



CHELTENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 18 January 2012
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.	MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING 23 November 2011	(Pages 1 - 12)
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 Built Environment Cabinet Member Sustainability	
7.	UPDATE ON GENERAL USE OF PLASTIC BAGS Discussion paper of the Climate Change & Sustainability Officer and presentation by Darren Price – Deputy Manager (Marks and Spencer)	(Pages 13 - 16)
8.	GENERAL FUND BUDGET PROPOSALS Cabinet report of the Cabinet Member Finance & Community Development and Chief Finance Officer and presentation by Finance Officer	(Pages 17 - 38)

9.		ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-2012	(Pages 39 - 40)
10.		ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION	
11.		DATE OF NEXT MEETING 29 February 2012	

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

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 23rd November, 2011

6.00 - 8.15 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Penny Hall (Chair), Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Helena McCloskey, Charles Stewart and Paul Wheeldon
Also in attendance:	Rob Bell (Director of Operations), Beth Boughton (Waste & Recycling Manager), Gill Morris (Climate Change & Sustainability Officer), Owen Parry (Head of Integrated Transport & Sustainability), Councillor Rawson (Cabinet Member Built Environment) and Councillor Whyborn (Cabinet Member Sustainability)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Holliday.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THE 14 SEPTEMBER 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 14 September 2011 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

There were no matters referred to the committee.

6. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING

The Cabinet Member Sustainability would not be raising any matters covered later on the agenda but did refer Members to the Pittville Bridge briefing note.

The bridge was being fabricated and should be ready for installation next month (December) and though he could give no guarantees, he did assure Members that in his opinion it would be worth the wait, having seen the bridge in construction. The decision for the authority to project manage the bridge construction in individual work packages was taken as the most cost effective approach, as the tenders received in 2010 had far exceeded the original

budget. He felt that this was the right decision but admittedly there was always a risk that this approach would cause delay, which it had and for which he apologised. A scrutiny request had been submitted by Councillor Cooper in relation to the perceived failings in management of this project and the Cabinet Member was at this stage, unclear as to whether this would be considered by this scrutiny committee or Economy & Business Improvement (EBI).

Members felt that the issue raised by Councillor Cooper related to a business process and therefore, should be considered by EBI. The Chair moved that a formal recommendation be made to EBI and upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the Environment O&S Committee formally recommend that the Economy and Business Improvement O&S Committee consider the project management process of the Pittville Community Bridge.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability gave the following responses to questions from Members;

- Replacement of street trees was a responsibility of the County Council but the work was delegated to the Borough Council under a cost sharing agreement. The issue raised by Councillor Garnham in relation to a tree that had been planted in Bourneside Road, died shortly after and had yet to be replaced, would be raised with the appropriate Officers.
- Sponsors of roundabouts paid an annual amount but had signed a 3 year contract.
- The repairs to Imperial Gardens following the Literature Festival had been completed and the repairs to Montpellier were in progress.

The Chair took the opportunity to comment on how she, on attending events at the Literature Festival, had felt that the new flowerbeds in Imperial Gardens had enhanced the festival experience beautifully and congratulated everyone involved. She also commended the use of notices to keep the public informed.

The Cabinet Member Built Environment hoped that exchange of contracts for North Place and Portland Street would be in mid December. Detailed plans were already being considered with a view to being in a position to go forward with a planning application in Spring 2012 and despite reports to the contrary, the plan was not a 'done deal' and there had in fact been a number of changes as a result of the public consultation.

During the difficulties last winter the Council had supplemented the efforts made by Gloucestershire Highways by helping to clear and grit town centre streets, but capacity issues had limited this to the town centre and could not extend to Trading areas. There was a proposal this year to develop a snow warden scheme, which would see traders across Cheltenham provided with training and snow clearing equipment to keep these areas clear of snow and ice. He felt this was a positive way of dealing with what could be another difficult winter and achieving a lot of good with very little money.

Some time ago the maintenance of the Municipal Offices moved to a health & safety only approach. This was no longer considered tenable and he was pleased to advise Members that there would now be a departure from this position. Property Services were considering what form the maintenance programme would take, though there would not be a high level of investment.

Members welcomed the news about the maintenance of the Municipal Offices, which they felt needed to be kept in good condition.

In response to a question from a Member of the committee, the Cabinet Member Built Environment accepted the reputational, energy and financial issues surrounding, heating the Municipal Offices and opening windows when it gets too warm. He would investigate how the heating system was operated and what means of temperature control were available.

The Chair thanked both Cabinet Members for their attendance.

7. CHELTENHAM CAR PARKING STRATEGY

The Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability introduced the paper as circulated with the agenda and as an introduction provided a brief overview of recent discussions.

The Cheltenham Parking Board had agreed to the development of the Cheltenham Local Car Parking Strategy with the aim that it be included within the county wide parking strategy as set out in the Local Transport Plan 3. Developing a localised plan would require broad engagement and consultation with a number of key stakeholders and adjoining authorities.

Recent discussions, like the session held at the Town Hall, demonstrated that there were a number of on and off street parking needs to be considered within the borough and there could be no standardised approach, though there needed to be some, efficiencies and management. This was a new approach and coupled with the period of changes in relation to enforcement this would be somewhat of a learning curve.

There were also challenging times ahead with the development of North Place and Portland Street, traffic modelling and consideration of the impact was ongoing. Importantly, the County Council had resubmitted their bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, which was primarily aimed at supporting economic growth (linking with Cheltenham Civic Pride and Gloucester Regeneration projects) and reducing carbon emissions from travel by implementing various improvements.

Work was ongoing to determine the impact of new on-street parking schemes. There appeared to have been a lot of displacement but there was no clear indication as to where to and Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) technology could be used to establish this.

The following responses were given by the Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability to questions from Members. He noted that some questions deserved further explanation and more detailed responses and this would be provided outside of the meeting;

- The proposed on-street parking scheme in Montpellier had been endorsed, as amended, by Cheltenham Borough Council and Gloucestershire County Council. The introduction of new parking schemes formed part of the consultation.

- TRO was enforceable 24 hours, 7 days a week, 365 days a year and job descriptions were being drafted to reflect this with a view to ensuring that late nights and public holidays could be resourced.
- The mobility of parking enforcement across Cheltenham was being addressed as part of the restructure of the service area. This could include the use of bicycles and stagecoach buses by members of staff and would enable a town-wide approach.
- Gloucestershire University had a policy that all first year students are in residence and do not have a car, but after their first year, many became residents of Cheltenham and paid Council Tax. Discussions had been ongoing in relation to a possible car share scheme.
- The Smarter Travel Plan did need to be revised, but this required commitment of resources that were currently not available given the number of conflicting priorities. There had been discussions with GCHQ in relation to learning/tweaking of their fairly recent Travel Plan.
- The location of car parks could not be considered in isolation, account needed to be taken of the road network Cheltenham had inherited. The ring road system had long been a source of frustration to residents and visitors. The NCP was a purpose built car park and was therefore very different to some of the sites which were never envisaged as long term parking solutions e.g. Grosvenor Terrace. There were however, some title constraints on some sites across Cheltenham. At some point in time there would need to be 2 more park and ride locations in Cheltenham.
- Using technology to collect data would enable understanding and intelligence as to where enforcement was required and when.
- A Project Officer was currently working with the Web Team to develop a means by which members of the public could report any parking issues.
- Admittedly there were a number of parking zones throughout the town with a large number of spaces during the day and consideration needed to be given to why this was.

Parking was a highly emotive subject but the strategy needed to be clear and to achieve this, matters would need to be debated and then discussions moved on.

The Chair thanked the Head of Integrated Transport and Sustainability for his attendance and expressed how vital she felt it was that Cheltenham developed a parking strategy of its own.

8. REVIEW OF GARDEN WASTE SCHEME

The Director of Operations introduced the paper, highlighting that the garden waste scheme was just one part of a package of measures to divert waste from landfill. The scheme had been in operation for 9 months and as such a review of the scheme was considered timely.

Take-up of the new scheme had been lower than anticipated based on the experiences of other authorities, with currently, just over 11,000 households having subscribed to the service and an average of 30 new orders being received each week since August. There was an expectation that more householders would subscribe in spring 2012, but forecasting the level of

subscriptions had proved difficult. Importantly, whilst the income received was less than anticipated, the running costs were lower than budgeted.

