling centre, garden centres and shopping centres where there was high footfall and in areas where there was low take-up, advertising on the side of vehicles and on receipts and in the Echo. Customers at Swindon Road would also be targeted.

Members raised the issue that many householders would like to take up the service but could not physically fit another wheeled bin on to their property or there were those who live in terraced housing and could not wheel a bin through their property. The Cabinet Member Sustainability told members that alternatives were being examined but it was unlikely they would be in a position to promote this during the forthcoming marketing campaign. Members remarked that an alternative may even be preferable to those residents who were using the brown bin. When asked about the cost of the campaign the Director of Operations explained that this was within existing budgets and mainly involved officer time. The overall target remained 20 000 households but the Director hoped for at least a take up of 15 000 following the marketing campaign. Members requested an analysis of take-up to date by area as local ward councillors could play a role in raising awareness in their area. The Director of Operations said that whilst the data fell under data protection rules he would try to provide this information as far as possible.

Members highlighted that some residents were under the impression that the green waste scheme was a one-off cost and it was asked how the collections would be differentiated when it came to the end of the period. In response the Director of Operations explained that the council held a database of existing customers and a reminder notice would be issued at the end of the period,

followed by a second reminder and finally contact would be made with the customer to say the service would be removed. In response to a question on the collection of brown cardboard in the future the Cabinet Member told members that the Council was currently working to capacity as the recycling scheme had proved so successful with residents but he acknowledged the issue which the Cabinet would wish to promote in future.

Members noted that a report was due to go to Cabinet on the review of the scheme in December and asked that information be brought to Environment O & S in advance of this meeting.

The issue of planting on roundabouts where there were advertising boards paid for by sponsors was raised by members. Some roundabouts had not been planted at all. In response the Cabinet Member Sustainability explained that roundabouts were planted with a mixture of flowers, bulbs, shrubs or trees. In response to a specific question relating to Westall Green roundabout the Cabinet Member explained that due to insufficient soil depth bedding plants were not suitable and therefore there would be flowering bulbs instead. The Director of Operations also told Members that as this was the first year of the scheme there had been a slight delay in securing sponsorship and thus in ordering plants in time for the season. Improvements should be visible next year. Members requested a briefing note on the funds raised through the sponsorship, how much had been spent thus far and what remained in the budget.

The Green Space Development Manager reassured Members that the work on Pittville Bridge was progressing well and was within budget despite rumours to the contrary. Members requested a briefing note from the officer detailing the original budget, what had been spent to date and what was anticipated to be spent.

In response to a question regarding flytipping by students in St Pauls the Director Operations reported that contact had been made with landlords who provided most of the student accommodation in the area. The letting agreement would now contain a clause stating that waste and recycling receptacles should remain at the property when the let terminated, if not money would be taken from the deposit.

A particular issue was raised with regard to a blanket licensing application by CBC Parks and Gardens Division for Sandford Park in July 2011 which had created significant public concern. The ward councillors for that area had not been given forewarning of the application and had thus found themselves wrong footed by the interest generated. This had done nothing to enhance the reputation for the council.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability explained that the rationale for the application was that a blanket licence was in place for Imperial Gardens. The application was in support of a food festival in 2012. However the application was withdrawn due to the public concern. Lessons had been learned from this and the festival organisers would apply for a temporary event licence for that event only and would consult properly with local residents. Members requested that the Green space strategy should be reviewed in terms of contacting local residents and park users on the way forward. In terms of the concerns raised on flooding issues the Green Space Development Manager explained that contact

had been made with the Environment Agency who gave in principle support provided a risk assessment was undertaken. The Council had also discussed the proposal with the hospital which was happy as long as access remained to the helipad and distances to the hospital were respected.

The Cabinet Member assured Members that in the future local members would be consulted first regarding the proposal of a major event in their area.

7. IMPERIAL AND MONTPELLIER GARDEN STRATEGY

The Green Space Development Manager updated members on progress with the redesign of Imperial Gardens since the Cabinet decision in July 2011. The results from the consultation had been positive and officers were now working up the design and quotations for works to be undertaken. The relevant applications for planning approval and listed building consent had been made. The final decision to go ahead with works in Imperial Gardens and Montpellier Gardens would be referred back to Cabinet for decision on 18 October in time for completion of works over the winter 2011/12. The Design Proposals and pictures of the current state of grass re-instatements in Imperial Gardens were on display at the meeting.

The Green Space Development Manager highlighted to Members that the cultivation of the whole site for the purposes of relaying the bedding area was likely to attract public attention and it was intended that temporary public information boards be used whilst this work was undertaken. Members highlighted the importance of the communication with the public and urged that local residents be directly informed and that a media release be issued to mitigate concerns.

The main issue arising from the consultation was that there should be good reinstatement after the events had taken place. The Green Space Development Manager informed members that prior to the Jazz and the Science Festivals the existing areas would be extensively drill seeded and that for the Literature Festival in Montpellier and Imperial Gardens there would be turf-oriented reinstatement.

Members raised the issue of the modifications to the eastern entrance to accommodate higher loadings and setting down area. The Green Space Development Manager confirmed that only a slight widening was required due to the gap between the two plinths but there were no highway implications.

In terms of whether officers had taken on board recommendations which had come out of the consultation the Green Space Manager said proposals with regard to seating repositioning and new seating and some suggestions with regard to plantings would be incorporated.

When asked if there was a fallback position the Cabinet Member Sustainability confirmed that preliminary costings in the proposals were on the conservative side and the Green Space Development Manager added that there were clauses in the land use agreements with the Festivals regarding rectifying any damage caused.

With regard to work to the Skillicorne Gardens shelter which had been deferred to a later phase assurance was given by the Green Space Development

Manager that this work would be fully scoped beforehand and there would be no damage to any first phase works.

In terms of funding for later works the introduction of heritage railings to the boundary of Imperial Gardens would be funded by the Friends. Cabinet was aware of the need to fund these works but had to prioritise.

8. FLOOD PROTECTION UPDATE

The Principal Engineer updated members on flood risk management progress since January 2010.

When asked why the town centre did not form part of the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) process the Principal Engineer explained that this was protected by the Chelt Flood Alleviation Scheme as the SWMP did not look at fluvial flooding from main rivers or sewer flooding but flooding from ordinary watercourses and impermeable surfaces.

In response to a question on the Warden Hill Flood Relief Works 45 properties had been flooded in 2007 but the design and modelling undertaken for this project showed that the scheme would now improve the level of protection to a total of 130 properties.

Members noted that in terms of general watercourse maintenance and improvements there was an annual budget of £15k but this was being supplemented by the £90k enhanced maintenance budget for the 3 year period 09/10 to 11/12. Members were concerned whether there would be proper maintenance and improvements once these funds were exhausted bearing in mind that the Principal Engineer estimated that a total annual budget of £30k would be required to undertake the necessary works. Members were reminded that they would have the opportunity to put forward their proposals and ideas in the budget round.

When asked whether officers were still encouraging individual landlords to clear the watercourses which ran across their properties the Principal Engineer confirmed that officers did try to do this but the work undertaken, if any, was not monitored.

In response to a question on whether the Environment Agency (EA) intended to carry out the replacement of the butterfly valve at the Dowdeswell reservoir he confirmed that it was not the EA's intention to do this.

Supplementary information was requested on the Hearne brook catchment study. The Principal Engineer said that the cost of the scheme was identified as £250 k and if the scheme was successfully added to the EA's medium term plan it would provide protection to 15-20 homes.

Resolved

That the committee pay attention in the budget negotiations to the general watercourse maintenance and improvement budget.

