



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 30 November 2015
6.00 pm
Pittville Room - Municipal Offices

| Membership | |
|---------------------|---|
| Councillors: | Tim Harman (Chair), Colin Hay (Vice-Chair), Nigel Britter, Chris Mason, Sandra Holliday, Helena McCloskey, Dan Murch, John Payne, Chris Ryder and Max Wilkinson |

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 26 October 2015 | (Pages 3 - 14) |
| 4. | PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS | |
| 5. | MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE | |
| 6. | FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED Police and Crime Panel (05 November) - verbal update from Councillor McCloskey | |
| 7. | CABINET BRIEFING A verbal update from the Cabinet on key issues for Cabinet Members which may be of interest to Overview and Scrutiny and may inform the O&S workplan | |
| 8. | ICT STRATEGY AND UPDATE ON THE STG RECOMMENDATIONS Consider progress against the STG recommendation which were agreed by the committee in October 2012 (Rachel McKinnon and Mark Sheldon to be in attendance to answer any questions) | (Pages 15 - 20) |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 9. | | REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE AT END OF QUARTER 2 (APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 2015) Discussion paper of the Strategy and Engagement Manager (no decision required) | (Pages 21 - 34) |
| 10. | | JOINT WASTE COMMITTEE DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN 2016-19 Discussion paper of Steve Read, Head of Service – Joint Waste Committee (no decision required) | (Pages 35 - 42) |
| 11. | | CHELTENHAM TOURISM PROJECT UPDATE Verbal update from O&S representatives on the Cabinet Member Working Group (Councillors C.Hay, Payne. Ryder and Wilkinson) | |
| 12. | | UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS | (Pages 43 - 44) |
| 13. | | REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN To review the scrutiny workplan and identify any additional topics. | (Pages 45 - 48) |
| 14. | | DATE OF NEXT MEETING 25 January 2016 | |
| | | | |

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

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 26th October, 2015
6.00 - 8.05 pm**

| Attendees | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Councillors: | Tim Harman (Chair), Nigel Britter, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Max Wilkinson and Klara Sudbury (Reserve) |
| Also in attendance: | Councillor Coleman (Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment), Councillor Jordan (Leader), Wilf Tomaney (Townscape Manager), Councillor Walklett (Cabinet Member Corporate Services), Fiona Warin (Green Space & Allotment Officer) and Councillor Whyborn |

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Murch, Hay and Ryder had given their apologies. Councillor Sudbury substituted for Councillor Hay.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

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

Councillor Sudbury highlighted that her name featured twice in the list of attendees. This would be amended.

The Chairman advised that Councillor Ryder had asked that her request that a member of the opposition from each partner be permitted a seat on the Joint Committee, be referenced under the 2020 Vision item (Agenda Item 10). The minutes would be updated accordingly.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 21 September 2015, as amended, be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS

None had been received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters had been referred to the committee.

6. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED

There had been no meetings of countywide scrutiny groups since the last meeting of this committee.

Councillor McCloskey did however, explain that one of the Independent Members of the Police and Crime Panel had sadly passed away after a long period of illness. Two candidates had been interviewed but neither had been considered suitable and as such another advertisement would be placed in the coming weeks. She asked that members promote this role to people that had an interest in the policing of the County and confirmed that full training would be provided.

7. CABINET BRIEFING

The Leader provided a brief update on 2020 vision since the Council meeting the previous week. He confirmed that all four partners had now agreed the key principles and work was now progressing on devising a timetable for the new services, which he noted did not include GO Shared Services and ICT which would form part of 2020 from the 1st April 2016. He reminded members that a cross-party group had been established to look at various aspects and that this would include involvement in service design.

The Chairman advised that it had been suggested that scrutiny look at customer focus as a particular issue and voiced his preference that this be reviewed by the entire committee rather than by a Scrutiny Task Group. The Leader assured members that the cross-party group would be looking at this very issue, among other things, but was comfortable that O&S may want to look at particular areas in more detail.

8. GROWING PLACES - ALLOTMENT STRATEGY

The Green Space & Allotment Officer introduced the draft Allotments Strategy 2015 (Growing Places). The strategy considered supply and demand for allotments in Cheltenham now and since 2005, as well as feedback from a customer satisfaction survey, to which a third of allotment holders (247) responded in early 2015. An action plan set out proposed activities for five key areas: allotment management; infrastructure, protection, provision and health & safety. One proposal was for the option to use some of the money currently set aside for new allotment provision for allotment site improvements (site security, health & safety and provision for disabled gardeners) instead. She explained that overall, those allotment holders that responded to the survey, were satisfied with the service provision, with 83% considering it to be good or very good. The main issue that was identified as a result of the survey was the need for additional security measures at two sites, where 60% of allotment holders had been the victims of crime in the last 5 years. Feedback on rent was that it was now at the upper level of what some people would be willing to pay.

The Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment felt that allotments provided a significant public service to residents across the town as well as representing great value and that the high level of satisfaction with the service was, in no small part, thanks to the work of the Green Space and Allotment Officer. He hoped that Councillors appreciated that the things had changed drastically since allotments were reviewed by a task group in 2012, when media coverage had resulted in an inflated waiting list; the position was rather different now. The strategy had already been considered by the Allotments Association,

Page 5

it would be considered by Cabinet in November and this was an opportunity for scrutiny to make any comments or suggestions.

The following responses were given to member questions;

- Clearly the Cabinet Member Finance would prefer that allotments were self-financing but in reality rent covered approximately 80% of the direct cost of the allotment service (water rates, Allotments Officer, etc) and legal advice was that rents were at the upper level of what the council could legally charge. There was an argument that allotments were a form of leisure service and other leisure services and recreational areas were funded by the council. It was estimated that 6-7k people were benefiting from allotments across the borough.
- Legal advice was that the council had no statutory obligation to provide anybody living in a parished area with an allotment. In spite of this the council had always accepted applications from people living in parishes but this became an issue 4-5 years ago but actioned more recently 2-3yrs ago, when the waiting lists were at their longest, these people were accepted onto the waiting list on the basis that priority could be given to those living in non-parished areas. As mentioned before the waiting list had now drastically reduced and this was no longer an issue but it was noted that those living in parishes were not taken into consideration when assessing the need for new non-parish provision.
- The demographic of allotment holders had changed in recent years and where it had previously been older males, investments in toilets, etc, had attracted more females and families; with up to 70% of some (the) current waiting lists being females. The majority of new allotment holders were taking on plots as a healthy hobby and to supplement their weekly shop and in line with demand, plots had gotten smaller. There was also more of a social community at each allotment site, which was in part, due to the facilities, as well as the change in profile of allotment holders.
- The council advised all allotment holders against storing anything of monetary or sentimental value in their sheds and to refrain from using locks to demonstrate this to any would be thieves. Typically it was November nights at the Hayden Lane site when all sheds would be broken into and the reports were for vandalism (breaking of the lock) rather than for theft, with only 20% having reported that anything had been taken. Media coverage, both locally and nationally, had been blamed for two instances whereby a number of sheds had been broken into.
- Legal advice was that the council was not permitted to provide new provision for people living in parished areas and this included Up Hatherley, where unfortunately there were no parish council allotments either.
- The STG in 2012 looked at allotments and a number of sites where it was hoped that the land could be handed over to parishes, but legal reiterated the point that no borough council money could be spent on allotment provision for people living in parished areas.
- All medium to large scale developments were asked to provide allotments. The plan for the Leckhampton site included a large number of allotments and any plans for the North West of Cheltenham would be expected to do the same.

- A checklist had been developed which set out the level of commitment required from allotment holders. Similar information was also available on the website and take-up was now lower, with almost 50% of people deciding that they could not make the required commitment. Applicants were able to defer their take up of a plot until such time as they had the time and capacity to manage one.
- The plots that had been developed for disabled plot holders had been developed specifically for those individuals. The risk of making provision for disabled plot holders at every site would be that there were no holders to fill them, given the cost associated with adding raised beds, etc. General improvements to access and pathways had been significant and would be beneficial to all allotment holders.
- Hayden 2 was a site that lent itself well to use by community groups and had been used by County Community Projects, an NHS group working in the Mental Health area, Schools, Vision 21 and a group of Bangladeshi ladies.
- The 3 strikes rule which had been adopted after the 2012 STG review seemed to be working and this coupled with the rent rise (from £8 to £40-50 per annum) A few senior citizens with very small plots had been paying as little as £8, which was not enough for them to give up the plot if they were not getting much use out of it. With most people now paying in the region of £40 to £50 per annum, it was enough to make people think twice about the value for money of their allotment and hand it back if they were not getting very much use from it. This had resulted in only 5% of plot holders having complained about unkempt plots. The Cabinet Member felt that it was important not to be too rigid about enforcements because of personal circumstances and it was important for the team to be able to use their discretion where necessary.
- There was no evidence that people on lower incomes were not taking up plots or were leaving because of the cost and if they were not included in the list within the strategy of those taking up plots, then this was simply an omission. This was not measured however, and whilst the option to provide a concession had been explored and there would be costs associated with administering concessions whereas the cost of the allotment for those on low incomes was not considered to be prohibitive. The invoices were sent out in January of each year and there were two options for payment, a one-off lump sum or monthly instalments which equated to approximately £1 per week.

The Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment thanked members for a valuable discussion and confirmed that some amendments would be made to reflect their comments, before it was taken to Cabinet in November. He also took the opportunity to thank the Green Space and Allotment Officer for drafting the strategy and for all of her work with the allotment holders.

No decision was required.

9. CHELTENHAM SPA RAILWAY STATION SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT

Councillor Whyborn introduced the STG report as circulated with the agenda. He had considered it a privilege to Chair the group as well as being some of the most interesting work he had undertaken in his time as a councillor. He felt it was important to highlight some key events between September 2014 and July 2015, by which time the group had concluded its review, before talking through the recommendations. First Great Western (FGW) were awarded an extension

of 3.5 years to the London service franchise by the Department for Transport (DfT) and as such the ambition for the task group to better understand the franchise renewal process was superseded by events. Then in late 2014, the Western Route Study, published by Network Rail, which included proposals for an enhanced train service from Cheltenham to London; it was subsequently announced that there would be an hourly service to Paddington from Cheltenham in 2017/18 and a longer term objective for journey times to Paddington of below 2 hours. The task group devised a motion which was considered and passed by Council in December 2014 and was duly submitted as a response to the consultation. The task group met with representatives from Network Rail and FGW in March 2015 and were able to press upon them the perceived priorities for Cheltenham's train service and the station itself.

In descending order he offered a brief explanation to each of the recommendations of the task group. The group accepted that not everything could be categorised as a priority and with this in mind had devised recommendation 3, which set out a number of matters which the group felt it was important were kept in mind in future. The group acknowledged with concern, that a consequence of increased services to London would be an increased pressure on the rail network and the need to terminate additional trains at Cheltenham, putting significant pressure on the single siding. It was important to note that Network Rail had, for the first time, recognised that there was an issue at Cheltenham. The task group supported the proposal for 2 bay platforms, not as the only solution, but as the only solution that had been developed at this time. Recommendation 1 identified the major issues and some of the limitations of Cheltenham Station. Passenger numbers had doubled since the 1990's and once they exceeded 2 million the station would be put into another Category and this would pose issues, especially to non-able bodied passengers. He referred members to Appendix 2 of the STG report, a letter from Clare Perry MP at the DfT. He stressed that though this could easily be perceived as a case of 'job done', it should be noted that whilst a significant programme of investment and improvements was planned, not all allocation of monies was complete and therefore there were no guarantees as to if; how; or indeed when the improvements would happen. He suggested that the reference to devolution would have been more detailed had the report been drafted and finalised more recently, but the report itself did suggest that the County should lobby for powers similar to those given to Transport for London. Stagecoach were a business and therefore ran services largely on commercial merits only, but the task group were of the opinion that this did not necessarily result in a service that met the needs of everyone. It was clear that first tier authorities had regular discussions with transport providers and the group felt that second tier authorities needed to be represented to ensure that local issues were taken into account.

In response to a question from a member of the committee, Councillor Whyborn explained that as part of a conventional structure CBC were not responsible for transport, but as part of a combined authority we would be in a position to help shape transport services across the county and he viewed this as a paramount for the county as part of the devolution bid.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Whyborn for his attendance and for the work of the task group on this issue. He was also keen that communication with residents living near the train station was maintained so that they were kept

informed of what was happening. The committee were reminded that a follow-up would be scheduled for 12 months and that the Managing Director of the Cheltenham Development Task Force had been asked to keep O&S informed of any developments.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the recommendations as set out in the Scrutiny Task Group report be agreed and Cabinet be recommended to:

- 1. Authorise the Managing Director of the Cheltenham Task force in conjunction with the Leader of the Council to undertake the following tasks and to report progress to O&S in 12 months' time;**
 - **To proactively lobby the relevant parties for all improvements in Phase 1A and 1B as listed in the table at 5.1.3 of the task group report.**
 - **Being mindful of devolution, particularly the integration of transport, to continue dialogue with Gloucestershire County Council, Local Economic Partnership and others; in particular to pursue all possible opportunities to improve public transport links to/from Cheltenham Spa station.**
 - **Publicise Smartcard and PlusBus opportunities in the area.**
 - **In view of the fact that some funding levels and finalised proposals for all of the improvements to the station have not yet been announced, to keep O&S informed of any developments.**
- 2. Note that whilst the service improvements announced by FGW are to be welcomed, it should be acknowledged, with concern, that a consequence of the increased services to London will be increased pressure on the rail network in the need to terminate additional trains. Thus Phase 2 will be even more necessary than it is a present.**
- 3. To note the other relevant matters raised;**
 - **On the north/south route, though train services are fairly frequent, there is concern that lack of route capacity may stifle traffic, and hence modal shift to rail in the future, with too high a proportion of traffic going by road.**
 - **The rolling stock on some local services, particularly operated by Arrive trains, if life-expired, and should be a factor when this franchise is renewed.**
 - **The train service to Worcester remains poor and is not addressed by the recent proposals.**
 - **The potential for future improvements through both electrification and re-signalling on the Bristol-Birmingham line**

is to be welcomed.

10. CYCLING & WALKING SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REPORT

Councillor Wilkinson, Chairman of the scrutiny task group, introduced the report, as circulated with the agenda. He felt that there were legitimate reasons for the review, given the need to reduce congestion and improve air quality within the borough. National and internationally renowned experts including John Mallows of Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign and Bronwen Thornton of Walk21 were co-opted onto the group, which held a series of meetings and heard evidence from a range of people including Officers from Cheltenham Borough and Gloucestershire County Councils. Members of the group also organised a seminar on 20's plenty (a national campaign to reduce speed in urban areas) and undertook a site visit to Bristol to witness, first hand, examples of good practice in cycling infrastructure and promotion. He accepted that none of the recommendations alone would solve the issues facing cycling and walking but felt that collectively they would go some way. He took this opportunity to thank Tess Beck, who had recently left Democratic Services, for her hard work and enthusiasm throughout the review.

Councillor Wilkinson, along with the Townscape Manager, gave the following responses to member questions;

- All members of the task group agreed that it was not ideal for cyclists and pedestrians to share footpaths but opinion was split about whether cyclists should be permitted on the Promenade and high street in Cheltenham. Councillor Wilkinson's opinion was that both were wide enough to not pose the same problem as cycling on pavements, provided cyclists were responsible.
- The Townscape manager felt that the problem with high street was that there were a number of regimes; some areas permitted vehicles, cycles or neither and some even permitted buses and his general feeling was that there was a need for some consistency. As part of the considerations of the Cheltenham Transport Plan, thought would be given to what to include about cycling. Those that argued that cycling should be permitted throughout did so on the grounds that there would always be someone that would break the rules but that the majority would not.
- The Transport Plan proposed that the regime for buses would remain unchanged except for a possible route across the front of Boots, which would equate to a length of 5-10 metres only. There was a lot of evidence that the more that you segregated drivers from their surroundings, with railing for example, the faster they would drive and railings severely disadvantaged pedestrians.
- The argument for 'no helmets' was a view that was held strongly by cycling groups, in an effort to normalise cycling and make it a more attractive proposition to a broader range of people. The task group were not suggesting that cyclists should be advised not to wear helmets but rather that any promotional images should feature cyclists without helmets rather than presenting a stereotypical image of cyclists wearing helmets and hi-vis clothing.
- Evidence suggested that lower speed limits reduced congestion and it was a fact that the impact of a collision at 20mph was far reduced than a collision at 30mph. The recommendation of the task group was that an assessment of the appetite for a 20mph limit across the town should be sought from residents and advice from Officers had been that it was far easier to apply for a Traffic

Regulation Order for a default 20mph limit and then exclude main routes from it, rather than to apply for a number of smaller areas.