As part of the review of the scheme Officers had surveyed 281 householders and obtained their views on the garden waste recycling service and potential alternatives. He talked Members through some of the results set out in the paper.

In response to concerns about price, it was felt that it would be reasonable and affordable to offer a discount for a fixed period to existing customers upon renewing their subscription or as an incentive to new customers. Other authorities who had offered a small discount believed that this had a positive impact.

There was potential for a bag service in addition to the wheeled bins, but the waste would have to be separated as the bagged waste needed to be treated via a more expensive process and as such it would be less cost effective. As a result the service would be limited to the streets listed in Appendix A, the hard to access areas with limited storage. Using 75 litres compostable paper sacks, provided on a pay as you go basis and available for purchase at the Municipal Offices and the Depot or could be delivered for a charge. The new or revised scheme would be publicised directly to those households to whom it would be available by a leaflet drop.

The Director of Operations gave the following responses to questions from Members;

- It had been anticipated that 20,000 subscriptions would be achieved in the first financial year, however there was currently a 9,000 shortfall. The monetary shortfall associated with lower subscriptions than forecast had been offset by increased recycling income.
- It was not expected that there would be a huge demand for the bag service given limited sized gardens in the streets to whom the service would be offered and as such smaller vehicles would be used in these hard to access areas.
- Consideration had been given to reducing the frequency of garden waste wheeled bin collections during the winter months but there was still a considerable demand and as such, it would be hard to justify this to all subscribers.
- The ability to charge for garden waste remained, despite the Localism Bill.
- Based on other authorities experiences it was originally felt that there would be little or no demand for a bag scheme. However, since the wheeled bin scheme had been launched, some residents had put forward requests for a bag alternative and this was now being considered.
- The wheeled bins had a 240 litre capacity, compared to the bags which had a capacity of 75 litres. Potentially requests for bags could come from areas that could have bins but overall the feedback on the wheeled bins had been positive. Members were given assurances that the income received covered the cost of providing the service but exact figures would be provided outside of the meeting.

- Admittedly there was little to stop someone purchasing a sack and putting it in a street from which it would be collected. Equally this would cost far too much to police to any further extent than monitoring who was purchasing the sacks.
- The Council had been actively promoting home composting for many years and to support this had made subsidised home compost bins available, which had been very successful and would be repeated again soon. However, the figure of 169 for the first 6 months did not take account of those people that were using other means of home composting and therefore could be a wild underestimate of the number of people actually doing this in Cheltenham.

The Chair thanked the Director of Operations for his attendance and asked that the comments of the committee be formally acknowledged by Cabinet when it considered the final report on the Garden Waste Scheme on the 6 December 2011.

9. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW WASTE AND RECYCLING SCHEME - REVIEW AND LESSONS LEARNED

The Waste and Recycling Manager offered a brief summary of the background to this item. To achieve the Councils target for reduction in household waste that went to landfill, in April 2011 a new kerbside waste and recycling scheme introduced the collection of refuse and food waste one week and recycling and food waste the next.

It was recognised that alternate weekly collections were not practical for some dwellings where there was little or no space available to store waste containers at either the front or rear of the property. As such, a small number of streets still received weekly refuse collections and in the town centre, some streets received twice weekly collections.

Overall, implementation of the new scheme had gone very well, with an increase of food waste diverted from landfill from an average of 250 tonnes to an average of 280 tonnes a month, in the first 6 months. There had been a significant increase in kerbside recycling, especially plastic bottles and in quarter one of 2011 the tonnage of household waste to landfill was down from 52kg to 37kg per household.

The increase in recycling had resulted in an unprecedented demand for kerbside recycling boxes and the council's stock of boxes ran out shortly after the scheme commenced. More boxes were ordered and the backlog was cleared quickly but the new stocks were soon depleted and as such box requests are currently being held and will be fulfilled as soon as more stocks are received.

Side waste was still problematic in some areas of the borough and this issue would be addressed by encouraging and educating people to use the scheme correctly, with enforcement being the last resort.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability had looked across the country at other similar urban authorities and a 50% recycling rate was very good and a great achievement. The new scheme had been managed successfully, people had been suitably encouraged to participate and Officers continued to monitor the

issue of black bags full of recyclable waste. These houses would be identified and he was confident that yet more household waste could be diverted from landfill.

The following responses were given to questions from Members;

- The County Council did offer incentives associated to reducing household waste to landfill and some significant sums if the targets were achieved.
- Income was generated from the sale of recyclable materials and in recent months the markets had been very buoyant but were volatile. Segregating waste enabled for the best price to be achieved and these products would be used in the UK and Europe, if the waste was not segregated it would achieve no income and could be sent to the far East.
- There had been unprecedented demand for kerbside recycling boxes but this was just one reason for the council having to make more multiple orders. Lack of storage space, lead in time and the initial budget, though the demand had justified the additional outlay.
- The Cabinet Member Sustainability said that the County Council aspired to achieve 70% of household waste diverted from landfill but had not yet said how this figure would be achieved. Cotswold District Council diverted 60% but they were a very different area to Cheltenham, historically, rural areas recycled more. 9 years ago Cheltenham's figure was 5% and as such 70% as a possible target was not necessarily unrealistic.
- Recyclables could be expanded in future to include mixed plastics but this posed a capacity issue for the vehicles.
- It was suggested that spillages were likely, the result of people using their own boxes without lids as a consequence of the stock shortage of the recycling boxes. The issue would be raised with the operatives.
- There was only one plant in Europe that recycled Tetrapak and given that it contained a number of components it wasn't possible to mix it with just cardboard, plastic, etc, so there were currently no plans to expand the service to include this material.
- Cheltenham's food waste was processed at a site in Newent and there had been no impact on bring sites across Cheltenham as they were so conveniently located.
- Unfortunately there were instances where operatives had missed some food waste containers and this was attributed to their colour and size which led to them being easily overlooked. It wasn't possible to get a message to the crew on the same day that the issue was reported and as such would be collected the following day. Officers would consider the approach for an issue reported on a Thursday or Friday, given that there were no weekend collections. Longer term there was an aspiration to get real time information to and from crews.

A number of Members applauded the performance and achievements of the new service and the work of Officers.

The Chair thanked the Waste & Recycling Manager for her attendance.

10. CLIMATE CHANGE MEMBER WORKING GROUP

Councillor Wheeldon introduced the paper as Chairman of the Climate Change Member Working Group and talked through some specific highlights;

- The council's carbon emissions reduction target of 30% by 2015 and had already achieved a 10%.
- Since the Government had slashed feed-in-tariffs, installation of solar panels was no longer feasible. A motion to Council in June recommending the purchase of zero carbon electricity from a green energy provider be a major consideration when choosing the new supplier had achieved unanimous support and this would now be critical in order that the target reduction could be achieved.
- The working group had taken a strong position on the replacement of the Mayors car and asked Officers to consider a whole range of options from a standard car, electric car and a hybrid. In addition they had asked Officers to ensure that a comparison of fuel costs over the period of the lease be made against the cost of running an electric car and that the comparison not be limited to capital cost only. Linked to this was, public charging points for electric cars, Cheltenham had none and the group felt that the council should take a lead on this.
- The working group would be receiving an impact assessment report of climate change on the operations of the council in view of the most recent winter weather and the 2007 floods suffered by the town.
- A number of other small scale projects were ongoing which would also contribute to the reduction target.

Councillor Wheeldon gave thanks to the Climate Change & Sustainability Officer and Building Services Manager for their hard work and support.

The Chair addressed the committee as the newest Member of the working group and described how impressed she had been by the work being done by the group. She also felt that the smaller steps being taken towards reducing emissions were just as important as the larger scale projects.

Councillor Garnham asked that the matter of the Mayors car be given due consideration and that it not be forsaken on principle, but rather, a sensible decision be reached. From personal experience he knew the benefits and value of having the car.

The Chair advised Members that Cheltenham was formally designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) on the 18th November, too late for inclusion in the paper circulated in advance of the meeting. As a result of the AQMA the authority was required to carry out further assessment of existing and likely future air quality within 12 months and produce an Action Plan. Members were invited to form part of a steering group being established by the relevant Officer, though the Chair felt that the invitation should be extended to all Members.

Relevant information and clear details as to what the Steering Group were being asked to do would be circulated to all Members.