9. NEW HOMES BONUS (INCLUDING ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME)

The Cabinet Member Built Environment introduced the report and informed members that any scheme not included this year could potentially be included in subsequent years as the new homes bonus would continue to be allocated to the authority from central government.

Members remarked that they would have been better placed to comment on the proposed schemes had the criteria been included but understood that this was still being worked on. In response the Cabinet Member explained that rather than getting involved in elaborate scoring systems the proposed projects should be examined in terms of best value for money. The proposals had in the main been put forward internally by officers but some had come forward from community groups.

A discussion was held as to whether the proposed projects did actually fit the purpose of the funding which was to mitigate the strain on the increased population causes. The example of guttering on allotment sheds was given. The Cabinet Member Built Environment was confident that the projects proposed were small scale infrastructure projects and were consistent with the Government's intentions. Meanwhile some Members applauded the flexibility being used. The example of the project of Pittville Gates and Railings Restoration was given which in Cllr Hibbert's view would represent the perfect project for Cheltenham to mark the Queen's diamond jubilee.

Rather than each member comment on the project relating to their ward the Chair proposed that each member email directly to the Cabinet member their comments on the proposals.

When asked whether grass cutting could be included in order to enhance the appearance of the town, the Cabinet Member Sustainability replied that grass cutting was an ongoing revenue item and could not be allocated to the new homes bonus.

Members agreed that those projects proposed by community groups be given priority.

Resolved

- That Members forward to the Cabinet member their comments on the proposals.
- That the minutes of this item be forwarded to Cabinet

10. JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMISSIONING PROJECT

The Cabinet Member Sustainability referred to the Member seminar held the previous evening and outlined the background to the commissioning project. Significant management and operational savings were projected by setting up a Local Authority Company, a non-profit making body which would deliver waste and other environmental services including park management. A Cabinet working group comprising Cllrs Thornton, Fisher, Hall, Stewart and Whyborn, was due to meet that week to discuss the proposals and comments from the committee would be fed into this group.

Members requested that the presentation from the recent member seminar and all relevant paperwork relating to the project be circulated to all members. This

should include extracts of relevant information from the confidential reports which at the time were confidential due to the commercial sensitivity of the information. It was confirmed that the answers to the points raised at the seminar, including on value added tax and pension fund issues, would be circulated to all members.

In response to a question on the trade union view of the project the Director of Operations explained that the trade unions had been engaged at the start of the process and formal meetings were held with them on a regular basis. They were broadly supportive of the process and appreciated the difficult financial position the authority faced.

The Chair thanked the Cabinet Member for the update and reminded Members that the report would be considered by Cabinet at a special meeting on 13 October. She requested that the minutes of this meeting be forwarded to Cabinet for their information.

- 11. ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-12**
The Chair referred members to the work plan as circulated with the agenda.
- 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION**
There were no urgent items for discussion.
- 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting was scheduled for the 23 November 2011.

Penny Hall
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 8

MATTERS ARISING FROM ENVIRONMENT O&S MEETING: 14 SEPTEMBER 2011

Agenda No.	Item	Action required	Officer / Member	Completed
6	Cabinet Briefing	Seek members for the garden development SPD working group	Councillors to put name forward to Mike Redman	
Action taken:				
6	Cabinet briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green waste scheme-forward members an analysis of take-up to date by area Bring review of green waste scheme to Env O & S November meeting 	Rob Bell Rob Bell	
Action taken:				
6	Cabinet briefing	Sponsorship of roundabouts-briefing note on funds raised through sponsorship, how much spent thus far, remaining budget	Rob Bell	
Action taken:				
6	Cabinet briefing	Works to Pittville bridge-briefing note detailing original budget, what has been spent to date and what was projected spending	Adam Reynolds	
Action taken:				
9	New Homes bonus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members to email Cabinet Member directly comments on the proposals Forward excerpt of Env O & S minutes to Cabinet 	All councillors Bev Thomas	
Action taken:				
10	Joint Environmental Services Commissioning Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward copy of presentation from recent Member Seminar and all relevant paperwork to all Councillors Answers to points raised at Member Seminar including on VAT and Pension Fund issues to be circulated to all members Forward copy of minutes of Env O & S to Cabinet on 13 October 	Rob Bell Grahame Lewis Bev Thomas	
Action taken:				

MATTERS ARISING FROM ENVIRONMENT O&S MEETING: 14 SEPTEMBER 2011

Agenda No.	Item	Action required	Officer / Member	Completed
------------	------	-----------------	------------------	-----------

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee –

23 November 2011

Cheltenham Car Parking 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?

Background

The 'Cheltenham Parking Board', (The Board) a county/borough partnership is moving towards a more holistic approach to parking in Cheltenham and which will lead the development of a jointly owned parking strategy for Cheltenham (the Strategy), considering both on and off-street parking needs within the borough.

2. Summary of the Issue

Parking facilities are a key component to the vitality of any town centre and Cheltenham is no different in this respect. The newly created Cheltenham Development Task Force has set out its central area ambition which is:

“to support the town’s economic strength and sustainable development by revitalising key streets and spaces to the highest attainable quality for the benefit of the whole community.”

The role of streets and streetscapes needs to be considered in conjunction with how residents, commuters and visitors access the town and its services – thus, the contribution parking schemes make to the well-being of the local economy is an area that requires detailed consideration.

3. Summary of evidence/information

A draft paper entitled “Towards a Cheltenham Parking Strategy” has been tabled with the Parking Board (which is attached for member consideration). The Board have agreed to the establishment of a member working group to support the development of the Cheltenham Local Parking Strategy with the aim that it be included within the county wide parking strategy as set out in the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3).

4. Next Steps - possible next steps for the committee to consider e.g. potential witnesses, further report, site visit etc.

It was intended to have a draft strategy for Cabinet to consider in January 2012, this will now need to be rescheduled whilst a broader engagement and consultation takes place with a number of key stakeholders and adjoining district councils.

Together with the County we are in the process of establishing a number of engagement sessions where we can consult with key stakeholders and the broader community in developing the localised plan.

It is important that members are involved in this process through the member working group as part of the ongoing development of Cheltenham's Parking Strategy.

Appendix	A. Towards Cheltenham Parking Strategy
Contact Officer	Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport & Sustainability, 01242 77 4640, owen.parry@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Councillor John Rawson
Scrutiny Function	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Towards a Cheltenham Parking Strategy (draft v10)

COVERING STATEMENT

Parking facilities are a key component to the vitality of any town centre and Cheltenham is no different in this respect. The newly created Cheltenham Development Task Force has set out its central area ambition which is:

“to support the town’s economic strength and sustainable development by revitalising key streets and spaces to the highest attainable quality for the benefit of the whole community.”

The role of streets and streetscapes needs to be considered in conjunction with how residents, commuters and visitors access the town and its services – thus, the contribution parking schemes make to the well-being of the local economy is an area that requires detailed consideration.

The ‘Cheltenham Parking Board’, (The Board) a county/borough partnership is moving towards a more holistic approach to parking in Cheltenham and which will lead the development of a jointly owned parking strategy for Cheltenham (the Strategy), considering both on and off-street parking needs within the borough.

Urban design and public realm is another consideration that the parking strategy needs to take into account. Many of the existing street-scapes in the town have evolved organically over time in both their use and occupation. To accommodate future changes and in support of the overall economic well being of local communities, the parking strategy needs to take into account and where feasible act as an enabler, in managing and enhancing local parking space provision and associated amenities.