- The task group did not approach the Police for their view on a 20mph speed limit because enforcement was not a pertinent issue. Most motorists abide by speed limits, which means any new limit would likely be successful due to compliance rather than enforcement.
- A Disability Group was established, which included a group from Birmingham who represented guide dog users, to consider the layout of new street designs. It was that group that recommended the 60mm. There had been an argument that flush curbs would better aid those with mobility issues but 60mm was favoured by those with visual impairments. It was accepted that the colour differential between the gutter and the kerb had not been as markedly different as the sample that was agreed with the group, but had been built exactly as agreed.
- It was true that people would be more inclined to walk or cycle in more attractive areas but it was important to note GCC would approach function before form.

Whilst members of the committee commended the report which they felt had captured the enthusiasm and hard work of the task group, some members had concerns about some of the recommendations. Members were uneasy that cycling should be permitted on the Promenade and High Street. These two areas were the main thoroughfare for shoppers and increased footfall was an ambition which seemed in conflict with allowing cycling throughout. The recommendation which concerned members the most was the recommendation for 20mph limits across the borough. Concerns included; cost, there would be a cost associated with the TRO needed to implement this and that cost would need to be funded by GCC and there was query about whether they had the budget to do this; the task group had used Bristol as an example of where the 20mph limits had been imposed, but it had cost £2.2m to implement and some members disputed the claim that it had been successful having experienced it themselves or having researched public opinion. The committee acknowledged that there were areas in Cheltenham that would welcomed and benefit from a 20mph speed limit but queried the blanket approach being suggested by the task group. Members were also apprehensive about cyclists being encouraged not to wear a helmet.

Councillor Wilkinson reminded members that the group was not encouraging cyclists not to wear a helmet, the issue was restricted to presentation of cycling in promotional materials rather than advice. He added that whilst the debate had focussed on 20mph limits and cycling in the Promenade, there were in fact 12 recommendations , which if all enacted, would increase the mental and physical health of Cheltenham and its residents and hoped that the committee would endorse the task group recommendations to enable further consideration by Cabinet.

The Chairman reiterated that despite some of the concerns raised by the committee, the hard work of the task group was evident and thanked members and those that had supported them for their efforts. He asked that the views of the committee be shared with Cabinet in November.

Upon a vote it unanimously

RESOLVED that the recommendations as set out in Appendix 2 of the covering report be agreed and forwarded to Cabinet for consideration;

- i. Rec 1: Identify opportunities for improving cycle route permeability and cycle parking in areas outside the town centre.** A lot of work has been done on removing barriers within the town centre and most of these proposals have been included in the Cheltenham Transport Plan. There is still work to be done outside the centre.
- i. Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign's wish list for improvements to Cheltenham's cycle network. Once agreed, the authority should put aside funds each year to pay for the items suggested, or proactively identify and bid for funds to pay for the suggestions and encourage the County Council to do the same. These could be added to a costed wish list of improvements, which could then be added to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) 123 lists or included in funding bids.
- ii. **An equivalent exercise should be undertaken for walking.** Councillors should work with residents and walking experts to draw up a wish list of improvements for residents. Locations should be identified for benches and funding identified for maintenance.
- ii. **Rec 2: Gloucestershire County Council should investigate and engage with Cheltenham residents in order to promote a borough wide 20mph default speed limit to make the environment safer and more attractive to walkers and cyclists.** A default speed limit does not mean that all roads will have a 20mph limit. Selected roads will have a higher speed limit, and a few may have an even lower limit. The Council should also investigate the possibility of securing additional funding for this from public health budgets.
- iii. **Rec 3: Gloucestershire County Council should undertake an assessment aimed at removing guard rails, which are a key barrier to walking and encourage faster vehicle speeds.**
- iv. **Rec 4: Benches should be strategically positioned along routes to allow people to rest – on inclines, at attractive viewpoints, at nodal points on the street and transport network (bus stops in particular.** Benches are an important part of any walking strategy, for elderly and disabled people in particular. They need to be well maintained and comfortable.
- v. **Rec 5: Cheltenham Borough Council should work with the Cheltenham**

Trust and Gloucestershire County Council to promote cycling and walking within Cheltenham, especially once Thinktravel loses its LSTF funding in 2016.

- i. Images of cycling and walking in Cheltenham Borough Council and Cheltenham Trust promotional material should depict them as attractive and normal activities for everybody.
- ii. The Cheltenham.gov.uk page: *Walking in Cheltenham* should be improved to promote walking within the borough.
- iii. Cheltenham Borough Council should work with Cheltenham Trust to create maps of walking routes within the town.
- vi. **Rec 6: The needs of walkers and cyclists should be considered before other road users when making policy and planning decisions, and their needs should be considered at the start of any major planning project.**
 - i. At the start of any major project when the equality impact statement is carried out, the needs of cyclists and walkers should be considered (as two separate categories).
 - ii. Cycling and walking are not the same mode and their needs should be considered separately in all policies and plans.
 - iii. The planning hierarchy of transport modes adopted by the JCS should also be adopted by the Cheltenham Plan and applied to planning and policy decisions.

| Hierarchy of Transport Modes | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Highest | 1. Pedestrians and people with mobility difficulties 2. Cyclists 3. Public transport and social/ community services 4. Access by commercial vehicles 5. Ultra-low emission vehicles |
| Lowest | 6. Other motorised vehicles |

- iv. Increased cycling provision should not be at the expense of walkers. Ideally cycle provision should not be on the footway. Where traffic speeds make it necessary, good quality segregation should be provided for bikes on the highway.
- v. If people are to be encouraged to walk, pedestrians need to have an at least equal level of service as other methods of transport and positive provision of space and safe crossing points. Their needs should be considered in the design of all public space including car parks.

- vi. Walking is a particularly important mode of transport for some groups of people such as those with visual impairment or other disabilities. The needs of these groups should be considered in planning and policy decisions.
- vii. The Cheltenham Plan will consider the inclusion of separate walking and cycling policies.
- vii. **Rec 7: A cycling and walking working group should be created to provide input into projects.** This could operate in a similar way to the access working group with Wilf Tomaney as the facilitator.
- viii. **Rec 8: Cheltenham Borough Council should endorse the Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy and draw up its own walking strategy.** The Gloucestershire County Council Cycling Strategy is likely to be adopted this municipal year. Cheltenham Borough Council could resolve to endorse it and take on some of its recommendations. There is no equivalent County Council strategy for walking, which strengthens the case for CBC producing its own walking strategy.
- ix. **Rec 9: Cheltenham Borough Council should select a cycling and walking champion from its members.** This member could represent CBC on the GCC Cycle Forum.
- x. **Rec 10: Cheltenham Borough Council should lead by example by devising and implementing its own green staff travel plan.**
- xi. **Rec 11: Cheltenham Borough Council should consider the introduction of Car Free Sundays.** This would involve the shutting of defined town centre streets to traffic one Sunday per month to allow for community events, following the example of successful schemes elsewhere.
- xii. **Rec 12: Cheltenham Borough Council should push for a more collaborative approach on street design, working across disciplines and departments and also across councils (County and Borough).**

11. **UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS**

The Democracy officer referred members to the update which had been circulated with the agenda. She confirmed that given that the committee had endorsed the final reports and recommendations of the Cheltenham Spa Railway Station and Cycling & Walking STGs, that there were only two remaining active STGs; Devolution and Broadband.

Devolution – the STG had met for the first time on the 12/10 and devised a draft One Page Strategy. This document had been circulated with the agenda and the committee were being asked to approve it, which it did. The STG were scheduled to meet again on the 29/10 and hoped to be in a position to give their

initial views direct to the special Council meeting which had been arranged for 16/10.

Broadband – members were reminded that they had chosen not to set ambitions or outcomes for the review given that this was to be a joint scrutiny group with members from Gloucester City Council. She explained that the group had met for the first time on the 20/10 but having had a presentation from Fastershire on the current position, the group had been unable to agree any ambitions for the review until they had considered more evidence. As such, there was no draft One Page Strategy for the committee to approve at this time. This would follow in due course.

12. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The Chairman reiterated that there may be an item relating to 2020 and customer focus and that this would be scheduled accordingly.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 30 November 2015.