The Cabinet Member Sustainability felt that with the reduction in feed-in tariffs, the focus would now be on energy reduction. The current reduction of 10.3% was fantastic, but there were other projects for which he hoped there would be

funding available and included the installation of energy saving lighting at the Town Hall and Pittville Pump Rooms. There was also the server room at the Municipal Offices to consider, there was an enormous amount of heat generated and gains could be made by using this heat elsewhere or cooling it more efficiently.

11. ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PLAN 2011-12

The Chair took the opportunity to highlight that all Members had the right to ask for an item, relevant to the functions of the Committee, to be added to the agenda. Such a request needed to be given to the Proper Officer (Saira Malin in regard to this committee) no later than 10am on the seventh working day before the day of the meeting. The request would then be included on the agenda for the next available meeting.

The Chair referred members to the work plan as circulated with the agenda, namely the items scheduled for the next meeting. She explained that the Winter Weather Procedures had not been scheduled for the next meeting as it was not considered timely enough. This would, instead, be listed under 'items to be added at a future date', with a view to scheduling it for September 2012, so that the winter weather procedures for 2012 could be scrutinised.

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 Wednesday 18 January 2012.

Penny Hall
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 10

MATTERS ARISING FROM ENVIRONMENT O&S MEETING: 23 NOVEMBER 2011

Agenda No.	Item	Action required	Officer / Member	Completed
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Pass on recommendation that EBI consider the project management process of the Pittville Community Bridge project following scrutiny request from Councillor Cooper.	Saira Malin	✓
	Action taken:	Recommendation passed to the relevant Officer to raise with the committee (25/11).		
6	Cabinet Member Briefing	Discuss means of temperature control for the Municipal Offices heating system.	Cllr Rawson	✓
	Action taken:	Councillor Rawson emailed a response to all Councillors (10/12).		
7	Cheltenham Car Parking Strategy	Provide more detailed responses to member questions (where applicable).	Owen Parry	✓
	Action taken:	Democracy Officer emailed Owen Parry (28/11 and 15/12) and asked that he confirm when and how the responses are provided. He responded (15/12) to advise that he had discussed the matter with Councillor Wheeldon, who had agreed to forward any queries, to which he would respond.		
8	Review of Garden Waste Scheme	Provide members with details of expenditure / income for the garden waste scheme.	Rob Bell	✓
	Action taken:	The Director of Operations emailed this information to members of the ENV committee (25/11).		
9	New waste and recycling scheme – review	Raise issue of spillages with operatives.	Beth Boughton	✓
	Action taken:	Beth Boughton emailed (28/11) to advise that a memo would be issued to all crews and the issue had already been raised with the Supervisors who would look out for issues whilst undertaking their inspections.		
10	Climate Change Member Working Group	Email invitation to all Members re: involvement in the AQMA steering group.	Saira Malin	✓
	Action taken:	Democracy Officer emailed detail of issue and brief explanation of the need for a steering group, advised that first meeting would outline full requirements and invited Members to contact the relevant Officer if they were interested.		
11	Work Plan	Send a copy of the scrutiny registration form to all Members.	Saira Malin	✓
	Action taken:	Democracy Officer sent scrutiny registration form and brief outline of process to all Members (28/11).		

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 12

Information/Discussion Paper

Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

18 January 2012

Update on general use of plastic bags

This note contains 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 Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee recently voiced concern about the continued use of plastic bags in Cheltenham and asked officers to provide an update on the issue.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 In December 2007, the council passed a motion to support and encourage retailers and businesses in the town to eliminate excessive packaging and in particular reduce the widespread use of plastic bags. A report was subsequently made to council in June 2008 about the work undertaken during the intervening period and to update members on progress.
- 2.2 This report looks at examples of legislation introduced and voluntary action taken elsewhere to reduce the use of plastic bags, a 2006 Environment Agency assessment report on plastic bags and also provides a snapshot of what is happening on the ground locally. It then suggests some courses of action for the Committee to consider should members wish to take up the promotion of this issue once again.

3. Legislation and voluntary action

- 3.1 There are a number of examples of legislation which have been introduced to reduce the use of plastic bags.
- 3.2 Ireland imposed a tax on plastic bags in 2002. Retailers are required to pass the cost of this tax onto the shopper and the number of plastic bags has plummeted, dropping from 27 per person a month to 2.
- 3.3 In October 2011, Wales introduced a charge of 5p on all plastic bags with a potential £5000 fine for non-compliance. Concern has been expressed about this legislation as it includes a complicated set of exemptions and it is not yet clear what the effect of this legislation has been.
- 3.4 In 2007, the residents of Modbury, Devon, took voluntary action and banned plastic bags from the village. This campaign was taken up nationally at the time by the Daily Mail, but the government has always shied away from imposing either a ban or a levy.
- 3.5 London's Mayor hopes to ban free plastic bags in London before the Olympic Games later this year.

4. Environment Agency assessment report

4.1 The Environment Agency undertook a study to assess the life cycle environmental impacts of the production, use and disposal of different carrier bags available in the UK in 2006. The report considered only the types of carriers available from supermarkets, not those given out by other high street retailers. The table below summarises some of the results and indicates the number of times a “bag for life” or a cotton bag need to be used to outweigh the lifecycle impacts of a single use carrier bag.

Type of carrier	Single-use bag (no secondary use)	Single-use bag (40.3% reused as bin liners)	Single-use bag (100% reused as bin liners)	Single-use bag (used 3 times)
“bag for life”	4	5	9	12
Cotton bag	131	173	327	393

4.2 The table shows that the reuse of single-use bags is crucial to their environmental performance. The study also concluded that reuse, even as bin liners, produces greater benefits than simply recycling these bags.

4.3 However, this study did not take account of the littering caused by plastic bag use. This results in a different set of problems including the cleanliness of the local environment and the damaging effect on wildlife in the countryside and in the sea, which supports the argument for reducing plastic bag use overall.

4.4 Biodegradable plastic bags are also now available as an alternative, but there has been much discussion about how effective they are and, as is demonstrated above, efforts are better focused on reducing the use of plastic bags in the first place, then encouraging reuse, rather than on promoting a bag that simply degrades faster when it is thrown away.

5. The local context

5.1 Since the council report of 2008 the culture surrounding single use plastic bags has changed. Nationally, in 2006, nearly 11bn single use carriers bags were used. This fell to under 6.5bn by 2009-10. Although this figure then rose again to 6.8bn in 2010 this still represents a reduction of around 38% (*Source: The Guardian, 28 July 2011*).

5.2 From observation locally, it is reasonably clear that a greater proportion of the public now make use of re-usable bags, particularly for food shopping, than could be said a few years ago. The manager of Cheltenham Business Partnership, Martin Quantock, has indicated that the retail trade is also working hard to reduce the distribution of bags. This is based on his own experience as a branch manager of a national retail chain and discussions with a number of local retail managers. It is in the retailer’s best interests to do this as significant cost savings can be achieved. Having canvassed retailers in the town centre, Mr Quantock has also been able to report that the majority either impose a charge for a plastic bag or ask their customers if one is needed.

5.3 In terms of the council’s own services the Tourist Information Centre, which probably hands out the most bags, now only has brown paper bags and recycled paper carrier bags to hand out to customers. It also sells cotton bags with a Cheltenham logo on the side. Plastic polylopes are still used for sending out brochures, but none have been ordered for several years and the ones being used are what is left of a previous order. There are no plans to order any more.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 In the absence of national legislation, the emphasis remains on encouraging retailers to restrict the availability of plastic bags and encouraging consumers to reduce their use of them.
- 6.2 Taking voluntary action locally to ban plastic bags is difficult, due to the abundance of national chains in the town, and local evidence suggests that it is actually consumer choice which is driving plastic bag use rather than retailers giving bags away freely. Any action, therefore, is probably better focused on consumers rather than retailers. The question is whether the council is best placed to influence the community on this issue and whether this would be of sufficient value to make the staff time and financial resources available.

7. Next steps

7.1 If the Committee is of the view that this issue warrants further work, there are different courses of action which could be taken.

- (i) The Committee could ask the Cheltenham Business Partnership manager to raise the issue at a partnership meeting to explore whether retailers could do any more to discourage their customers from accepting plastic bags or to encourage those who do take plastic bags away to reuse them in other ways.
- (ii) The Committee may wish to put forward one of the following options to the new scrutiny function, for consideration as a task and finish exercise:
- Running a direct promotional campaign aimed specifically at consumers
 - Linking up with a local voluntary group (subject to interest) to deliver a campaign

However, members will need to consider whether the outcomes are likely to be of sufficient value to warrant the investment in both staff time and financial resources, both of which will need to be identified.