The Board should ensure that the Strategy is underpinned by parking policies with particular regard to:

- Managing the traffic network to ensure expeditious movement of traffic, (including pedestrians and cyclists), as required under the TMA Network Management Duty
- Improving road safety;
- Improving the local environment;
- Improving the quality and accessibility of public transport;
- Meeting the needs of people with disabilities, some of whom will be unable to use public transport and depend entirely on the use of a car;
- Managing and reconciling the competing demands for kerb space.

The use of the surplus generated needs to be discussed between the GCC and CBC and clarity sought on the legislative restrictions that govern the expenditure in Section 55 (as amended).

As evidenced via feedback from communities, engaged thus far, the parking strategy needs to acknowledge the opportunities for a range of localised and shared parking arrangements that supports local transport schemes, including car clubs, cycling, shuttle buses and community transport options.

This also needs to be linked to smarter travel plans such as those adopted by several major local employers, but also those developed in the future in conjunction with community and other defined groups with structure and delivery mechanisms. This approach will encourage

Communities to work together in delivering sustainable transport choices aligned for both on /off-street parking provision.

It should be acknowledged that parking schemes play a pivotal role in supporting a number of strategies and schemes, for example, The Agency Agreement, Sustainable Travel Towns, Community & Neighbourhood Management and DIY Street Schemes

Consideration should be given for CBC to have a more active and strategic role in the development of policy and in the management of the engagements and consultation process, this could provide opportunity for the GCC to allocate resources into developing and supporting county wide strategic initiatives.

Towards a Cheltenham Parking Strategy (draft v9)

Contents

Background.....	3
Changing circumstances.....	4
Key target outcomes.....	5
Existing Provision.....	7
Headline outputs.....	9
Proposed solutions.....	9
Current issues for discussion.....	10

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Parking facilities are a key component to the vitality of any town centre and Cheltenham is no different in this respect. The newly created Cheltenham Development Task Force has set out its central area ambition which is:

“to support the town’s economic strength and sustainable development by revitalising key streets and spaces to the highest attainable quality for the benefit of the whole community.”

- 1.2 The role of streets and streetscapes needs to be considered in conjunction with how residents, commuters and visitors access the town and its services – thus, the contribution which parking facilities make to the well-being of the local economy is an area worthy of detailed consideration.
- 1.3 As with many towns, parking in Cheltenham consists of both “on street” and “off street” provision. Both on and off street public parking facilities are operationally managed by Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC), but the strategic management of on street parking facility is currently overseen by Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), which has commissioned CBC to manage the day to day operation of the service in Cheltenham There is also parking facility provision in private ownership, often linked to specific facilities or venues, with pricing linked to public parking tariffs governed by Section 106 planning agreements.
- 1.4 What has become clear is that the overall level of parking provision in Cheltenham has simply evolved over time. Public parking facilities have primarily been provided on land owned by the Borough Council which was perceived as surplus to operational requirements, in the sense that there was no immediate pressing alternative use, other than as an opportunity for parking spaces. There has never really been a co-ordinated strategic approach to the number of parking facilities, their accessibility, their capacities, their location, their quality or the signage to them. Equally, on-

street parking has also developed in a relatively uncoordinated manner, responding to specific pressures rather than through a coherent defined approach.

- 1.5 Off-street publicly available parking facilities in Cheltenham, are owned or controlled by CBC, on-street pay and display parking spaces are strategically overseen by GCC and managed by CBC as part of the Agency Agreement.

2.0 Changing circumstances

- 2.1 Several independent but related strands of work, suggest that CBC and GCC should work collaboratively to consider the adoption of a defined parking facility strategy for Cheltenham.

- 2.2 The specific strands are:-

1. The traffic modelling work being undertaken by the Cheltenham Development Task Force, which has raised some fundamental issues concerning traffic movements associated with parking facilities in the town; which further suggests a significant increase in traffic in and around Cheltenham by 2026.

It further suggests that many road junctions in Cheltenham are likely to become severely overloaded. New development will add to the pressure. Therefore it is clear that the parking strategy should include a clear strategy for dealing with these forecast problems and that further there needs to be a clear link to LTP3 thus ensuring an holistic approach is taken when considering the parking issues linked to road improvements, traffic management or public transport strategies.

2. A new CBC approach to parking facility management, has identified a range of shortcomings in the way that parking income and data are collected and managed and which is considering improving the customer parking experience by introducing new booking and payment arrangements based upon "smart" technologies;
3. The development of the 'Cheltenham Parking Board', a County/Borough partnership which is moving towards to a more holistic approach to parking in Cheltenham and which will lead the development of the parking strategy for Cheltenham, considering both on and off-street parking needs within the Borough;
4. The adoption of the CBC asset management plan which highlights parking facilities as a significant source of existing revenue, but also offering the potential for development opportunities and capital receipts, to support Cheltenham's economy;
5. The need to implement environmentally and economically sustainable transport solutions for the town, including additional Park & Ride facilities;
6. Recognition that surface parking facilities are not an efficient means of providing the required quantum of car spaces in town centres, where

land values are at a premium;

7. Data that suggests there is a surplus of capacity and thus, higher management and operational costs associated with existing parking facility provision than may be necessary.

2.3 All of these factors suggest that it would be prudent to develop a more holistic approach to the provision of parking facility in the town.

3.0 Key target outcomes

3.1 Critical to any analysis is an understanding of the outcomes sought. These have been defined as follows:-

- Sustainable solutions that reduce the impact of vehicular traffic in the town centre but equally, do not damage the experience of Cheltenham as a desirable social, retail and cultural destination. For example, encouraging the use of park and ride and reducing cross-town journeys purely for the purpose of accessing a parking facility, which should ideally be available at each key entry point to the town;

This needs to be linked to LTP3 in identifying the locations of Brockworth, Elmbridge, Uckington and West of Severn Park and ride sites.

Parking related policies will need to promote sustainable economic growth and be defined in terms that relates to Cheltenham's needs, with clear benchmarking against national indicators.

- On-street provision which supports a reasonable level of resident parking, whilst also supporting the needs of the wider community and local businesses; critically, on-street provision should not be designed to compete with off-street provision where capacity exists, or where it is desirable for long stay provision to be located off-street;
- Cost efficiency in the provision of parking services, including the maintenance or replacement of existing parking revenue streams, to avoid the potential for collateral damage to wider Council services supported by off street parking revenue – critically, this requires a genuine joined-up approach by CBC and GCC in relation to both on and off street provision;
- Better and 'more customer friendly' parking facilities with efficient and reliable payment methods (e.g. automatic number plate recognition and smart phone/card technology) that are consistent with promoting and incentivising parking facility services and a better customer experience for those choosing to use them;
- Fewer, but more strategically positioned and better maintained larger off street parking facilities to match customer expectations; we need to set and deliver a consistent quality of parking provision in respect of access, signage, cleanliness, safety, reserved facilities for the

disabled and parent/toddlers, adequate lighting, access to toilet facilities etc;

- Improved level of payment compliance with a consequent reduction in the need for enforcement, which is a very negative customer experience.

3.2 It is recognised that there are a range of key customer groups accessing the town's facilities, including:-

- local residents;
- shoppers/day trippers;
- commuters;
- evening visitors taking advantage of Cheltenham's vibrant night-time economy.

The needs of these various interest groups should be balanced in such a way as to maximise 24 hour off street parking facility usage, thereby absorbing vehicles from elsewhere on the road network. This needs to be linked to a review of the existing charging & restriction times for both on & off-street parking; the review also needs to consider localised issues such as the retail and commercial offering, festivals and the night time economy to mention a few. Standardising time restrictions across the town is not considered to be an acceptable approach.