Tim Harman
Chairman

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview & Scrutiny – 30th November 2015

Progress review on the implementation of the ICT strategy which came out of the ICT review in 2012/13

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 Members have requested an update on the progress of the ICT infrastructure upgrade strategy, which was a product of the ICT commissioning review undertaken in 2012/13.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 An Overview and Scrutiny task group was set up in July 2012 to assess whether the current ICT service was resilient and fit for purpose and to help define the outcomes for the ICT commissioning exercise which was about to initiate.
- 2.2 In November they reconvened to review the aftermath of the ICT virus and satisfy themselves that all the necessary actions had been put in place.
- 2.3 The task group supported many of the findings of the ICT review carried out in 2011 but through their recommendations highlighted a number of areas which needed to be addressed. These included:
- difficulties with resources and staff morale and the task group recommended that Senior Leadership Team (SLT) ensure the necessary strategic lead is given to the service and its staff
 - disaster recovery must be reviewed to ensure the best long-term option is adopted

- councillors ICT facilities must be addressed as part of the ICT review

All the recommendations of the task group were accepted by Cabinet and input into the outcomes of the ICT commissioning review.

The overall ambition for ICT was:

A modern, in touch and innovative ICT service, which is an integral part of the business that understands and responds to the complex needs of the Council and its partners enabling delivery of services in innovative, effective and efficient ways.

3. Summary of evidence/information

The following table provides an update for each of the recommendations identified by the ICT Scrutiny Task Group in their report of September 2012.

| ICT STG recommendations | Position statement – November 2015 |
|---|---|
| i. the Senior Leadership Team ensure the necessary strategic lead is given to the service and its staff. | Complete; A shared ICT service between Cheltenham and Forest of Dean was established in 2013. Forest of Dean District Council adopted the lead position. A Joint Monitoring and Liaison Group (JMLG) was set up to provide the necessary overview and strategic lead to the programme/service. As a result of the emerging 2020 Vision programme, late 2014 saw the creation of a secondary group tasked specifically with ICT strategy. This group, the ICT Leadership Board consists of representation from CBC, FoDDC, WODC, and CDC. CBH attend as a client representative for CBH, UBICO and Cheltenham Trust. The ICT Leadership Board has been pivotal to the delivery of the alignment and stabilisation work, necessary for a proposed 4-way ICT shared service. |
| ii. a long-term ICT infrastructure investment plan is put in place as part of the current budget cycle and as an essential element to support the ICT commissioning review. | Complete; CBC Cabinet agreed the investment proposals laid out in the 2012 ICT Review business case. An ICT programme was initiated to manage and deliver the strategy. Additional funding |

| | |
|---|---|
| | was approved by Council in July 2015 to support further ICT infrastructure upgrade work which is now almost complete. |
| iii. the impact of GO, and other IT applications on the council's current ICT infrastructure, and network performance, be reviewed and fully understood as part of the ICT commissioning review. | Complete; The redesigned ICT infrastructure has been scaled to an appropriate level to deal with the current customer base, while factoring in future 2020 Vision aspirations. Works are underway to decommission the standalone legacy infrastructure that currently hosts the GO ERP solution. The new infrastructure will be the same as is used for all other business applications. Thereby benefiting from improved resilience and performance. |
| iv. the impact of the council's accommodation strategy on any decisions regarding expenditure (or delay in expenditure) on ICT infrastructure are fully understood | Complete; A significant proportion of the ICT capital investment made to date is transferable in the event a decision is made to vacate the Municipal Offices. The only investment not recoverable is the works in relation to the wide area network data circuits. |
| v. the cost and operational impact of the requirements of Government Connect should be assessed by the Director of Resources and if significant then the Cabinet Member should consider making higher representations to government. | Complete; The Cabinet Office has relaxed their previously resource intensive compliance process. A successful joint submission was made by CBC and FoDDC for 2015 with no requirement for consultancy services. The partnership working which has arisen due to 2020 vision has resulted in the sharing of knowledge and expertise and further alignment of infrastructure which will facilitate a simplified approach and sharing of the cost of achieving future PSN accreditation. |
| vi. the options for disaster recovery should be reviewed in discussion with our GO partners to ensure the best long-term solution is adopted as part of the commissioning review and the council continues to review and enhances its | Ongoing; The ICT Shared Service has undertaken an exercise with the support of external consultancy services to define and implement a set of DR/BC policies and procedures. This exercise was undertaken collaboratively with partners. Deliverables included a DR strategy, |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>plans on an ongoing basis.</p> | <p>scorecard, invocation plan and recovery plan. A schedule of live business application recovery tests is also undergoing planning.</p> <p>From a technology standpoint, recent works include the implementation of reciprocal DR infrastructure at CBC, FoDDC, CDC and WODC. This will provide the foundation for business system recovery opportunities at any of the partner sites.</p> |
| <p>vii. requirements for members ICT support are fully specified as an outcome from the commissioning review and that any services offered to members are fully compliant with data security requirements relating to Government Connect.</p> | <p>Complete; Section 4.9 of the ICT infrastructure upgrade strategy. The ICT shared service provides hardware in the form of iPads, the software needed to allow the use of personal devices and the secure access to Council systems. All of which are compliant with the data security requirements relating to the PSN Code of Connection.</p> |
| <p>viii. the roll out of remote working facilities to all members should be progressed with a view to offering all members this option by end of November 2012 and ensure necessary support facilities are put in place.</p> | <p>Complete; All members have been issued with security access and tokens when required for remote working. The rollout was underpinned with a face to face training program.</p> |
| <p>ix. the options of providing Wi-Fi to members and the public in the Municipal Offices is progressed</p> | <p>Complete; A guest Wi-Fi service is now available at the Municipal Offices. Users are required to register to use the service. Full instructions are provided when the hotspot is selected from the user device.</p> |
| <p>x. the Democratic Services Manager should be requested to contact all members giving them the opportunity to raise any concerns they may have with the revised members ICT provision in the context of the Members Allowance Scheme which can then be forwarded to the IRP if these are of a significant level.</p> | <p>Members raised a number of issues with the IRP and they made a recommendation to Council, which was agreed, that the basic allowance should be increased by £100 per annum to cover the cost of their home working facilities.</p> |

4. Next Steps

The committee may wish to identify any further areas they wish to follow up.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Background Papers | 2012_12_11_CAB_ICT Review Business Case 1-00Report 2012_12_11_CAB_ICT Review Business Case 1-00AppA 2012_12_11_CAB_ICT Review Business Case 1-00AppB Security Task Group Report – ICT Review (Sep 2012) |
| Contact Officer | Sanjay Mistry, Programme Manager, 01242 264331, sanjay.mistry@cheltenham.gov.uk |
| Accountability | Cabinet Member Corporate Services, Councillor Jon Walklett |
| Scrutiny Function | Overview & Scrutiny Committee |

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

30 November 2015

Review of the council's performance at end of Quarter 2 (April to September 2015)

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

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 To review the corporate performance of the organisation at the end of quarter 2 (April to September 2015)
- 1.2 To make any comments and observations on the presentation of the performance information.
- 1.3 To make requests for further information where this might clarify understanding of corporate performance.

2. Background

- 2.1 The performance report takes information and data from our performance management system to provide elected members with an overview of how the council is performing. This enables elected members to input into discussions about how to resolve areas where there maybe performance concerns and also to recognise where performance is better than expected.
- 2.2 The report summarises how the council performed in regard to the published milestones, performance indicators and outcomes set out in the 2015-16 action plan that was agreed by Council on 30th March 2015.
- 2.3 The full performance report is attached as appendix A.