- (iii) The Committee could invite The Echo to run a story or a campaign to get the message across to consumers.

Background Papers	Council report, 30 June 2008
Contact Officer	Gill Morris, climate change & sustainability officer, 01242 264229, gill.morris@cheltenham.gov.uk
Accountability	Councillor Roger Whyborn, cabinet member for sustainability
Scrutiny Function	Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 16

Cheltenham Borough Council

Cabinet – 13th December 2011

General Fund Revenue and Capital - Revised Budget 2011/12 and Interim Budget Proposals 2012/13 for Consultation

Accountable member	Cabinet Member for Community Development and Finance, John Webster
Accountable officer	Director of Resources (Section 151 Officer), Mark Sheldon
Accountable scrutiny committee	All scrutiny committees
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	Yes
Executive summary	This report summarises the revised budget for 2011/12 and the Cabinet’s interim budget proposals for 2012/13 for consultation.
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the revised budget for 2011/12. 2. Approve the interim budget proposals for consultation including a proposed council tax for the services provided by Cheltenham Borough Council of £187.12 for the year 2012/13 (a 0% increase based on a Band D property). 3. Approve the growth proposals, including one off initiatives at Appendix 3 and use of New Homes Bonus as indicated in paragraph 5.3. 4. Approve the proposed capital programme at Appendix 6, as outlined in Section 9. 5. Delegate authority to the Director Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Development and Finance, to determine and approve any additional material that may be needed to support the presentation of the interim budget proposals for consultation. 6. Seek consultation responses by 14th January 2012.
Financial implications	<p>As contained in the report and appendices.</p> <p>Contact officer: Mark Sheldon.</p> <p>E-mail: mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01242 264123</p>

<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>As this report proposes an interim budget for consultation purposes, there are no specific legal implications at this stage.</p> <p>Contact officer: Peter Lewis</p> <p>E-mail: peter.lewis@teWKesbury.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01684 272012</p>
<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>In the spirit of building on our positive industrial relations environment, the recognised trade unions received a budget briefing at a Joint Consultative Committee on 24 November 2011. The interim budget proposals (Appendix 4) details the savings generated from a number of restructures that have already taken place this year. Dialogue with the recognised trade unions will continue in order to ensure that the potential impact on employees are kept to a minimum and in doing so help to avoid the need for any compulsory redundancies. The Council's policies on managing change and consultation regarding any redundancies will be followed.</p> <p>On going, it is important that capacity is carefully monitored and managed in respect of any reductions on FTE and reduced income streams.</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy</p> <p>E-mail: julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel no: 01242 264355</p>
<p>Key risks</p>	<p>As outlined in Appendix 1</p>
<p>Corporate and community plan Implications</p>	<p>The aim of the interim budget proposals is to direct resources towards the key priorities identified in the Council's Corporate Business Plan whilst recognising the reduction in government funding.</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>The draft budget contains a number of proposals for improving the local environment, as set out in this report.</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council's Budget and Policy Framework Rules, which is part of the Council's constitution, the Cabinet is required to prepare interim budget proposals for the financial year ahead and consult on its proposals for no less than four weeks prior to finalising recommendations for the Council to consider in February 2012. This report sets out the interim proposals for 2012/13.

2. 2011/12 Revised Budget

- 2.1 The budget monitoring report to the end of August 2011, considered by Cabinet on 18th October 2011, identified a potential projected overspend of £476k for the current year, 2011/12. In response, the Senior Leadership Team implemented a freeze on all unspent supplies and services budgets which included leasing costs for the purchase of new vehicles and equipment. As a result of the action taken, the revised budget for 2011/12, which includes projected savings in employee related and supplies and services budgets, is now projected to have managed the projected overspend to zero.

3. Finance Settlement

- 3.1 The Government's comprehensive spending review (CSR10) in 2010 determined the level of funding for the whole of the public sector for the period 2011/12 to 2012/13. The following table summarises the updated headline figures for the level of Government support to the Council released on 7th February 2011.

	2010/11 £m	2011/12 £m	2011/12 £m adjusted	2012/13 £m
Revenue Support Grant	1.118	1.440	1.440	
Cheltenham's share of Redistributed Business Rates	7.701	4.658	4.658	
Formula Grant	8.819	6.098	6.098	5.518
less formula grant adjustment e.g. concessionary fares	(1.631)	-	(0.046)	
Adjusted formula grant	7.188	6.098	6.052	5.518
Actual cash (decrease) over previous year		(1.090)		(0.534)
% cash cut		(15.16%)		(8.82%)

- 3.2 In the coalition Government's comprehensive spending review in October 2010, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that councils would receive a cut in government support of 7.1% in each of the next 4 years, a total of 28.4%. This was broadly in line with the assumptions for a reduction in government support modelled in the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) although the council anticipated some front loading and planned for a 10.7% cut in 2011/12.
- 3.3 The actual settlement was very different. The council received a cash reduction in government

support (revenue support grant plus share of redistributed non domestic rates) of £1.090m, a cut of 15.16% in 2011/12 followed by a further projected cash cut of £534k (8.82%) in 2012/13. Cumulatively, this equates to a 23.23% cut over 2 years. Funding levels for the following 2 years i.e. 2014/15 and 2015/16, have yet to be announced but it is likely that they will continue to impact on the council's finances detrimentally.

4. The Cabinet's general approach to the 2012/13 budget

- 4.1** The Cabinet's budget strategy for 2012/13, approved at a meeting on 18th October 2011, included an estimate of £824k for the 2012/13 budget gap i.e. the financial gap between what the Council needs to spend to maintain services (including pay and price inflation) and the funding available assuming a 9.57% cut in government support. A technical change to the provisional 2012/13 settlement was made on 7th February 2011, which provided an additional £45k in government support which represents a revised cash reduction of 8.82%.
- 4.2** The final assessment of the budget gap for 2012/13, based on the detailed budget preparation undertaken over recent months and the provisional financial settlement is £972k which takes into account, structural shortfalls within the 2011/12 base budget such as car parking income and green waste sales.
- 4.3** In November 2011, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that the Government intends to make funding available to help councils freeze their council tax in 2012/13. Unlike for 2011/12, the council tax freeze grant for 2012/13 will involve a single one-off payment and this will not be built into the baseline (i.e. no further grant payments will be made over the Spending Review period). Whilst the Cabinet are proposing to take up the Governments offer to freeze council tax at 2011/12 levels it recognises that this will put additional pressure on the 2013/14 budget as this decision will add circa £200k to the funding gap.
- 4.4** In preparing the interim budget proposals, the Cabinet and officers have made the following assumptions:
- Prepared a standstill budget projection under a general philosophy of no growth in levels of service with the exception of Taxi Marshall's, tree maintenance and license costs for 'Huddle', costing £44k annually, which have now been built into the base budget. The Taxi Marshall's service had previously been funded from the Licensing Equalisation Reserve which is no longer sustainable.
 - Provided for inflation for contractual, statutory, and health and safety purposes at an appropriate inflation rate where proven.
 - Not budgeted for pay inflation for 2012/13.
 - Increased income budgets based on an average increase in fees and charges of 2.5% with the exception of property rents which have not been inflated but are now set in line with rent projections based on property leases. The Cabinet intend to freeze car park charges and hire charges for its entertainment's venues at current year's levels which have been shown as growth within the interim budget proposals.
 - Assessed the impact of prevailing interest rates on the investment portfolio, the position in respect of Icelandic banks and the impact of HRA self-financing, the implications of which have been considered by the Treasury Management Panel.
 - Allowed for a council tax freeze, in line with the coalition Government's request, on the basis that it will be funded through a specific grant for one year only.

4.5 The key aims in developing the approach to the budget were to:

- Protect frontline services, as far as possible
- Continue to develop longer term plans for efficiencies over the period of the MTFS including increasing emphasis on shared services and commissioning services.

4.6 Once again, there has been considerable activity during the course of the year to develop this longer term strategy for closing the funding gap. The Cabinet have worked with officers to develop the 'Bridging the Gap (BtG)' programme using the BtG group supported by the Senior Leadership team. The Cabinet's interim budget proposals for closing the budget gap in 2012/13, the result of this work, are detailed in Appendix 4, split into:

- Decisions already made by council and therefore built into the base budget, totalling £254k.
- Proposals yet to be agreed by council which are not built into the base budget, totalling £862k which includes a contribution from New Homes Bonus (NHB) of £250k.