3.3 As evidenced via feedback from communities, engaged thus far, the parking strategy needs to acknowledge the opportunities for a range of localised and shared parking arrangements that supports local transport schemes, including car clubs, cycling, shuttle buses and community transport options. This also needs to be linked to smarter travel plans such as those adopted by several major local employers, but also those developed in the future in conjunction with community and other defined groups with structure and delivery mechanisms. This approach will encourage communities to work together in delivering sustainable transport choices aligned to both on and off-street parking provision. It should be acknowledged that parking schemes play a pivotal role in supporting a number of strategies and schemes, for example, The Agency Agreement, Sustainable Travel Towns, Community & Neighbourhood Management and DIY Street Schemes.

3.4 Urban design and public realm is another consideration that the parking strategy needs to take into account. Many of the existing street-scapes in the town have evolved organically over time in both their use and occupation. To accommodate future changes and in support of the overall economic well being of local communities, the parking strategy needs to take into account and where feasible act as an enabler, in managing and enhancing local parking space provision and associated amenities.

3.5 The strategy needs to be delivered at an affordable cost, preferably better than cost-neutral and yielding economic benefits from the development of sites and/or capital receipts from the release of any identified surplus assets.

4.0 Existing provision

- 4.1 Within the area mapped out by the Cheltenham Development Task Force as the 'Central Area Ambition' lie 19 parking facilities; 14 of which are in the ownership or direct control of CBC.
- 4.2 An analysis of each of these sites is set out at Appendix 1 and is referred to throughout this document.
- 4.3 Of the 13 parking facilities actually owned by CBC, two are already earmarked for development as part of the work under the Civic Pride banner, these being North Place and Portland Street. Analysis identifies a potential rationalisation strategy for the remainder, based upon a premise that at any time of the day or at the weekend, there is always surplus parking facility capacity within the town.
- 4.4 Whilst some of this capacity will be lost as a result of the proposed development of North Place and Portland Street (813 car spaces down to a target minimum of 300 car spaces) this can be readily absorbed by existing capacity. However, such a simplistic approach does not tackle the fundamental issues that have become clear from the traffic modelling work, namely, that there is a significant imbalance between parking facility provision and demand in the various quarters of the town.
- 4.5 The town has access points from all four compass points, but traffic flows are heaviest from the south and west, associated with the M5 corridor and junctions 9 and 10. Much of the traffic is forced to cross the town in order to access the majority of parking facility provision, as a result of both the physical locations of parking facilities and the inherent restrictions of the one-way inner ring road system.
- 4.6 Thus, a key factor is whether parking capacity is in the most appropriate locations to support the needs of the town. A significant issue is that the majority of provision is to the north and east of the town centre, but the majority of the traffic generation is from the south and west (notably via the M5 corridor). It is this factor that generates a lot of traffic movements across town, as motorists are forced to use the one way system to access a parking facility. Return journeys add to this congestion problem. Additionally, the Festivals, an important dimension of the "Cheltenham offer", are located in the heart of the town and not particularly close to many of the major parking facilities.
- 4.7 Providing new parking facilities (either above or below ground) in "required" locations is likely to be problematic, due to the lack of available open or surface sites and the likely cost and sensitivities associated with this type of development in a town of significant heritage value.
- 4.8 An alternative would be to increase the capacity of existing parking facilities already owned by the Borough Council. This could be by adding extra tiers or decks to existing surface parking facilities, or by being more radical and providing underground provision in areas not currently considered as parking facility space, such as Imperial Gardens.

- 4.9 Either option will require careful and sensitive cost benefit analysis, as the combination of planning constraints and recent public discontent with the proposed General Hospital multi-storey parking facility have shown. Any proposals for either creating new or increased capacity from existing parking facilities will need early input from the planning team and any feasibility assessments for “decking” will need to incorporate best practice elevational treatments.
- 4.10 Critical to the analysis is parking facility usage data. This identifies not only spare capacity, but also evidences some key issues regarding behaviour. There tends to be a presumption in favour of surface parking facilities by users and yet, where multi-storey provision is well located and managed, it is equally well used. This suggests that we need to achieve better utilisation of some of the existing multi-storey provision such as Grosvenor Terrace, through improving access (linked to traffic modelling), signage (for both vehicles and pedestrians), general state of cleanliness and décor, with dealing with perceived safety issues and access to other facilities.
- 4.11 Equally, notwithstanding the locations or capacities, there are marked variations in both the quality of parking provision and its associated facilities. For this reason, it is proposed to set a parking facility “standard” which will outline what is acceptable to CBC. This will detail not only quality requirements within the parking facility (such as surfacing and disabled bays) but also vehicle signage to the parking facility, pedestrian signage from the parking facility, location of nearest toilet facilities etc.
- The analysis identifies short term and long term costs for achieving the acceptable standard at the parking facilities to be retained.
- 4.12 A major component of the strategy must be the approach to revenue generation, both in terms of payment structures (which need to be carefully related to the on-street parking charges regime administered by GCC) but also payment collection. The analysis identifies the current payment method at each of the 19 parking facilities and any underlying problems associated with existing ageing technology.
- 4.13 The focus will be to consider a single payment software package, applicable to all CBC off street parking facilities. The initial findings of the parking project group investigation into payment technologies, suggest that CBC should be implementing a smart card and barrier less system as a potential solution.
- 4.14 Any solution must be sustainable and able to both support and potentially influence the outputs of the traffic modelling currently being undertaken e.g. two way travel on certain streets which are currently designated as one-way (e.g. Albion Street).
- 4.15 Multiple use of a parking facility could be a solution to emerging problems associated with additional on-street parking facility restrictions where demand outstrips supply.
- 4.16 By this we mean utilising car spaces for shoppers, visitors and possibly some commuters during the day, but utilising the same spaces for residents and evening visitors during the evening/night. For this to be effective, further investigation of acceptable charging regimes and night time safety is

required

5.0 **Headline outputs**

- 5.1 The evidence set out in this report supports the challenges identified and provides a sound platform against which the desired outcomes identified in 3.0 above can be delivered.

6.0 **Proposed Solutions**

- 6.1 These fall into distinct phases on the assumption that we determine the long term strategy and then have a series of steps towards achieving the range of priority outcomes identified. It may however be both desirable and possible to release some 'surplus to requirement' sites early in the process, in order to ease cash flow and facilitate investment or development in the retained parking facilities.

- Phase 1 – implement a coherent pricing strategy for park and ride and on/off street provision and appropriate signage, quality standards and payment collection in all parking facilities identified as part of the long term solution and not likely to be subject to significant structural works in the near future – assumed to be Regent Street, Grosvenor Terrace, Brewery NCP and Beechwood.
- Phase 2 - commission study and works to increase capacity at St Georges Road car park (potential for additional tiers);
- Phase 3 – deliver the new parking facility on North Place/Portland Street in conjunction with wider redevelopment scheme;
- Phase 4 – deliver additional parking facility decks at Rodney Road and/or Chelt Walk / underground parking facility at Imperial Square (subject to business case and sustainability implications) against the quality standards agreed;
- Phase 5 – release surplus sites for alternative uses – potentially, St.James Street, Sherborne Place and/or Chelt Walk.

- 6.2 It is recognised that some smaller sites will probably be released as proposals progress. This would include the 23 spaces at the Brewery and 47 spaces at Chapel Walk (Royal Well).