3. Q2 Performance Overview










3.1 Corporate Strategy milestones

In the 2015-16 action plan, we identified 78 milestones to track our progress. Out of these:

- 8 (10%) are complete
- 50 (64%) are green and are on track to be delivered on time
- 20 (26%) are amber, there are some concerns about the deliverability of the project – Overview and Scrutiny may wish to review these.
- 0 are red

The 20 amber milestones are:

| Improvement Action | Milestones | Status | Q2 Progress |
|--------------------|------------|--------|-------------|
|--------------------|------------|--------|-------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01D - Consideration of Community Infrastructure Levy |  | Detailed viability issues raised through CIL consultation. Work ongoing with consultants DVS and PBA to address issues raised. Project Board for CIL re-established. Revised programme being reviewed in context of capacity constraints affected by resources needed to deliver JCS and Cheltenham Plan. Predicted end date amended. A more defined programme will be available for the next update. |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03C - Review garden waste charging systems |  | CBC has just procured a new system for managing the garden waste customer data, so this action has been superseded. The proposal is to review each of the charging systems (incl. CBC) and present a report to the JWC SMG - however with the other projects underway including 20:20 it's unlikely that any system changes will be made for the time being. |
| | ENV 03D - Swindon Road recycling centre review |  | This review is being co-ordinated with a review taking place of the GCC Household Recycling Centres and is likely to roll into the 2016/17 action plan. |
| ECON 02 - We will work in partnership with key stakeholders to agree a strategic approach to deliver our economic outcome; including how best we use the JCS and Cheltenham Development Task Force activities | ECON 02C - Report to Cabinet with recommended actions |  | The Council's economic strategy will be underpinned by decisions about site allocations arising from the conclusion of the JCS and Cheltenham Plan processes, both of which are making good progress. Capacity to progress the strategy as been limited, but will be addressed by implementation of the REST restructure agreed by Council on 20th July 2015. Member working group established to progress Car parking strategy, with identified links to Economic development, MTFs, Capital investment and Tourism strategies. |
| ECON 03 - We will implement the revised and updated governance arrangements for Gloucestershire Airport Ltd | ECON 03B - Implementation of updated articles of association and shareholder agreement |  | Articles of association and shareholder agreement are in the process of being reviewed with the airport board. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04A - Support the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan |  | GCC approved the Cheltenham Transport Plan on 22/07/15 with implementation on a phased basis and Boots Corner as a trial. This approval has allowed Blackrock and John Lewis to confirm their intentions for the Beechwood Shopping Centre which was predicated on adjustments to the traffic flow in Albion Street. Initial phase of transport plan targeted for February 2016 with further phases July 2016 and a trial at Boots Corner spring 2017; if the latter is successful CBC will work with GCC and fund a £2m public realm upgrade. Retailers remain fully supportive of scheme implementation. |
| | ECON 04B - Continue implementation of public realm works |  | Bennington Street to Boots Corner works completed. Negotiations with GCC have identified potential additional targets for this financial year of completing the outstanding Prom phase 3 by Neptunes Fountain and refurbishment of the pedestrianised Promenade once phone boxes have been returned from their refurbishment. Plans to deliver the further upgrades to High St East are being prepared now that the future of Beechwood Shopping Centre confirmed. |
| | ECON 04D - Work with Gloucestershire Local Transport Board, Network Rail and First Great Western on the delivery of upgrades at Cheltenham Spa Railway station |  | Railway partners now fully behind a first phase which will see c£5m investment in next 18 months. Funding secured from Cycle-Rail fund, GLTB, Access for All, National Station Improvement Fund. Awaiting outcome of GWR bid for additional 70 surface car space which will allow time for a the development of a further bid for a decked car park and in the future potential for additional bay platforms. The commitment to improved hourly services to London may hasten the requirement for the latter. |
| | ECON 04E - Support delivery of key sites such as Brewery II, and Regency Place and seek outcomes where challenges exist |  | Honeybourne Gate completed, Brewery II and Regency Place all progressing. North Place delayed due to third party legal issues and Portland Street is allegedly at preferred bidder status. Discussions continue with all parties to either resolve |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | eg North Place | | local site difficulties and co-ordination or seek new solutions. |
| | ECON 04F - Support property services in securing interim upgrade to Royal Well bus provision | | Proposal linked to longer term ambition for Municipal Offices. Planning application submitted for interim measure to improve passenger experience at Royal Well. |
| ECON 06 - We will develop our strategic approach to tourism | ECON 06A - Implement the tourism forum | | Decision taken to procure external consultancy support to help develop the council's strategic approach to tourism. Meetings of the tourism forum will take place as part of the consultancy work with members of the forum being actively engaged through the process. |
| | ECON 06B - Work with the tourism forum to develop a strategic approach to tourism | | As above |
| COM 03 - We will develop proposals to introduce a more rigorous approach to the licensing and enforcement of private rented sector housing in the borough within the scope of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services | COM 03A - Survey of private rented sector housing commenced | | Tenders returned and being analysed. Discussion with Cabinet Member required and report to Cabinet January 2016 with tender results for decision on whether to proceed or not. |
| | COM 03B - Report to council setting out strategic direction | | On target - but dependent on tender analysis and viability of survey work. |
| | COM 03C - Public consultation | | As above |
| | COM 03D - Implementation | | As above |
| COM 04 - We will work in partnership to ensure that our local response in Cheltenham supports a coordinated approach to supporting victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence | COM 04A - Evaluate the outcomes of the community-led domestic abuse project in Oakley | | Despite positive conversations between the University and Oakley Neighbourhood Project, the evaluation has not yet started on this project |
| COM 06 - Early Help - To provide an effective, reliable multi- agency approach for early help provision for children and families across Cheltenham | COM 06A - Working with Gloucestershire County Council to develop a hub-model for the delivery of early help based on a partnership between Inspiring Families, Families First, the Our Place project and the local Targeted Support Team | | The hub model is now in place, but local partners remain concerned about its ability to deliver; PLP has agreed an "amber" risk - around the concern from partners whether there is capacity to support the numbers of families that may require 'early help' especially in the climate of future reductions to service delivery. Further positive discussions have been held with the team manager for Cheltenham and a revised governance model will be proposed at PLP on 19 November. |
| VFM 06 - We will consult on options and agree a car parking strategy, to determine where council investment should best be directed in support of the local economy | VFM 06A - Develop and consult on options | | The draft parking strategy has been subject to legal consultation which has highlighted the need for a robust public consultation process to minimise the risk of legal challenge to any proposed change in the off-street parking charging structure. It is likely that external consultancy support will be needed to take the strategy forward to public consultation and this will have budgetary implications. There are key links to the Council's MTFs, capital investment and economic strategies. A member working group has now been established to oversee the development of the Council's parking strategy, taking account of the issues identified above. An initial meeting will agree terms of reference and the scope of evidence and stakeholder input required. |
| | VFM 06B - Report to Cabinet | | A member working group has now been established to oversee the development of the Council's parking strategy, taking account of the issues identified above. An initial meeting in October will agree terms of reference and the scope of evidence and stakeholder input required |

3.2 Performance indicators



In the 2015-16 action plan, we identified 15 outcome measures to track our progress towards achieving our outcomes. Out of these:

- 10 (67%) were green

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Scrutiny Committee 30 November 2015 | | Q2 2015-16 Performance |
| | Page 3 of 5 | Last updated 18 November 2015 |

- 2 (13%) were red
- 3 (20%) were not updated

The two red outcome measures are:



| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|-------------------|--|--|--------|---|---|
| Outcome Measure | Growth in numbers of food businesses rated 3 stars and above | There are currently 777 food premises rated 3 stars and above out of 836 food premises | 690 |  | 690 out of 773 are rated 3 and above. Reprioritisation of resource (confirmed by Cabinet) at the inspection of A, B and non-compliant C premises has considerable impact on ability to undertake unrequested revisits outside of the ratings brand standard. The service does however, reinspect and re-rate every premises that requests a revisit through the scheme. |
| Outcome Measure | Reduce the numbers of households who are homeless | Currently there have been no households accepted as homeless in 2014-15 | 6 |  | There have been 6 Homeless acceptances in the past quarter |




We also identified 15 service measures to track how well individual services are performing.

Out of these:

- 4 (47%) were green
- 5 (33%) were red
- 3 (20%) were not updated.

The five red service measures are:

| Type of Indicator | Measured by this indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---------------------|--|---|---------|--------|---|---|
| Key Service Measure | Average number of days to process a major planning application from receipt to issuing of decision (Q) | 58 Days combined for both major and other | 91 Days | 203 |  | In relation to the majors there were three applications which have bumped up the major figure - Travis Perkins, King Alfred Way and Pittville Campus. There are specific matters in relation to all three of these applications which resulted in additional time to determination. It is also worth noting that of the 12 majors dealt with in this quarter, 9 were within the relevant determination period (75%). As updated in Qtr 1 the targets will be reconsidered in light of work undertaken through systems thinking. |
| Key Service Measure | Average number of days to process other planning applications (Q) | 58 Days combined for both major and | 49 Days | 53 |  | Performance measures are being reviewed in light of systems thinking. This will be fed into the 2016/17 model. |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------|---|---|
| | | other | | | | The applications team has been managing capacity issues during the last quarter. A review of capacity is being undertaken following the loss of a contract member of staff and gaps in resource due to periods of maternity for 2 members of staff. |
| Key Service Measure | Number of disabled and older persons able to stay in their own homes as a result of Council action | 126 | 115 | 34 |  | Performance has been impacted by a change of policy at County level. Social Services / Health moving away from provision of level access showers. In the short term, this will reduce referrals to CBC, but will only delay the necessary provision of level access showers for many cases. |
| Key Service Measure | No. days lost due to sickness absence | 7.5 days per FTE | 6.5 days per FTE | 3.34 |  | Total for quarters 1 and 2. This is just above target of 3.25 |
| Key Service Measure | Percentage of staff appraisals completed | 100% | 100% | 77% |  | This is the figure at end of September; managers have been requested to ensure all appraisals are completed and an update will be made at the end of Q3 |

Background Papers

2015-16 Corporate Strategy action plan, Report to Council, 30th March 2015.