4.7 The Cabinet and SLT have been anticipating having to make significant savings and have been actively managing vacancies and staffing levels in order to minimise the impact of service reviews, system's thinking and savings initiatives and cuts. As a result, the reduction in staffing numbers (4.9 full time equivalents) outlined in the budget proposals have been achieved at minimal cost to the taxpayer.

5. Service growth

5.1 The Cabinet's initial approach was that, given the difficult financial situation, there should be no growth in services which has an impact on revenue expenditure except where there is a statutory requirement or a compelling business case for an 'invest to save' scheme. The growth identified in the budget proposals supported by Cabinet meets these criteria and reflect the need to invest in business processes, infrastructure and schemes which support the BtG programme.

5.2 The New Homes Bonus (NHB) scheme was designed to address the disincentive within the local government finance system for local areas to welcome growth. The scheme is designed to provide local authorities with the means to mitigate the strain the increased population causes whilst promoting a more positive attitude to growth and creating an environment in which new housing is more readily accepted. Whilst funding is not ring-fenced for a specific purpose, it is designed to allow the 'benefits of growth to be returned to local communities'.

5.3 An assessment of projected allocations for NHB based on housing commitments to 2022/23 allows for £250k to be built into the 2012/13 base budget which is sustainable over the period of the MTFS. This leaves a further £324k allocation of NHB in 2012/13 which the Cabinet aspires to fund the following one-off investment and an aspiration to take a similar approach in future years.

- A further £50k towards addressing youth work issues that the County can no longer fund in the way that it traditionally did.
- £142k for small environmental works to tackle environmental issues costing up to a maximum of £15k.
- £142k towards a Promoting Cheltenham fund to support events, projects and initiatives that will stimulate economic and business growth in Cheltenham.

5.4 The full list of proposals for growth, including one off initiatives, is included in Appendix 3.

6. Treasury Management

- 6.1** Appendix 2 summarises the budget estimates for interest and investment income activity taking into account the following changes, considered by the Treasury Management Panel, at its meeting on 21st November 2011.
- 6.2** Security of capital remains the Council's main investment objective. The solvency issues surrounding Europe in addition to the downgrades of some UK banks has meant the Council has scaled back its lending list, and will start to repay temporary debt with maturing investments rather than re-invest. For 2012/13 interest payable will reduce by £10,600 and interest receivable will reduce by £127,400. Interest rates are expected to remain at low levels for the foreseeable future. Interest payable to the HRA for reserves and balances held within the Council's overall balances will reduce by £32,500.
- 6.3** The government are going ahead with changes which will have a major impact on the way the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is financed from April 2012. One of the changes is the methodology for splitting the current loans the council has and charging the coupon rate of a loan instead of a weighted average rate to the HRA loans. This has resulted in an additional £232,200 of borrowing costs being transferred to the HRA.
- 6.4** As a result, the net impact on the 2012/13 budget is an increase in net treasury income of £147,900.
- 6.5** The council has been actively pursuing the deposits from the three Icelandic owned banks, Glitnir, Landsbanki and Kaupthing Singer and Friedlander (KSF). Recently the Icelandic Supreme Court upheld the District Court decision that the test cases involving Local Authority deposits with Landsbanki and Glitnir banks as having priority creditor status. This means that local authority deposits will be at the front of the queue in getting the deposits back. Although the council is awaiting ratification of the court decision on non-test cases, it is expected that the council will receive back 98% of the Landsbanki deposits and 100% of the Glitnir deposits. So far 63p in the pound has been received from KSF and future total distributions should be in the range of 79p to 86p in the pound.
- 6.6** This has enabled the council to reduce its Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), as an element of the capital direction received in 2009 is no longer required, which will save the council £155,000. This has been built into the base budget projection for 2012/13.

7. Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)

- 7.1** The MTFS identified a funding gap for the period 2012/13 – 2016/17 of £2.5m. The MTFS projection will be reassessed to include the latest view of financial implications of more recent developments including any information in respect of future funding levels for the Cabinet's final budget proposals in February 2012.

8. Reserves

- 8.1** Further work on reserves will be undertaken prior to the presentation of the final budget in February 2012, including the Civic Pride, ICT and Property Maintenance reserves.

9. Capital Programme

- 9.1** The proposed capital programme for the period 2012/13 to 2016/17 is at Appendix 6.

- 9.2 The programme includes provisional sums for infrastructure investment to be funded from the Civic Pride reserve. The council may well be concluding the sale of the Midwinter site, North Place and Portland Street car parks during 2012/13. A shopping list of infrastructure investment across the town is being developed for approval.

10. Property Maintenance Programmes

- 10.1 The budget proposals include a proposal to defer the increase in annual contribution of £200k to the planned maintenance reserve by a further year, in response to the severe settlement position. In line with the budget working group's suggestions to Cabinet, the planned maintenance programme will be reviewed by the Asset Management Working Group prior to the final budget preparation in February 2012.

11. Reasons for recommendations

- 11.1 As outlined in the report.

12. Alternative options considered

- 12.1 The Cabinet have considered many alternatives in arriving at the interim budget proposals. Opposition groups will be able to suggest alternative budget proposals for consideration by council in February 2012.

13. Consultation and feedback

- 13.1 The formal budget consultation on the detailed interim budget proposals will be over the period **14th December 2011 to 13th January 2012**. The Cabinet will seek to ensure that the opportunity to have input into the budget consultation process is publicised to the widest possible audience. During the consultation period, interested parties including businesses, tenants, residents, staff and trade unions will be encouraged to comment on the initial budget proposals. They will be asked to identify, as far as possible, how alternative proposals complement the Council's Business Plan and Community Plan and how they can be financed. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees will be invited to review the interim budget proposals in the meetings scheduled for January 2012 and any comments will be fed back to the Cabinet.
- 13.2 Whilst the Cabinet will be as flexible as possible, it is unlikely that any comments received after the consultation period can be properly assessed to consider their full implications and to be built into the budget. Accordingly, if alternative budget proposals are to come forward, this should happen as early as possible.
- 13.3 All comments relating to the initial budget proposals should be returned to the Head of Financial Services by the end of the consultation period for consideration by the Cabinet in preparing their final budget proposals. Consultation questionnaires will be available in key locations and for completion on line via the council's website. Comments can be e-mailed to moneymatters@cheltenham.gov.uk.

14. Performance management – monitoring and review

- 14.1 The scale of budget cuts will require significant work to deliver within the agreed timescales and there is a danger that it diverts management time from delivery of services to delivery of cuts. There are regular progress meetings to monitor the delivery of savings and this will need to be

matched with performance against the corporate strategy action plan to ensure that resources are used to best effect and prioritised.

- 14.2** The delivery of the savings workstreams included in the interim budget proposals, if approved by full council will be monitored via the BtG group.

Report author	<p>Paul Jones, Head of Financial Services</p> <p>Tel. 01242 775154;</p> <p><i>e-mail address paul.jones@cheltenham.gov.uk</i></p>
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment 2. Summary net budget requirement 3. Growth 4. Savings / additional income 5. Projection of reserves 6. Capital programme
Background information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provisional Finance settlement 2012/13 2. MTFS 2011/12 – 2016/17