- 6.3 Essentially, this would obviate the need to cross town in pursuit of a parking space, unless a specific destination was being sought. All parking facilities would become accessible from the point of entry to the town, from the north: 3 - North Place, Portland Street and Sherborne Place from the east: 2 - St James and Bath Parade, from the west: 2 – West End and High Street ('Henrietta Street') from the south 5 – Rodney road, Regent Arcade, Royal Well, St George's Road and Chelt Walk, providing a total of 12 against an existing total of 18 Pay & Display or Pay on Foot sites.

- 6.4 The costs of rebalancing provision in this manner and upgrading parking facilities to improve utilisation needs to be determined, but subject to identifying the resourcing plan, could be implemented in phases as set out in 6.0 above.

Current issues for discussion

- GCC & CBC have shown a willingness to engage in discussions about a holistic parking strategy (through the Cheltenham Parking Board), it is clear that the strategy needs to ensure where increased on-street parking is introduced both on and off-street parking revenue supports the wider customer and environmental considerations;
- There is a need for clarity about the aspirations for park and ride – for example, what ongoing support will remain for the racecourse park and ride facility;
- Investment in the off-street parking facilities is necessary to underpin current customer demands and revenue to enable ongoing management and support, following years of limited investment in the service. CBC wants to retain control of off-street parking provision and ensure that this is linked to the increasing on-street provision as part of a holistic parking facility strategy;
- Should CBC be planning for the provision of additional off-street parking to rebalance geographic provision on a 'demand-led' basis, or should the principal driver be around environmental quality and reducing unnecessary car trips into the town centre? – We can not do this unless we define the long term strategy for the demands of on-street parking?
- How would this link in the control of private Off-street Parking facilities? – in 2010 a Private Members Bill concerning off-street parking was introduced into Parliament by the Hon Member for Crawley, Henry Smith MP. The Bill, if enacted, would place a duty on local authorities to licence all publicly available off-street parking facility where a fee was charged.

The Bill is currently being considered by Parliament, although there is existing provision for local authorities to use discretionary powers in relation to off-street parking facility places.

CBC may wish to consider the use of these powers to licence off-street parking places. The powers allow, following appropriate consultation with stakeholders, for local authorities to establish controlled areas within which no person other than the local authority may operate a public off-street parking place of a prescribed description, except under and in accordance with the terms and conditions of a licence granted to that person by the local authority.

- How much investment risk is CBC willing to take in relation to taking forward asset management proposals that might see some parking facilities 'decked' and others prioritised for disposal for redevelopment? Given the current proposals at North Place / Portland Street, how cautious or ambitious should the timetable be?

- In terms of the enforcement service itself, should CBC and GCC be focussing on a supportive neighbourhood management approach, minimising costs with a balanced approach to income generation supported by effective and localised enforcement?
- Having a modern and forward thinking enforcement regime is critical in both supporting the emerging Localism Bill and the agenda for creating the Big Society. It is recognised that an effective local authority enforcement service needs to be capable of adapting to the ever increasing demands, expectations and perceptions that local communities and identified key stakeholders have, not only in relation to the emerging changes to legislation and statutory guidance, but the broader issues linked to the localism agenda.

The civil enforcement service currently issues some 20,000+ PCN's (Penalty Charge Notices) and manages some 60,000+ unsolicited engagements per annum, ranging from community and neighbourhood management issues, parking, utility street works to tourism.

This reinforces the fact (as previously stated) that the service already plays a pivotal role in it's support for a number of strategies and schemes such as; The Agency Agreement, Sustainable Travel Towns, Community & Neighbourhood Management and, DIY Street Schemes to name but a few.

This demonstrates the need to evolve the service so that it is capable of delivering an efficient enforcement regime, together with supporting the eyes and ears approach to street-scape and highways management, for the following town-wide benefits:

1. A greener, healthier Cheltenham
2. Sustainable economic growth
3. A safe and secure integrated transport and highway system.
4. Good access to services.

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 24

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment O&S Committee - 23 November 2011

Review of the Garden Waste Scheme

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 Committee requested information on the performance of the garden waste scheme prior to the matter being considered by cabinet on 6th December 2011.

2. Background and History

- 2.1 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).
- 2.2 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% when compared with the first quarter of 2010/11. This represents 1077 tonnes of waste diverted from landfill in three months.
- 2.3 The new garden waste scheme has now been in operation for 9 months and a review of the scheme is taking place to recommend improvements.
- 2.4 The Gloucestershire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, 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 strategy 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 as well as information and advice to householders. In the first six months of 2011/12, a total of 169 home composting units were delivered to households in Cheltenham. As this strategy begins to take effect the total volume of garden waste collected for composting will reduce.
- 2.5 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. Those 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 households 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.

- 2.6** 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.
- 2.7** It was considered that the most equitable, cost effective option to address the above issues was to introduce a charge for the collection 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.
- 2.8** 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.
- 2.9** 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.

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. 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. Emerging alternative proposals

- 4.1 In response to concerns about price it may be reasonable and affordable to offer a discount for a fixed period to existing customers who are renewing their subscription or as an incentive to new customers. The discount would be of sufficient value to generate interest but remain affordable to the council. Other authorities offer a small discount and believe it has a positive impact.
- 4.2 In response to demand for an alternative service in the hard to access areas with limited storage it may be possible to offer a collection service using 75 litre compostable paper sacks provided on a pay as you go basis. A bag service at a fixed charge of £36.00 per annum has less support from households who live in hard to access areas (see para 3.4 above). It would also be more expensive to administer and therefore be less cost effective.
- 4.3 This service would be limited to the streets listed in appendix A of this paper. Unfortunately it would not be possible to offer the alternative bag scheme throughout the town. The compostable bags and consequently the garden waste within them cannot be windrow composted along with the brown bin waste. The bagged waste will be treated via the more expensive in vestal composting process and must therefore be collected separately.
- 4.4 Bags could be made available for purchase at the Municipal offices and Central Depot Swindon Road or could be delivered for a charge.
- 4.5 Any new or revised scheme will be publicised by leaflet drop to households in those streets where it will be made available.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The views of the committee will be fed back to the cabinet. Cabinet will consider the final report on the Garden Waste Scheme on 6th December 2011.

Background Papers	Cabinet report 27 th July 2010. Proposed waste and recycling collection systems.
Contact Officer	Rob Bell, Assistant Director, Operations 01242 264181, rob.bell@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Roger Whyborn, Cabinet Member Sustainability, 01242 231458, cldr.roger.whyborn@cheltenham.gov.uk
Scrutiny Function	Environment

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 28

**Review of the Garden Waste Scheme
Environment Overview and Scrutiny - 23rd November 2011**

Appendix A

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	Cambray 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	Tivolli Mews	
Union Street	Bloomsbury Street	Tivolli Street	
York Street	Market Street	Tivolli Lane	
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	Tivolli 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

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

23 November 2011

Implementation of the new Waste and Recycling Scheme – review and lessons learned

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 Committee requested a review of the implementation and performance of the new kerbside Waste and Recycling Scheme which was introduced in April 2011.

2. Background

2.1 The council’s corporate strategy 2010 to 2015 states that over the next 5 years we will decrease the amount of waste that goes to landfill and increase recycling and composting of household waste. A key milestone in achieving this is to recycle and compost at least 40% of household waste in 2011. This was increased to 46% in the 2011/12 corporate strategy action plan and is a challenging target.

2.2 To achieve this target Cheltenham Borough Council launched a new kerbside waste and recycling scheme which introduced weekly food waste collections to the whole of the borough in April 2011.

2.3 At the same time refuse collections were changed to alternate weekly collections for the vast majority of households in the borough. These households therefore receive a collection of refuse and food waste one week, and recycling and food waste the next.