Contact Officer

Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager.
01242 235354.

richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk

Accountability

Cllr. Steve Jordan, Leader of the Council


















Cllr. Jon Walklett, Cabinet Member Corporate Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A – Corporate Performance at end of Quarter 2 (April to September 2015)

Our Outcome: Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced

Progress against milestones

| Priority Action | Key Milestone | Predicted End Date | Lead | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------|---|--|
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01A - Examination of the JCS | Sun-31-Jul-16 | Tracey Crews |  | Progress on the JCS examination has been slower than anticipated. There has been an extensive list of additional work requested by the Inspector which has resulted in examination and roundtable sessions added into the programme schedule. In September officers accompanied the Inspector on site visits and the examination re-opened October 2015 to consider all omission sites. At the time of writing this update it seems likely that the examination sessions programmed for December to discuss again Objectively Assessed Need (housing) and economic growth will be moved to January at the request of the Inspector. In addition to this delay the JCS team have been informed that the transport model will not be available for use until the end of the year. This is likely to add a further 4 months into the programme. Dialogue is continuing with the Inspector to ascertain whether the JCS authorities will receive an interim report early in the new year. The timetable is not in the control of the JCS authorities, whilst end date has been extended, the status remains green - officers supported by the cross boundary programme board are doing all they can to facilitate the requirements of the Inspector. |
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01B - Adoption of the JCS | Sat-31-Dec-16 | Tracey Crews |  | Due to extended programme of JCS as set by the Inspector the predicted end date is extended to December 2016. Status retained as green, as whilst significant slippage has occurred in the programme this is out of the control of the JCS authorities. Officers are facilitating all actions requested by the Inspector |
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01C - Consultation - Cheltenham Plan issues and options including Green Space designations | Sun-31-May-15 | Tracey Crews |  | Positive engagement and management of Cheltenham Plan programme through Planning and Liaison Member Working Group. Work progressing on schedule for review of draft part 1 Cheltenham Plan by Cabinet April 2016. |
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01D - Consideration of Community Infrastructure Levy | Sat-30-Apr-16 | Tracey Crews |  | Detailed viability issues raised through CIL consultation. Work ongoing with consultants DVS and PBA to address issues raised. Project Board for CIL re-established. Revised programme being reviewed in context of capacity constraints affected by resources needed to deliver JCS and Cheltenham Plan. Predicted end date amended. A more defined programme will be available for the next update. |
| ENV 01 - We will put in place the statutory development plan for Cheltenham, including adoption of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and preparation of the Cheltenham Plan | ENV 01E - Cheltenham Plan - consideration given to the role of neighbourhood groups and parishes in bringing forward neighbourhood plans | Sun-31-Jan-16 | Tracey Crews |  | Leckhampton and Warden Hill Parish Council are now formally preparing a neighbourhood plan. Interest generated from other areas, including non parished areas which would require the creation of a neighbourhood forum. The planning policy team are keeping a watching brief on interest to prepare neighbourhood plans as this may impact on capacity of the team. |
| ENV 02 - We will review and revise the ten year Cheltenham Allotment Strategy | ENV 02A - Allotment tenants and stakeholders consulted | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Adam Reynolds |  | Allotment tenants and stakeholders consulted. |
| ENV 02 - We will review and revise the ten year Cheltenham Allotment Strategy | ENV 02B - Revised strategy written and approved by cabinet | Thu-31-Dec-15 | Adam Reynolds |  | Completed and approved by cabinet 10th November 2015 |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03A - Investigate the potential to retrieve non approved residual bins | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Scott Williams |  | The JWC considered an initiative currently being undertaken in Gloucester whereby officers target areas where there is little recycling being done and where regularly additional residual waste is presented, and through doorstep communication, advice and education they work with the offending household until they are properly participating in the recycling schemes - as part of this initiative additional non-approved residual bins are also removed. It has been agreed that further work will be carried out to scope the proposal and this is due to be presented to the JWC in December. |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03B - Implement the decision regarding the second phase review of the Cheltenham bring site provision with the outcome of increased recycling at the sites | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Scott Williams |  | Improvements to the bring site service have been implemented which include the increase of textile recycling banks and the introduction of greater shoe recycling facilities. |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03C - Review garden waste charging systems | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Scott Williams |  | CBC has just procured a new system for managing the garden waste customer data, so this action has been superseded. The proposal is to review each of the charging systems (incl. CBC) and present a report to the JWC SMG - however with the other projects underway including 20:20 it's unlikely that any system changes will be made for the time being. |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03D - Swindon Road recycling centre review | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Scott Williams |  | This review is being co-ordinated with a review taking place of the GCC Household Recycling Centres and is likely to roll into the 2016/17 action plan. |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03E - Implement the decision taken with regard to recycling materials bulking review and support the mobilisation of the Ubico bulking facilities | Sat-31-Oct-15 | Scott Williams |  | Project successfully completed in October 2015 |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03F - Proactively increase public awareness by implementing a range of different education and publicity initiatives to reduce landfill and increase recycling and reuse | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Scott Williams |  | Recycling week was promoted with an emphasis on textile recycling. Publicity will shortly be going out on the improvements to the textile and shoe recycling provisions. Further promotions are planned in the JWC engagement plan |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03G - Assist Ubico to assess business case for new recycling vehicles | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Scott Williams |  | Ongoing |
| ENV 03 - We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan | ENV 03H - Actively explore options for adding new materials such as cardboard, plastics and cartons within kerbside collections | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Scott Williams |  | Ongoing and linked to 3G |
| ENV 04 - We will develop a project to replace the children's play area in Pittville Park | ENV 04A - Request for internal project management and capital bid to deliver project | Thu-30-Apr-15 | Adam Reynolds |  | Project manager appointed |
| ENV 04 - We will develop a project to replace the children's play area in Pittville Park | ENV 04B - Subject to the above, develop a PID | Sun-31-May-15 | Adam Reynolds |  | PID developed |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| ENV 04 - We will develop a project to replace the children's play area in Pittville Park | ENV 04C - Project procurement and implementation | Sat-30-Apr-15 | | | Tender advertised and awarded and planning application submitted and supporting documents for December planning committee. Fund raising underway. |
| ENV 04 - We will develop a project to replace the children's play area in Pittville Park | ENV 04D - Completion | Thu-30-Jun-16 | Adam Reynolds | | Construction anticipated at start of January. |
| ENV 05 - We will restore Cheltenham's War Memorial | ENV 05A - Conservator work commences | Thu-30-Apr-15 | Pat Pratley | | Conservator appointed and report produced and recommendations approved by Cabinet in June. |
| ENV 05 - We will restore Cheltenham's War Memorial | ENV 05B - Cabinet decision to proceed | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Pat Pratley | | Cabinet recommendations approved |
| ENV 05 - We will restore Cheltenham's War Memorial | ENV 05C - Fundraising commences | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Pat Pratley | | Trustees of the mayor's charity have agreed that the charity can be used to process contributions. |
| ENV 05 - We will restore Cheltenham's War Memorial | ENV 05D - Award of contract for restoration | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Pat Pratley | | Cabinet have now endorsed the conservators report and recommendations. Procurement exercise to commence in September 2015 |
| ENV 05 - We will restore Cheltenham's War Memorial | ENV 05E - Completion of restoration | Fri-30-Nov-18 | Pat Pratley | | as above |