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	I	L	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
1.01	If the council is unable to come up with long term solutions which bridge the gap in the medium term financial strategy then it will find it increasingly difficult to prepare budgets year on year without making unplanned cuts in service provision.	Mark Sheldon	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	The council has agreed a commissioning approach and the MTFS identifies a number of longer term solutions. The council will need to be mindful of capacity to deliver the savings programme	Dec 2012	Mark Sheldon	
1.02	If the robustness of the income proposals is not sound then there is a risk that the income identified within the budget will not materialise during the course of the year.	Mark Sheldon	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	Robust forecasting is used to prepare the budget looking back on previous income targets and collection, and forecasts take into account the current economic situation. Professional judgement used on the deliverability of income targets. Once budget approved, regular monitoring of income targets will identify any issues and any corrective action which need to be taken and will be reported through the budget monitoring reports.	Ongoing during course of year	Mark Sheldon	
1.03	If when developing a longer term strategy to meet the MTFS, the council does not make the public aware of its financial position and clearly articulates why it is	Jane Griffiths	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	As part of the development of BtG programme there will need to be a clear communication strategy. In adopting a	Dec 2012	Communications team to support the BTG programme	

	making changes to service delivery then there may be confusion as to what services are being provided and customer satisfaction may decrease.							commissioning culture then it will be basing its decisions on customer needs and requirements and this should help address satisfaction levels.			
1.04	There is a reliance on shared services delivering savings. If these savings do not materialise or shared service projects do not proceed as anticipated then other savings will need to be found to meet the MTFS projections.	Pat Pratley	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	All shared services are operated under prince 2 principles, with clear business case and risk logs are maintained for the shared service projects and regularly reviewed	Ongoing during course of year	Pat Pratley	
1.05	In the past the council has used in year savings to support one off growth to fund new initiatives or unpredicted expenditure. It is unlikely that moving forward over the life of the MTFS there will be such savings and if new initiatives or unpredicted expenditure arises then the dependency on the General Reserve will intensify.	Mark Sheldon	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	Future realignment of reserves may be required in order to increase the General Reserve.	Dec 2012	Mark Sheldon (working with SLT and Cabinet)	
1.06	If the council does not carefully manage its commissioning of services then it may not have the flexibility to make additional savings required by the MTFS in future years and a greater burden of savings may fall on the retained organisation	Mark Sheldon	15 December 2010	3	3	9	R	Contracts, SLAs and other shared service agreements will need to be drafted and negotiated to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility with regards to budget requirements	Ongoing	AD Commissioning	

NET GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2011/12 REVISED AND 2012/13

GROUP	2011/12 ORIGINAL	2011/12 REVISED	2012/13 ORIGINAL
	£	£	£
Projected cost of 'standstill' level of service			
Commissioning	2,942,800	2,853,300	2,864,200
Built Environment	1,166,850	1,262,166	839,700
Wellbeing & Culture	4,672,200	4,550,250	4,607,850
Resources	1,340,650	1,558,950	1,708,350
Operations	4,793,500	4,740,800	4,820,400
Strategic Directors	(16,450)	(1,450)	(8,550)
Programmed Maintenance (Revenue)	482,100	588,400	770,000
Business Change	734,800	1,016,900	591,325
Savings from vacancies	(480,000)	(69,650)	(480,000)
Bad debt provision	40,000	40,000	40,000
	15,676,450	16,539,666	15,753,275
Capital Charges	(2,097,600)	534,600	(1,913,300)
Interest and Investment Income	521,800	597,200	373,900
Use of balances and reserves	173,643	(2,925,674)	408,498
Proposed Growth recurring - Appendix 3			149,600
Savings / Additional income identified - Appendix 4			(861,600)
LAA Performance Reward Grant		(180,424)	
New Homes Bonus		(290,275)	
Specific Grant in lieu of council tax freeze 2011/12	(197,000)	(197,800)	(197,800)
Specific Grant in lieu of council tax freeze 2012/13			(199,000)
NET BUDGET	14,077,293	14,077,293	13,513,573
Deduct:			
Revenue Support Grant	(1,439,927)	(1,439,927)	(5,518,459)
National Non-Domestic Rate	(4,658,405)	(4,658,405)	0
Collection Fund Contribution	(59,500)	(59,500)	(34,000)
	(6,157,832)	(6,157,832)	(5,552,459)
NET SPEND FUNDED BY TAX	7,919,461	7,919,461	7,961,114
Band 'D' Tax	£187.12	£187.12	£187.12
Increase per annum			£0.00
Increase per week			£0.00
% Rise			0.0%

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 28

Ref	Division	Project Name	Description	Revenue Costs			Capital Costs		
				2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
				£	£	£	£	£	£
SUPPORTED GROWTH (RECURRING)									
1	Wellbeing & Culture	Public Protection - Taxi Marshalls	To continue the service of providing taxi marshalls in the town centre to maintain safety in the nighttime economy.	17,000	17,000	17,000			
2	Resources	IT Infrastructure	Huddle is a "cloud" based application that enables team members within partnership projects to work collaboratively and share documents. Funding is required to establish a base budget for licence costs.	7,000	7,000	7,000			
3	Built Environment	Trees Budget	Additional annual tree maintenance budget.	20,000	20,000	20,000			
4	Wellbeing & Culture	Town Hall and Pump Room Lettings income	To not increase the lettings fee income in line with inflation, to keep the fees and charges competitive and reflective of the current economic climate.	11,700	11,700	11,700			
5	Built Environment	Car Parking income	To not increase car parking income charges in line with inflation, to reflect the current downturn in car parking income levels.	93,900	93,900	93,900			
				149,600	149,600	149,600			
SUPPORTED GROWTH (FUNDED FROM CIVIC PRIDE RESERVE)									
6	Built Environment	Civic Pride	CBC contribution to East Promenade repaving by GCC, plus street furniture costs.				145,000		
7	Built Environment	Civic Pride	CBC contribution to West Promenade repaving by GCC.					100,000	
8	Built Environment	Civic Pride	Upgrade of Promenade pedestrianised area including remodelling of tree pits, providing seating, re-pointing existing Yorkstone.				100,000		
9	Built Environment	Civic Pride	Remodelling of Sherborne Place Car Park into a Green car park for short stay bus use.				100,000		
10	Built Environment	Civic Pride	Scheme for St.Mary's churchyard					50,000	
11	Built Environment	Civic Pride	Public Space Designer	35,000	35,000	35,000			
				35,000	35,000	35,000	395,000	100,000	-

Ref	Division	Project Name	Description	Revenue Costs			Capital Costs		
				2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £
SUPPORTED GROWTH (FUNDED FROM CAPITAL RESERVE)									
12	Resources	IT Infrastructure	Upgrade of Microsoft Office required as version currently used is an end of life product and no longer supported by Microsoft.				120,000		
13	Resources	IT Infrastructure	Upgrade of Civica system to ensure PCI compliance.					56,200	
14	Built Environment	Civic Pride	Improvements to Grosvenor Terrace Car Park including making a Green car park, improving linkages to the High Street, improved sustainability - rainwater harvesting, PV cells etc.				150,000		
				-	-	-	270,000	56,200	-
SUPPORTED GROWTH (FUNDED FROM PROPERTY R&R RESERVE)									
15	Programme Maintenance	Carbon Reduction	Evaporation system in ICT Server Room	13,000					
16	Programme Maintenance	Carbon Reduction	New LED pool lights at Leisure@	10,000					
				23,000	-	-	-	-	-

	2012-13 Savings / Addnl Income £	Built into Base Budget 2012/13 £	Not built into Base Budget 2012/13 £	FTE Losses 2011/12	FTE Losses 2012/13	Service / Risk Implications	Indicative equality / diversity impact at draft budget stage
CORPORATE							
1	15,000	0	15,000	1.0		There may be additional pressure on SLT to undertake more administration, diverting valuable time from more critical work.	No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.
COMMISSIONING							
2	20,000		20,000	1.0		It will be important to ensure that the public have the right level of information to access services.	No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.
3	20,000	0	20,000			None identified.	No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.
HUMAN RESOURCES							
4	2,000	0	2,000			Will need to watch capacity if developing bespoke e-learning.	None identified.
5	62,100	0	62,100			Have not been able to reach agreement with TUs at present, may need to introduce new arrangement separately (individual sign up to new approach). Preparing briefing note for SLT, intranet update, will offer 12 Is. May be reduced performance from reduced allowance.	None identified.
OPERATIONS							
6	83,000	0	83,000				None identified.
7	-30,000	0	-30,000				None identified.
HEALTH AND WELLBEING							
8	5,000	5,000	0				None identified.
9	5,000	5,000	0				The grant reduction may impact on the Everyman's ability to provide outreach work which is particularly valued by community groups; the Everyman has focused recently on work with BME communities. Director of Wellbeing & Culture to keep an overview of equality impacts.
10	10,800	10,800	0				The grant reduction may impact on the financial sustainability of the Festival of Performing Arts which provides performance opportunities for children and young people. Director of Wellbeing & Culture to keep an overview of equality impacts.
11	25,000	0	25,000				The increase in charges for allotments may impact on the ability of some individuals to afford their allotments. Director of Wellbeing & Culture to keep an overview on the equality impact of this proposal.
12	7,000	0	7,000				As above.
13	14,000	0	14,000				The price increases may impact on the ability of some customers to access leisure@. Director of Wellbeing & Culture to keep an overview on the equality impact of this proposal.
13a	15,000	0	15,000				None identified.
13b	45,000	45,000	0				None identified.
13c	3,000	0	3,000				This is a proposal for additional facilities for children and young people.
13d	3,000	0	3,000				None identified.
13e							Full value offset against possible loss of other business in the hall hires area in particular.