2.4 The cabinet report of 27 July 2010 recognised that whilst alternate weekly collections are suitable for many households the system is not practical for some types of dwelling.

2.5 A very small number of streets still receive a weekly collection of refuse and in the town centre some streets receive a collection twice a week.

2.6 This reflects the type of property located in these areas, the key factor being that there is little or no space available to store waste containers at either the front or the back of the property.

	Page 1	Last updated 15 November 2011

2.7 A policy of no side waste and a closed lid on every wheeled bin came into effect from 1st September 2010. Enforcement of these policies has been low key to date in recognition of the time needed for residents to adjust to using the new scheme.

3. Performance Review

3.1 Overall, the new scheme has been received very well by the residents of Cheltenham, with the food waste collections proving successful from the outset.

3.2 In April 2011, 250 tonnes of food waste was diverted from landfill to be composted and this figure has increased in the first 6 months of the scheme to an average of 280 tonnes per month.

3.3 Recycling at the kerbside has also increased very significantly, with growth in tonnage across all materials collected. Kerbside arisings are now an average of 80 tonnes higher per month than in the first 6 months of 2010/11.

3.4 The most improved material collected at the kerbside is plastic bottles. In quarter one of this year, 88 tonnes of plastic bottles were collected for recycling in Cheltenham, compared to just 55 tonnes the previous year. 69% of this tonnage is now collected from the kerbside.

3.5 The scheme also saw instant success in reducing the borough's household waste to landfill. Refuse arisings dropped significantly from day one of the new scheme, and the tonnage to landfill in quarter one of 2011 was down from 52kg to 37kg per household per month. If this rate continues to be achieved just under 23,000 tonnes of household waste will be landfilled in 2011/12 compared to just over 31,000 tonnes landfilled in 2010/11.

3.6 The uptake of the food waste recycling scheme, improvement in recycling tonnages and reduction in waste to landfill has boosted Cheltenham's recycling and composting figures from 35% in the first quarter of 2010 to 50% in the same period this year.

4. Lessons learned

4.1 The increase in recycling arisings at the kerbside has resulted in an unprecented demand for kerbside recycling boxes. Between March 2011, when publicity for the scheme began in earnest, and the end of August 2011, over 7500 recycling boxes were requested.

4.2 This demand resulted in the council's stock of boxes running out shortly after the scheme commenced. More boxes were ordered and the backlog of box requests was cleared as quickly as possible once these arrived.

4.3 Demand remained high and the new stocks were soon also depleted. Box requests are currently being held and will be fulfilled as soon as more stocks are received.

	Page 2	Last updated 15 November 2011

- 4.4 This has resulted in additional and unforeseen costs being incurred, not only in purchasing additional boxes, but in hiring in resources to deliver the boxes to fulfil demand. The funding for this has been met through additional recycling income.
- 4.5 The demand for recycling facilities in flats and houses of multiple occupation also exceeded expectations, with many residents also complaining about insufficient refuse bin allocation once the alternate weekly refuse collections commenced.
- 4.6 240 litre communal food waste bins had been delivered to all such properties prior to the commencement of the scheme however the provision of refuse and recycling bins had not been specifically reviewed before the new scheme started.
- 4.7 278 site visits were undertaken in response to these complaints. For the vast majority of sites it was a lack of recycling facilities or misunderstanding of the new scheme which were the root cause of the issue and successful participation in the scheme was achieved once these problems were resolved and additional recycling facilities were installed. Enquiries of this nature have since returned to their normal level.
- 4.8 Some problems arose which were specific to individual allocations. These included issues such as bin storage problems, a failure of the local residents to participate in the scheme or irresponsible and inconsiderate behaviour in relation to the management of wastes. Officers have worked with housing associations, ward councillors and community groups to tackle these issues at a very local level, and will continue to do so as such problems arise.
- 4.9 Side waste continues to be problematic in certain areas of the borough and this needs to be addressed in the near future to ensure the continued success of the scheme and to allow further improvements in the recycling rates achieved.
- 4.10 The first step to addressing this issue with residents will be to encourage correct participation in the scheme through education and support with formal enforcement action being taken only as a last resort.
- 4.11 A paper on the new garden waste scheme will be provided under separate cover.

Background Papers	2010-2015 Corporate Strategy Cabinet Report 27 July 2010 'Proposed Waste and Recycling Collection Systems'
Contact Officer	Beth Boughton, Waste and Recycling Manager, 01242 774644 beth.boughton@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Councillor Roger Whyborn
Scrutiny Function	Environment

	Page 3	Last updated 15 November 2011

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 34

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

23 November 2011

Climate Change Member Working Group

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 purpose of this report is to inform Committee members of the work of the climate change member working group and to put forward suggestions for future work for the working group.

2. Membership

Councillor Paul Wheeldon
Councillor Ian Bickerton
Councillor Helena McCloskey
Councillor Penny Hall

Jane Griffiths, Director Commissioning
Gill Morris, Climate Change & Sustainability Officer

Other officers attend the working group as required

3. Terms of reference

- 3.1 Terms of reference agreed by the working group are as follows

- Receive notes from the Officer Carbon Reduction Group to assist in:
 - Scrutinising proposed projects which have carbon reduction outcomes
 - Prioritising new projects which have carbon reduction outcomes
 - Reviewing the progress of projects which have carbon reduction outcomes
 - Reviewing the effectiveness of completed carbon reduction projects
- Review funding and investment plans and sponsor invest-to-save schemes
- Identify new projects which have carbon reduction outcomes
- Champion carbon reduction with elected members and staff
- Work with established groups such as the low carbon partnership to influence other organisations and learn from their experiences
- Gain an understanding of the effects that climate change could have on the operations of the council
- Submit reports (at times to be agreed) to Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the progress being made to tackle climate change
- Make recommendations to the Committee and the Officer Carbon Reduction Group

4. Summary of activity

The current financial climate and the process of restructuring the Council has

impacted on carbon reduction projects; however, the working group has continued to support officers to make progress where possible.

4.1 Electricity contract

The council's energy contracts were due for renewal in October and members of the working group were central in ensuring that the option of purchasing true green energy was included in the scope for bidding for the electricity contract. The Chair of the Working Group proposed a motion to Council in June recommending that purchasing zero carbon electricity from a green energy provider be a major consideration when choosing the new supplier. This was carried unanimously by Council.

The award of the contract has since been postponed until January 2012; indications from the market and the brokers were such that a more competitive bidding process will be achievable at this later date, but the parameters of the tender will remain the same.

4.2 Replacement of the Mayor's car

The current lease on the car was due to expire in September and has since been extended to the end of December. Working group members have taken a strong position on this issue and have asked officers to consider a whole range of options from a car of standard specification through to a hybrid, an electric car and the option of not having a car at all. In addition, they have asked officers to ensure that a comparison of fuel costs over the period of the lease is made against the cost of running an electric car and not to limit comparison to capital cost only. Members have taken the view that any decision must be a positive one for the environment. Officers are currently looking at the options.

4.3 Public charging points for electric cars

The working group is of the view that the council should take a lead on this if possible and they have asked the Climate Change & Sustainability Officer to undertake some research on the cost of purchasing and installing at least one charging point. A recommendation may be brought back to a future Environment O&S Committee.

4.4 Renewable energy

The working group has been keen to see progress on installing renewable energy schemes (photovoltaics (PV) to generate electricity) on council buildings, but it remains a difficult area. The working group supported the council signing up to a County Council PV Procurement Framework contract, which has been put out to tender on the basis of PV installation without any capital investment, the recipient of the panels benefiting from the free electricity and potentially also receiving a small percentage of the Feed-in Tariff. That contract has not yet been awarded. The working group is of the view that, in order to benefit financially from the feed-in-tariff, the council should install a PV system as soon as possible.