Progress against indicators

| Type of Indicator | Measured by this indicator | Baseline | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|-------------------|--|---|--------|-----|---|
| Outcome Measure | An increase in the number of buildings and spaces given an award or commendation in the Cheltenham Civic Awards (bi-annual). (Q) | At the 2014 ceremony, there were 4 Awards and 5 Commendations | 0 | | There will not be another award ceremony until 2016. |
| Outcome Measure | Increase in the number of green spaces with community involvement in terms of management or maintenance | Current baseline in the process of being calculated | 16 | | indicator to be changed, to number of green space sites with community involvement in terms of management or maintenance. |
| Outcome Measure | Increase the number of applications for green flag status for our parks and gardens | Currently there are 4 parks with Green Flag status, Naunton Park, Hatherley Park Montpellier Gardens and Springfield Park | 5 | | Five parks including Pittville, will be submitted for Green Flag Status in January 2016 |

| Type of Indicator | Measured by this indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---------------------|--|---|---------|--------|-----|--|
| Key Service Measure | Average number of days to process a major planning application from receipt to issuing of decision (Q) | 58 Days combined for both major and other | 91 Days | 203 | | In relation to the majors there were three applications which have bumped up the major figure - Travis Perkins, King Alfred Way and Pittville Campus. There are specific matters in relation to all three of these applications which resulted in additional time to determination. It is also worth noting that of the 12 majors dealt with in this quarter, 9 were within the relevant determination period (75%). As updated in Qtr 1 the targets will be reconsidered in light of work undertaken through systems thinking. |
| Key Service Measure | Average number of days to process other planning applications (Q) | 58 Days combined for both major and other | 49 Days | 53 | | Performance measures are being reviewed in light of systems thinking. This will be fed into the 2016/17 model. The applications team has been managing capacity issues during the last quarter. A review of capacity is being undertaken following the loss of a contract member of staff and gaps in resource due to periods of maternity for 2 members of staff. |
| Key Service Measure | Number of improvement schemes to parks, streets and spaces (Q) | 3 (2014-15) | 3 | 10 | | ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS: Play Areas: Agg Gardner Play Area, Construction phase of Pittville rejuvenation underway. Partial play refurbishments at Humpty Dumps, Burrows Playing Field, Chelt Walk Park. Landscape: Restoration of Pittville lake edge, and ornamental metal work, desilting and clear out of residuum. Elmfield Playing Field Big Local new path, KGV public art installation, Year 2 Urban Meadowws project. Neptune Fountain. Sandford Park Petanque area. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: Sandford, Leckhampton Hill, Priors Farm, Montpellier, Hatherley, Weavers Field, Honeybourne Line, Wymans Brooke, Swindon Village Playing Field, Springfields Park, Benhall Open Space, St Peters Park, Pilley Bridge Nature Reserve, Imperial Gardens. |
| Key Service Measure | Number properties improved in terms of built environment heritage as a result of council action (Q) | 119 | 30 | 74 | | Q1 + Q2 =74 |
| Key Service Measure | Percentage of household waste recycled and composted (Q) | 44.4% (2013/14) | 46% | 46.7% | | Average for the 2 quarters is 47.18% |
| Key Service Measure | Residual household waste per household (Kg/year) (Q) | 467 kg (2013/14) | 464kg | 121.0 | | running total is 241kg for the half-year which is just over the half year target of 232kg |

Progress against milestones

| Priority Action | Key Milestone | Predicted End Date | Lead | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|--|--|--------------------|-------------------|-----|--|
| ECON 01 - We will support Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in the delivery of the Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire | ECON 01A - We will take forward the statement of co-operation agreed between the LEP and JCS authorities in the consideration of land safeguarded for development at junction 10 M5 and work with the Highways Agency to investigate the delivery of a four-way junction | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Andrew North | G | The process of agreeing a statement of co-operation was achieved though the LEP is still pushing for greater allocations of land for employment than the JCS authorities feel is justified by evidence. JCS authorities have been working proactively with LEP and wider business community and evidence derived from this engagement will be considered by the JCS examination in January 2016. The LEP have been supportive on the legal test under the 'duty to cooperate' and the quality of interaction between the JCS and LEP has been good even though there is difference of approach on individual issues. Work with the highways England continues with no firm commitment to a four-way junction, a task group has been established and modelling work agreed to define the business case. |
| ECON 01 - We will support Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in the delivery of the Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire | ECON 01B - We will support the implementation of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Andrew North | G | The council was party to the creation of the GEGJC and has been an active participant at meetings through membership by the Leader of Council. However, the Joint Committee's work will potentially be rolled up into the proposed Combined Authority as part of Gloucestershire's devolution agreement with government. |
| ECON 01 - We will support Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in the delivery of the Strategic Economic Plan for Gloucestershire | ECON 01C - We will identify employment land through the JCS and work with the LEP to bring this to the market | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Andrew North | G | The current JCS allocation is 60 hectares of employment land based on the (then) best evidence available. However, during the JCS examination the inspector has sought additional evidence. Work has shown that release of land for employment development on a site by site basis will contribute more employment land than the 60 hectare figure bring the respective positions of the JCS and LEP closer together. The latest evidence will be considered at the JCS examination in January 2016. |
| ECON 02 - We will work in partnership with key stakeholders to agree a strategic approach to deliver our economic outcome; including how best we use the Joint Core Strategy and Cheltenham Development Task Force activities. | ECON 02A - Publish consultancy advice on economic development | Thu-30-Apr-15 | Mike Redman | C | Athey consultancy report published and reported via member seminar and briefing to Cabinet. Strategy report to be developed and implemented via REST restructure. |
| ECON 02 - We will work in partnership with key stakeholders to agree a strategic approach to deliver our economic outcome; including how best we use the Joint Core Strategy and Cheltenham Development Task Force activities. | ECON 02B - Consult with key stakeholders | Sun-31-May-15 | Mike Redman | C | The JCS is currently in examination and the Cheltenham Plan, which will determine the balance between smaller sites allocated for housing and employment has now been out to public consultation with results informing further development of the plan. |
| ECON 02 - We will work in partnership with key stakeholders to agree a strategic approach to deliver our economic outcome; including how best we use the Joint Core Strategy and Cheltenham Development Task Force activities. | ECON 02C - Report to Cabinet with recommended actions | Thu-30-Jun-16 | Mike Redman | A | The Council's economic strategy will be underpinned by decisions about site allocations arising from the conclusion of the JCS and Cheltenham Plan processes, both of which are making good progress. Capacity to progress the strategy as been limited, but will be addressed by implementation of the REST restructure agreed by Council on 20th July 2015. Member working group established to progress Car parking strategy, with identified links to Economic development, MTFs, Capital investment and Tourism strategies. |
| ECON 03 - We will implement the revised and updated governance arrangements for Gloucestershire Airport Ltd | ECON 03A - Implementation of shareholder forum | Fri-31-Jul-15 | Pat Pratley | C | Shareholder forum meetings taking place on a quarterly basis |
| ECON 03 - We will implement the revised and updated governance arrangements for Gloucestershire Airport Ltd | ECON 03B - Implementation of updated articles of association and shareholder agreement | Fri-31-Jul-15 | Pat Pratley | A | Articles of association and shareholder agreement are in the process of being reviewed with the airport board and will be completed by end of November. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04A - Support the delivery of the Cheltenham Transport Plan | Thu-30-Aug-18 | Jeremy Williamson | A | GCC approved the Cheltenham Transport Plan on 22/07/15 with implementation on a phased basis and Boots Corner as a trial. This approval has allowed Blackrock and John Lewis to confirm their intentions for the Beechwood Shopping Centre which was predicated on adjustments to the traffic flow in Albion Street. Initial phase of transport plan targeted for February 2016 with further phases July 2016 and a trial at Boots Corner spring 2017; if the latter is successful CBC will work with GCC and fund a £2m public realm upgrade. Retailers remain fully supportive of scheme implementation. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04B - Continue implementation of public realm works | Fri-30-Jun-17 | Jeremy Williamson | A | Bennington Street to Boots Corner works completed. Negotiations with GCC have identified potential additional targets for this financial year of completing the outstanding Prom phase 3 by Neptunes Fountain and refurbishment of the pedestrianised Promenade once phone boxes have been returned from their refurbishment. Plans to deliver the further upgrades to High St East are being prepared now that the future of Beechwood Shopping Centre confirmed. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04C - Commence implementation of projects arising from High Street Analysis Report (subject to available funding) | Fri-31-Aug-18 | Jeremy Williamson | G | Upgrade works from Bennington Street to Boots Corner implemented. Tree pots ordered for Pittville to Winchcombe Street. Timetable to be prepared with GCC over next phases of upgrade which will need to be co-ordinated with Beechwood proposals and Cheltenham Transport Plan. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04D - Work with Gloucestershire Local Transport Board, Network Rail and First Great Western on the delivery of upgrades at Cheltenham Spa Railway station | Fri-31-Mar-17 | Jeremy Williamson | A | Railway partners now fully behind a first phase which will see c£5m investment in next 18 months. Funding secured from Cycle-Rail fund, GLTB, Access for All, National Station Improvement Fund. Awaiting outcome of GWR bid for additional 70 surface car space which will allow time for a the development of a further bid for a decked car park and in the future potential for additional bay platforms. The commitment to improved hourly services to London may hasten the requirement for the latter. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04E - Support delivery of key sites such as Brewery II, and Regency Place and seek outcomes where challenges exist eg North Place | Sat-30-Sep-17 | Jeremy Williamson | A | Honeybourne Gate completed, Brewery II and Regency Place all progressing. North Place delayed due to third party legal issues and Portland Street is allegedly at preferred bidder status. Discussions continue with all parties to either resolve local site difficulties and co-ordination or seek new solutions. |
| ECON 04 - We will support delivery of the Cheltenham Development Taskforce business plan | ECON 04F - Support property services in securing interim upgrade to Royal Well bus provision | Thu-31-Dec-15 | Jeremy Williamson | A | Proposal linked to longer term ambition for Municipal Offices. Planning application submitted for interim measure to improve passenger experience at Royal Well. |
| ECON 05 - We will work in partnership with The Cheltenham Trust as they develop their capital investment strategy to support their business plan | ECON 05A - Discussions through strategic partnership board | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Pat Pratley | G | Initial discussion has taken place with the trust Chief Executive following Council decision to support funding the next stage of the town hall redevelopment project. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|-------------|--|---|
| ECON 06 - We will develop our strategic approach to tourism | ECON 06A - Implement the tourism forum | Thu-15 | Patley | | Decision taken to procure external consultancy support to help develop the council's strategic approach to tourism. Meetings of the tourism forum will take place as part of the consultancy work with members of the forum being actively engaged through the process. |
| ECON 06 - We will develop our strategic approach to tourism | ECON 06B - Work with the tourism forum to develop a strategic approach to tourism | Sat-31-Oct-15 | Pat Pratley | | See comment above. |