SAVINGS / ADDITIONAL INCOME

	2012-13 Savings / Addnl Income £	Built into Base Budget 2012/13 £	Not built into Base Budget 2012/13 £	FTE Losses 2011/12	FTE Losses 2012/13	Indicative equality / diversity impact at draft budget stage	Service / Risk Implications
14 BOX OFFICE BOOKING FEE INCREASE & RESTRUCTURE	48,000	0	48,000		2.0	The proposal will lead to a small increase in the cost of purchasing tickets from the Town Hall booking office therefore no detrimental equality impacts have been identified at this stage. Any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	
RESOURCES							
15 SOURCING STRATEGY - REVENUES & BENEFITS Savings from Systems Thinking	109,100	109,100	0	2.9		This is a large project which will have significant impacts on staff which needs to be subject to a stand alone equality impact assessment.	There is less resource to deal with any future additional demands on the service resulting from the move to universal credit.
16 FLEXIBLE RETIREMENT OF CUSTODIAN	5,000	0	5,000	0.4		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	There will be a reduced pool of staff to call on to maintain the out of hours opening times for the Municipal Offices.
17 RENEGOTIATION OF REGENT ARCADE LEASE (Cabinet approved on 26th July 2011)	75,000	75,000	0			None identified.	None
18 BUILD NEW HOMES BONUS INCOME INTO BASE BUDGET	250,000	0	250,000			None identified.	There may be less money available to fund one off projects previously funded from this income stream.
19 DEFERRED INCREASED CONTRIBUTION TO PROPERTY REPAIRS & RENEWALS RESERVE	200,000	0	200,000			None identified.	The annual programme of maintenance may have to be reduced in line with a reduced budget which could lead to a deterioration in the upkeep of the councils buildings and the towns infrastructure .
20 RESTRUCTURE IN REVENUES DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING RETIREMENT)	15,000	0	15,000	0.5		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	There is less resource to deal with any future additional demands on the service resulting from the move to universal credit.
BUILT ENVIRONMENT							
21 MERGING ON STREET AND OFF STREET PARKING TEAMS	10,000	0	10,000	1.0		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	There is a risk that if the council were to lose the current civil parking enforcement service provided on street on behalf of GCC, there would be significant financial implications in terms of support service and accommodation costs which would need to be established.
22 MERGER OF STRATEGIC LAND USE AND HOUSING ENABLING FUNCTIONS	14,500	0	14,500	2.0		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	A reduction in staffing capacity may make it difficult to deal with work volumes if there is an upturn in the number of applications. This situation will be kept under review.
23 REDUCE GRANTS TO REGENERATION PARTNERSHIPS (Oakley and Hesters Way Partnerships) Reduce both partnerships by £2k each per annum over 5 years.	4,000	4,000	0			None identified; the funding reduction was agreed last year and has been built into their current 3 year agreements.	Risks from reducing this funding support have been mitigated through dialogue with the affected organisations and phasing of the grant reductions over two years.
24 REORGANISATION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	25,000	0	25,000	1.0		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	Whilst there will be a reduction in initiatives providing direct financial support to individual businesses, the council's strategic approach will focus on activities aimed at fostering the conditions within which businesses have the best chance of success.
25 RESTRUCTURE OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT DIVISION	25,000	0	25,000	1.0		No specific equality impacts identified as part of this proposal - any staffing reorganisation will follow agreed procedures, including consultation with affected staff and Trade Unions to ensure fairness throughout the process.	There will be a reduction in strategic housing capacity which is likely to have some impact on the council's ability to contribute to partnership working in areas such as the supporting people programme.
26 SINGLE ADVICE CONTRACT RE-TENDER	25,000	0	25,000			This is a large procurement exercise which need to be subject to a stand alone equality impact assessment.	No significant risks to the authority have been identified.
27 CHARGE FOR DISCRETIONARY ADVICE IN RELATION TO LISTED BUILDINGS AND OTHER HERITAGE ASSETS	5,000	0	5,000			The price increases may impact on the ability of some customers to access this service.	If the council charges for this service, there is an increased risk that the owners of listed buildings and other heritage assets may undertake works without seeking the appropriate advice and consents.
TOTALS	1,115,500	253,900	861,600	7.9	4.9		

* As previously agreed by cabinet/council after discussion with the relevant organisations.

PROJECTION OF RESERVES TO 31ST MARCH 2013		2011/12		2011/12		2012/13		2012/13		2012/13		2012/13		31/3/13	
Purpose of Reserve		Movement		Capital		Movement		Capital		Revenue		Movement		Revenue	
		£		£		£		£		£		£		£	
		31/3/11		31/3/12		31/3/12		31/3/12		31/3/12		31/3/12		31/3/13	
<u>EARMARKED RESERVES</u>															
Other															
BR01	Single Status Reserve	(14,247.00)	3,600.00	(10,647.00)	(10,647.00)										(10,647.00)
BR02	Pension Reserve	(28,373.38)	(50,000.00)	(78,373.38)	(78,373.38)										(178,373.38)
BR04	Economic Development Reserve	(14,200.00)		(14,200.00)	(14,200.00)					(100,000.00)					(14,200.00)
BR05	IBS License Reserve	(148,700.00)		(148,700.00)	(148,700.00)										(148,700.00)
BR06	Keep Cheltenham Tidy Reserve	(626.27)		(626.27)	(626.27)										(626.27)
BR08	Grave Maintenance Reserve	0.00		0.00	0.00										0.00
BR09	Cultural Development Reserve	(22,361.00)		(22,361.00)	(22,361.00)					15,000.00					(7,361.00)
BR10	LABGI Reserve	(76,052.86)	45,000.00	(31,052.86)	(31,052.86)					10,000.00					(21,052.86)
BR12	House Survey Reserve	(105,024.83)	24,500.00	(80,524.83)	(80,524.83)					(7,500.00)					(88,024.83)
BR13	Twinning Reserve	(17,400.00)		(17,400.00)	(17,400.00)										(17,400.00)
BR14	Flood Alleviation Reserve	(348,093.52)	133,910.00	(214,183.52)	(214,183.52)					50,000.00					(164,183.52)
BR15	Art Gallery & Museum Development Reserve	(2,000,000.00)	(122,000.00)	(1,538,000.00)	(1,538,000.00)	584,000.00				1,416,000.00					(122,000.00)
BR25	Pump Room Insurance Reserve	(28,066.11)	11,000.00	(17,066.11)	(17,066.11)										(17,066.11)
BR26	Museum Shop Reserve	0.00		0.00	0.00										0.00
BR27	TIC Shop Reserve	(11,729.18)	11,700.00	(29.18)	(29.18)										(29.18)
BR30	GF Insurance Reserve	(159,871.44)	38,600.00	(121,371.44)	(121,371.44)										(121,371.44)
BR42	Vehicle Leasing Equalisation Reserve	(116,085.24)		(116,085.24)	(116,085.24)										(116,085.24)
BR45	Joint Core Strategy Reserve	(234,580.36)		(234,580.36)	(234,580.36)										(234,580.36)
BR54	Legal Staff Reserve	(19,350.00)		(19,350.00)	(19,350.00)										(19,350.00)
BR58	Civic Pride	(1,083,197.60)	258,100.00	(625,097.60)	(625,097.60)					226,900.00					(168,197.60)
		(4,428,058.79)		(3,489,648.79)	(3,489,648.79)					430,000.00					(1,449,248.79)
Repairs & Renewals Reserves															
BR52	Commuted Maintenance Reserve	(263,629.37)	39,000.00	(224,629.37)	(224,629.37)					39,000.00					(185,629.37)
BR78	Highways Insurance Reserve	(15,000.00)		(15,000.00)	(15,000.00)										(15,000.00)
BR63	Council Tax/Benefits IT Reserve	(30,000.00)		(30,000.00)	(30,000.00)										(30,000.00)
BR88	I.T. Repairs & Renewals Reserve	(133,064.70)	79,400.00	(53,664.70)	(53,664.70)					6,300.00					(47,364.70)
BR89	Planned Maintenance Reserve	(1,025,929.12)	(89,600.00)	(591,529.12)	(591,529.12)	524,000.00				(108,000.00)					(345,529.12)
		(1,467,623.19)		(914,823.19)	(914,823.19)					131,000.00					(623,523.19)