4.5 Other carbon reduction initiatives

The working group has been receiving regular reports on the progress of other carbon initiatives:

- Voltage optimisation – reduces voltage of electricity supply into buildings – piloted at Leisure@ (swimming pool side) and due to be installed at the Depot, Town Hall and the remaining areas of Leisure@ by the end of November.
- Fleet fuel monitoring and saving trial – equipment installed in two refuse vehicles to measure fuel efficiency and drivers given training on driving techniques. This trial is ongoing.
- Lighting replacement scheme in Regent Arcade Car Park – to replace existing lighting with low energy LED alternatives. A range of LED lighting options are currently being tested prior to a business case being developed and tendering undertaken. Installing LED lighting will deliver considerable savings on energy use and will require less frequent maintenance, both important factors once the car park is open 24 hours a day. Current indications suggest a payback on investment of approximately two years.

4.6 Climate change and commissioning

The council restructure has led to a change in senior officer representation on the working group. Jane Griffiths, Director Commissioning, has replaced Rob Bell, who has been heading up the implementation of the Local Authority Company.

The working group recognises the importance of ensuring that the council's objectives of reducing carbon emissions and adapting to climate change are accounted for throughout the commissioning process and this direct link into the commissioning division will enable working group members to monitor how these issues are being taken forward. It should be noted that emissions from council activities must be counted even if delivered through alternative arrangements.

5. PROGRESS ON REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS

New guidelines for reporting on emissions were issued to local authorities earlier in the year by the Department for Energy & Climate Change (DECC). DECC has asked all local authorities to follow company reporting guidance issued by DEFRA '*Guidance on how to measure and report your greenhouse gas emissions*'. This new method of reporting means that figures cannot be compared with those previously published because of changes to the way in which figures are calculated.

The working group has received reports for financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11; both reports use 2005/6 as the baseline year against which to measure progress. These reports are available on the council's website if committee members wish to view the figures in more detail. In summary, comparing 2010/11 with the baseline year, the council has reduced greenhouse gas emissions from its own energy use by 10.3% and from the fleet by 3.7%.

The council has a carbon emissions reduction target of 30% from 2005/6 levels by 2015, which reflects national targets to reduce carbon emissions, and clearly there is still a significant amount of work to do. However, the working group's view is that these figures are encouraging, especially given the expansion of the waste & recycling service during this period and the increasing reliance on IT equipment. A number of strands of activity could, when/if delivered, make a significant contribution to this reduction target:

- Extension of voltage optimisation project
- Fuel monitoring and saving trial

- Lighting replacement at Regent Arcade car park
- Replacement of cremators
- Replacing PCs with data terminals (reduces energy consumption of individual units by up to 90%)
- Installation of PV on council buildings
- Smarter travel plan (which will also deliver community benefits)
- Downsizing to a smaller, more efficient building

The working group will continue to explore these options with officers and will ask officers to look at the proposals on an invest-to-save basis, which can then be built into the budget process.

6. AREAS FOR FUTURE WORK

The working group will continue to review and support existing areas of work as outlined above, but members have identified some additional areas that they would like to receive more information on at future meetings.

6.1 Climate change and biodiversity

Current commissioning reviews have identified that further work is needed on the future of Cheltenham's parks, gardens and open spaces and climate change is integral to this. The working group will be discussing with the Parks Development Manager how biodiversity is being affected by climate change and, linked to this, will look at ways in which they can support the Green Space Strategy review.

6.2 Air pollution and Smarter Travel Plan

Pollution levels in the town have increased to the extent that the whole of Cheltenham has been declared an Air Quality Management Area. The council now has 18 months to deliver an action plan which must address the exceeded pollution levels and recommend agreed solutions to the problem. There are clear linkages to be made between improving air quality across the town and the Smarter Travel Plan, which is being developed by the Integrated Transport team, and the working group will investigate with officers how members can support this process.

6.3 Commissioning

The working group will review the SLA for the Local Authority Company and will also receive a report on how the commissioning reviews have taken account of climate change, which will be reported back to a future Committee meeting.

6.4 Climate change and council operations

The working group will receive an impact assessment report of climate change on the operations of the council.

7. Next Steps

7.1 The working group requests Committee approval to:

- Continue to explore options with officers for invest-to-save projects, including potential investment in PV, and to approach Cabinet directly with any formal

recommendations

- Pursue the areas for future work outlined above

7.2 The Committee may also wish to direct the working group to look at areas of concern to the Committee, which have not been highlighted in this report.

Background Papers

Contact Officer Gill Morris, climate change & sustainability officer, 01242 264229, gill.morris@cheltenham.gov.uk

Accountability Councillor Roger Whyborn

Scrutiny Function Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 40

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Meeting Date: 23 November 2011				
Chairs Briefing: 13 October 2011				
Waste Strategy	Scrutiny	Review the implementation of the new strategy and lessons learned	Discussion paper	Beth Boughton, Waste and Recycling Manager
Review of green waste scheme	Scrutiny	Consider proposed revisions to the scheme	Discussion paper	Rob Bell, Director of Operations
Climate Change working group	Update	Progress update	Discussion paper	Gill Morris c/o Climate Change Working Group
Cheltenham Car Parking Strategy and related enforcement (Glos. County and CBC)	Update	Consider and agree draft strategy prior to Cabinet (matters raised to be included in final strategy to Cabinet – 17 Jan)	Discussion paper	Owen Parry, Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability
Sponsorship of roundabouts	Update	Funds raised, level of spend and remaining budget	Briefing note (for information only)	Rob Bell, Director of Operations
Pittville Community Bridge	Update	Details of original budget, projected and actual spend to date	Briefing note (for information only)	Adam Reynolds, Green Space Development Manager
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
Plastic Bags	Scrutiny	Consider the issue of plastic bags by retailers and raise awareness	Discussion paper	Gill Morris, Climate Change and Sustainability Officer (Martin Quantock, Town Centre Manager arranging speaker from M&S)

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
CBC Business Continuity Arrangements (to include Cold Weather Plan for England??)	Scrutiny	Consider the arrangements	Discussion paper	Grahame Lewis, Executive Director / Human Resources
Meeting Date: 29 February 2012				
Chairs Briefing: 26 January 2012				
DRAFT Corporate Strategy 2012-13	Scrutiny	Review DRAFT strategy for 2012-13 prior to Council (23 March)	Discussion paper	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnership Manager
Meeting Date: 30 May 2012				
Chairs Briefing: tbc				
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
Meeting Date: 29 June 2012				
Items to be added at a future date				
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

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
Imperial Gardens (after 2012 Festival season)	Scrutiny	Assess remedial works to Imperial Gardens after 2012 festival season	Tbc	Rob Bell, Director of Operations
Winter Weather Procedures (to be scheduled for September 2012)	Scrutiny	Keeping the town/borough moving (GCC)	Presentation	Officer, Gloucestershire County Council

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 44

Briefing Notes

Environment Overview and Scrutiny
Committee

23 November 2011

Adam Reynolds

Pittville Community Bridge Update

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

If Members have questions relating to matters shown, they are asked to contact the Officer indicated.

Background

During extensive public consultation, as part of a £4 million bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) to restore Pittville Park, reinstatement of the lower lake bridge was consistently the most popular improvement proposed. While the bid submitted to the HLF in 2008 was unsuccessful, Cheltenham Borough Council and the community were keen to build on the interest and support generated by the bid and take forward plans to install a new 'community bridge' in the Park.