PROJECTION OF RESERVES TO 31ST MARCH 2013		Purpose of Reserve					
		31/3/11	2011/12	2011/12	2012/13	2012/13	31/3/13
		£	Movement Revenue	Movement Capital	Movement Revenue	Movement Capital	£
			£	£	£	£	£
<u>EARMARKED RESERVES</u>							
<u>Equalisation Reserves</u>							
BR63	Rent Allowances Equalisation	(119,655.60)	39,100.00		39,100.00		0.00
BR64	Planning Appeals Equalisation	(38,955.09)					(41,455.60)
BR65	Licensing Fees Equalisation	(28,355.00)	17,000.00				(38,955.09)
BR66	Interest Equalisation	(2,787,594.76)	2,500,000.00				(11,355.00)
BR72	Local Plan Equalisation	(55,030.00)	55,000.00				(287,594.76)
BR76	Elections/Electoral Reg. Equalisation	(11,500.00)	(61,200.00)		72,700.00		(30.00)
		(3,041,090.45)			(491,190.45)		(379,390.45)
BR91	Reserves for commitments Old Year Creditor Rsvs - RR	(351,200.00)	351,200.00				0.00
<u>CAPITAL</u>							
BR77	Capital Reserve - GF Housing	(902,476.15)	370,000.00				(532,476.15)
BR92	Capital Reserve - GF	(901,799.88)	(751,693.00)	928,300.00	(700,000.00)	620,000.00	(535,192.88)
		(1,804,275.83)			(1,257,668.83)		(1,067,668.83)
		(11,092,248.26)					(3,519,831.26)
TOTAL EARMARKED RESERVES							
<u>GENERAL FUND BALANCE</u>							
BS01	General Balance - RR	(2,619,507.03)	393,057.00	109,400.00	48,002.00		(2,069,048.03)
		(2,619,507.03)			(408,498.00)		(2,069,048.03)
TOTAL GENERAL FUND RESERVES AND BALANCES		(13,711,755.29)	2,925,674.00	2,515,700.00	(408,498.00)	2,167,000.00	(5,588,879.29)
Projected Annual Reduction							2,681,502.00

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Code	Fund	Scheme	Scheme Description	Original Scheme Cost	Payments to 31/03/11	Budget 2011/12 agreed 27/06/11	Revised Budget 2011/12	Budget 2012/13	Budget 2013/14	Budget 2014/15	Budget 2015/16	Budget 2016/17
				£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
		<u>RESOURCES</u>										
		Property Services										
Various	C/R	Programmed Maintenance	New cremators			655,000	524,000	131,000				
		Financial Services										
GCERP	C	GO ERP	Development of ERP system within the GO Partnership	421,700	212,309	209,400	209,400	1,200,000				
DC4002	C	Gloucestershire Airport	Contribution towards the redevelopment project - £1.2m loan			1,200,000	0					
		ICT										
DC3211	C	Working Flexibly	Deliver council services at a time and place which suit the customer. Implementation of Citrix environment to deliver business applications to the home / remote users desktop			35,300	35,300					
DC3213	C	Storage Area Network	Storage for the council's data in a secure, expandable and robust environment	155,000	142,297	12,700	12,700					
DC4003	C	Telephony switch upgrade	Upgrade of operating system, voice system and contacts centre with the benefit of future-proofing the council's system and adding flexibility.	70,300		70,300	70,300					
		<u>WELLBEING & CULTURE</u>										
		Parks & Gardens										
LC6001	S	S.106 Play area refurbishment	Developer Contributions			76,500	54,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
LC6006	C	Play Area Enhancement	Ongoing programme of maintenance and refurbishment of play areas to ensure they improve and meet safety standards			80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
LC6011	P	Pitville Park Boathouse	Enhancements to Pitville Park including the Boathouse bridge funded from Severn Trent Water Community Fund awarded following the floods in 2007.			72,000	72,000					
LC6015	P	Leckhampton Hill dry stone wall	Match funded with Natural England to construct dry stone walling on Leckhampton Hill sit of special scientific interest (SSSI)	620,000	677,363	0	0					
		Cemetery & Crematorium										
LC6022		Burial Chapel	Invest to save scheme to convert burial chapel to handle cremations.	110,000	99,829	10,100	10,100					
		Cultural Services										
LC4006	R/P	Art Gallery & Museum Development Scheme	Council's commitment to new scheme as agreed by Council 20th July 2008			1,000,000	2,030,000	4,270,000				
LC4007	C	Everyman Theatre	Contribution towards the redevelopment project - £1m loan and £250k grant	1,250,000		1,250,000	1,250,000					
		Community Safety										
EC0006	C	CCTV/Town Centre initiative	Expansion of on street CCTV in the town centre to increase safety and secure the environment			50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000

GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Code	Fund	Scheme	Scheme Description	Original Scheme Cost	Payments to 31/03/11	Budget 2011/12 agreed 27/06/11	Revised Budget 2011/12	Budget 2012/13	Budget 2013/14	Budget 2014/15	Budget 2015/16	Budget 2016/17
				£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
		BUILT ENVIRONMENT										
		Integrated Transport										
EC0033	C	CCTV in Car Parks	Additional CCTV in order to improve shopping areas and reduce fear of crime			104,800	14,800	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
EC0060	C	Car park management technology	The upgrade of the car park management technology at selected sites such as Regent Arcade is essential as the existing management systems and hardware have now reached the end of their life cycle.			250,000	130,000	120,000				
EC0051	C	Re-joining High Street/Promenade pedestrianised area	Re-joining works required to improve safety and appearance of the core commercial area	60,000	51,993	7,700	7,700					
		Housing										
HC7440	C/SCG	Disabled Facilities Grants	Mandatory Grant for the provision of building work, equipment or modifying a dwelling to restore or enable independent living, privacy, confidence and dignity for individuals and their families.			600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
HC7445	C	Adaptation Support Grant	Used mostly where essential repairs (health and safety) are identified to enable the DFG work to proceed (e.g. electrical works).			26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
HC7400	PSDH	Health & Safety Grant / Loans	A new form of assistance available under the council's Housing Renewal Policy 2003-06			324,400	324,400					
HC7405	PSDH	Vacant Property Grant	A new form of assistance available under the council's Housing Renewal Policy 2003-06									
HC7410	PSDH	Renovation Grants	Grants provided under the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996									
HC7455	LAA / C	Warm & Well	A Gloucestershire-wide project to promote home energy efficiency, particularly targeted at those with health problems			60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
HC9200	C/S	Housing Enabling	Expenditure in support of enabling the provision of new affordable housing in partnership with registered Social Landlords and the Housing Corporation			345,000	270,000					
HC9200	C/S	Housing Enabling	Transformational improvements to private households in St. Paul's to assist them in raising the standard of their dwellings in line with new build council housing stock.			55,000	130,000					
HC9200	C/S	Housing Enabling	Expenditure in support of enabling the provision of new affordable housing in partnership with Cheltenham Borough Homes			1,790,000	1,790,000	2,900,000				
		INTERIM BUDGET PROPOSALS FUTURE CAPITAL PROGRAMME:										
								270,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000

This page is intentionally left blank
Page 38

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
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)	Cabinet report / presentation	Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources
Plastic Bags	Scrutiny	Consider the issue of plastic bags by retailers and raise awareness	Discussion paper / presentation	Gill Morris, Climate Change & Sustainability Officer and Martin Quantock, Town Centre Manager (arranging speaker from M&S)
Meeting Date: 29 February 2012				
Chairs Briefing: 26 January 2012				
Deadline for papers: 17 February 2012				
DRAFT Corporate Strategy 2012-13	Scrutiny	Review DRAFT strategy for 2012-13 prior to Council (23 March)	Discussion paper	Richard Gibson, Policy and Partnership Manager
CBC Business Continuity Arrangements (to include Cold Weather Plan for England – tbc)	Scrutiny	Consider the arrangements for business continuity	Discussion paper	Grahame Lewis, Executive Director / Human Resources
Meeting Date: 30 May 2012				
Chairs Briefing: tbc				
Deadline for papers: 18 May 2012				
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				
Deadline for papers: 29 June 2012				
Third annual review of the Gloucestershire Airport – Green Policy	Scrutiny	Review of the Green Policy	Report	Gill Morris, Climate Change and Sustainability Officer

Item	Purpose	Outcome	What is required?	Lead Officer
------	---------	---------	-------------------	--------------

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
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