It has already been reported that all tenders received in 2010 (14 in total) exceeded the initial cost estimate of just over £91,000, by a significant amount. Analysis of tenders showed marked differences in the anticipated cost of piling, abutments, landscaping and access decking together with other general set up costs items. In addition, closer inspection of the lowest three tenders indicated that design changes necessitated in order to improve the appearance of the bridge to achieve planning permission, also contributed to the budget overrun.

In considering which options were available to move the project forward it was decided that the most cost effective approach would be to project manage the bridge construction in individual work packages. A revised cost plan was produced totalling just under £119,000. This figure excludes all costs incurred to the point of planning consent, which are £12,400 for engineers design fees, project management, and surveys, and £15,500 for the community art project to produce the decorative figures for the sides of the bridge. The shortfall in budget was found through under spends in other projects and through a proportion of the parks capital budget that had previously been set aside for Pittville Park over a three year period as part of the original Heritage Lottery application.

Progress to Date

Pittville Bridge is currently being fabricated and should be ready for installation in the park in early December. During the summer months, supporting piles were driven into the banks and concrete pile caps and abutments constructed in readiness for the bridge. The current project spend to date against the revised cost plan is £53,500, and is projected to complete within budget.

Contact Officer: Adam Reynolds
Tel No: 01242 774669
Email: adam.reynolds@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 46

Briefing Notes

Environment Overview and Scrutiny
Committee

23 November 2011

John Rees

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

If Members have questions relating to matters shown, they are asked to contact the Officer indicated.

Sponsorship of Roundabouts

1.0 Introduction

- Cheltenham is renowned for its parks and gardens and the appearance of our open spaces contribute to the success of the town as a centre for commerce, festivals and tourism.
- It is of paramount importance that traffic islands, roundabouts and other landscaped areas are also visually attractive and are maintained to high standards. This is particularly important on the gateway routes into the town and at major intersections.
- Many local authorities consider sponsorship as a means of improving standards and enhancing the appearance of the street scene.

2.0 Background

- The current service level agreement between Gloucestershire County Council and Cheltenham Borough council permits CBC to obtain sponsorship for highway floral displays subject to a licence by GCC and provides guidance to those locations that CBC may wish to erect promotional signs.
- There is currently no CBC or GCC budget for the supply and maintenance of floral displays on the highway or for enhancing landscaped areas on the highway.

3.0 Current Proposals

- In January 2008 Cabinet approved proposals to commission a company called Marketing Force to assist in obtaining planning consent, developing sponsorship packages together with marketing and sales. Marketing Force are experts in the field of municipal sponsorship packages and currently work in partnership with over 50 local authorities on traffic island and flowerbed sponsorship programmes.
- In financial year 2009/2010 Marketing Force provided a dedicated telesales team together with experienced field staff to identify possible sponsors as well as identifying those traffic islands and roundabouts suitable for sponsorship deals.

4.0 Latest sponsorship list

No.	SITE	SPONSOR	DATE SIGN ERECTED	EXPIRY DATE	NO OF SIGNS	SIZE " 500 x 400 900 x 400mm
1	Lansdown Road/Westall Green	Alex Clarke Lettings	31.03.11	31.03.12	2	20 X 16
2	Montpellier Walk Roundabout	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	3	20 X 16
3	Shurdington Road/Up Hatherley Way Roundabout	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	3	36 X 16
4	Pittville Circus	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	2	20 X 16
5	Up Hatherley Way/Cold Pool Lane Roundabout	Cotswold Plumbers	28.04.11	28.04.12	3	36 X 16
6	Race Course/Evesham Road Roundabout	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	4	36 x 16
7	Grovefield Way/Park & Ride Roundabout	Tewksbury Printing	19.04.11	19.04.12	4	36 x 16
8	Coronation Square	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	4	36 X 16
9	Gordon Lamp Island/Lansdown Road	Alex Clarke Lettings	31.03.11	31.03.12	2	20 x 16
10	Cirencester Road/Cudnall Street	Uni of Gloucester	31.03.11	31.03.12	2	20 x 16
11	Tewkesbury Road/Princess Elizabeth Way/Kingsditch Lane	Uni of Gloucester	17.05.11	17.05.12	4	36 X 16
12	Benhall Road/Gloucester Road/Princess Elizabeth Way	Uni of Gloucester	17.05.11	17.05.12	3	36 X 16
13	Arle Court/A40 Gloucester Road/Fiddlers Green Lane	CGT Lettings Ltd	23.05.11	23.05.12	4	36 X 16
14	Cirencester Road/Bradley Road Junction	Spice Lodge	27.07.11	27.07.12	3	36 X 16

5.0 Income Details

- Under the agreement with Marketing Force Limited they are entitled to a fee of 15% of the gross income for administration and finance together with a fee of 10% of the gross income for customer service and design. Furthermore they are due a remuneration of 25% of the distributable income.
- The proportion of distributable income due to CBC for 2011/2012 amounts to the sum of £23,000.00. The first payment of £20,000.00 was payable in October 2011 with the remaining £3,000.00 payable in February 2012.
- Total sponsorship income for 2010/2011 amounts to the sum of £47,000.00

Less 25% admin/finance/design	£11,750.00	new total	£35,250.00
Distributable income			£35,250.00
Less MF Ltd 25%	£8,812.50	new total	£26,437.50
Distributable income			£26,437.50
CBC share of distributable income			£23,000.00
Balance Remaining			£3,437.50

Balance due to Marketing Force to purchase and install advertising signs on all traffic islands.

6.0 Expenditure to date (October 2011)

• Shurdington Road traffic island	supply, plant and maintain per annum	£3,400.00
• Montpellier traffic island	ditto	£3,400.00
• Prestbury Road traffic island	ditto	£1,800.00
	Total	£8,600.00

7.0 Future floral enhancement programme commencing November 2011

• Westall Green	supply and plant autumn/spring flowering bulbs	£500.00
• Benhall traffic island	ditto	£1,000.00
• B&Q / Park & Ride traffic island	re landscape, turf and plant flowering bulbs	£2,000.00
• Racecourse island	re landscape to include sustainable planting	£3,000.00
• Montpellier Street island	supply, plant and maintain annual bedding	£2,750.00
• Tewkesbury Road island	Enhanced autumn / spring flowering bulbs	£1,000.00
• Coronation Square island	Enhanced autumn / spring flowering bulbs	£1,000.00
• Gordon Lamp	Enhanced autumn/spring flowering bulbs	£500.00

Page 50

• Arle Court Roundabout	Enhanced autumn /spring flowering bulbs	£1,000.00
• Pittville Circus	Enhanced autumn/spring flowering bulbs	£1,000.00
	Total	£137,50.00

The total projected spend in 2011/12 is £22,350 from income of £23,000 leaving a contingency budget of £650 for unforeseen works and maintenance (e.g. vandalism, road traffic damage etc)

8.0 Corporate Approach to Sponsorship

The council are looking to develop a corporate approach to advertising and sponsorship by establishing a task group with officers from around the council. It is also in the process of drafting a policy which sets the framework for what the council wishes to achieve and the parameters within which it is prepared to make arrangements in the future. Once this is established, it will look to procure a partner organisation to work on the council's behalf in obtaining the most advantageous advertising and marketing arrangements, making use of a range of the council's assets and including roundabouts. The aim is to generate an income stream that will support services and contribute to the Bridging the Gap programme.

Contact Officer: John Rees
Tel No: 01242 264163
Email: john.rees @cheltenham.gov.uk