Progress against indicators

| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|-------------------|---|--|--------|-----|---|
| Outcome Measure | Growth in births of new enterprises | 5.7% (January 2012) | 14 | | According to the ONS, In 2013, there were 725 new enterprise births, within the context of 5,335 existing enterprises |
| Outcome Measure | Growth in number of new jobs created and their value to the economy | In 2012, there were 72,000 jobs in the local economy. Between 2000 and 2012, 6,000 net new jobs were created in Cheltenham | | | annual figure |
| Outcome Measure | Increase in Cheltenham's Economic output | It is estimated that Cheltenham's economy generated between £2.4 billion and £2.7 billion in economic output in 2011. GVA per head in Gloucestershire is £21,066, on a par with the UK (£21,674) but above the South West average (£19,023). | | | annual figure |
| Outcome Measure | Reduction in claimant rate | As at Jan 2015, there were 961 claimants representing a rate of 1.3%. Cheltenham rate of young people not in education, employment or training was 3.9% | 0.8% | | As at September 2015, the Job Seekers Allowance claimant count was 0.8%, with Oakley ward having the highest rate at 1.7% |







| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---------------------|--|----------|--------|--------|-----|--|
| Key Service Measure | Number of High Street enhancement schemes implemented by Spring 2016 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | Work now complete to enhance the lower high street in conjunction with the Brewery redevelopment |




Progress against milestones

| Priority Action | Key Milestone | Predictd End Date | Lead | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---|--|-------------------|----------------|-----|--|
| COM 01 - We will work with CBH to ensure the development of older persons community 'hubs' and flexible housing related support arrangements in line with CBC's contractual requirements with Supporting People | COM 01A - Cabinet agreement to approach | Fri-31-Jul-15 | Martin Stacy | | Cabinet approved the council entering into a new contract with Supporting People from October 2105 for one year. |
| COM 01 - We will work with CBH to ensure the development of older persons community 'hubs' and flexible housing related support arrangements in line with CBC's contractual requirements with Supporting People | COM 01B - New contract with Supporting People | Mon-31-Oct-16 | Martin Stacy | | Cabinet approved a report recommending that the Council enters into a new contract with Supporting People from October 2015. This is a one year contract. Supporting People will be reviewing the way it commissions its services for older people over the following 12 months. The council will continue to engage with SP via quarterly strategic meetings, as well as working with CBH to ensure the the delivery of relevant outcomes. |
| COM 02 - We will explore potential models for maximising the delivery of affordable housing and supporting community cohesion | COM 02A - JCS strategic allocations - preferred partners agreed (Registered Providers), subject to prior cabinet approval on approach and mechanisms for selection | Mon-30-Nov-15 | Martin Stacy | | The affordable housing partnership is currently undergoing its selection of Preferred Registered Providers. The evaluation panel has met and assessed the submissions and our scores will be reviewed following presentations and interviews, which are scheduled to take place during the final week of October. A draft memorandum of understanding has been agreed between the 3 district authorities across the JCS area and preferred providers are currently being given the opportunity to provide any additional comments. |
| COM 02 - We will explore potential models for maximising the delivery of affordable housing and supporting community cohesion | COM 02B - To maximise the delivery of affordable housing across HRA sites through identification of suitable sites for development through CBH | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Martin Stacy | | Cabinet and Council have approved the delivery of the first tranche of affordable housing to be built on number of garage sites in the following areas: Coniston Rd, Haweswater Rd, Redgrove Rd and Parkbury Close. These sites have planning permission for a total delivery of 1 x 4 bed house, 5 x 3 bed houses, 2 x 2 bed flats and 2 x 1 bed flats. We are expecting to start on site shortly. Cabinet and Council approval will be sought in December for the delivery of more affordable housing on another site at Swindon Road. There are also a number of other garage sites which have potential to be used to deliver more affordable housing and we are currently at various stages in the planning approval process, and considering rights of way issues. |
| COM 03 - We will develop proposals to introduce a more rigorous approach to the licensing and enforcement of private rented sector housing in the borough within the scope of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services | COM 03A - Survey of private rented sector housing commenced | Sun-31-Jan-16 | Mark Nelson | | Tenders returned and being analysed. Discussion with Cabinet Member required and report to Cabinet January 2016 with tender results for decision on whether to proceed or not. |
| COM 03 - We will develop proposals to introduce a more rigorous approach to the licensing and enforcement of private rented sector housing in the borough within the scope of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services | COM 03B - Report to council setting out strategic direction | Sun-31-Jul-16 | Mark Nelson | | On target - but dependent on tender analysis and viability of survey work. |
| COM 03 - We will develop proposals to introduce a more rigorous approach to the licensing and enforcement of private rented sector housing in the borough within the scope of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services | COM 03C - Public consultation | Fri-30-Sep-16 | Mark Nelson | | On target - but depends on viability of survey work to identify private rented stock and condition. |
| COM 03 - We will develop proposals to introduce a more rigorous approach to the licensing and enforcement of private rented sector housing in the borough within the scope of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services | COM 03D - Implementation | Fri-31-Mar-17 | Mark Nelson | | On target -but depends on viability of survey work to identify private rented stock and condition. |
| COM 04 - We will work in partnership to ensure that our local response in Cheltenham supports a coordinated approach to supporting victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence | COM 04A - Evaluate the outcomes of the community-led domestic abuse project in Oakley | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Richard Gibson | | Despite positive conversations between the University and Oakley Neighbourhood Project, the evaluation has not yet started on this project |
| COM 04 - We will work in partnership to ensure that our local response in Cheltenham supports a coordinated approach to supporting victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence | COM 04B - Assess the recommendations from two domestic homicide reviews and their impact on our own organisational practice and how we work in partnership | Fri-31-Jul-15 | Richard Gibson | | The two DHRs are making progress; DHR1 has been presented in draft form to the Leadership Group, and comments taken on board. The report is currently being considered by the victim's family. DHR2 is underway, all IMRs have now been reviewed and the panel chair is aiming to produce a draft report in the by early December. Positive discussions with GCC regarding involvement of GCSB in the report and action plan. |
| COM 05 - We will ensure our revenues and benefits service responds to national and local policies | COM 05A - Support the transition to the 'universal credit' benefits system for new claimants to be administered by DWP and to determine the impact on the residual benefit service | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Paul Aldridge | | We went live on Universal credit on 1st June 2015 for a very restricted group of single people, who have just become unemployed. No details yet of when other client groups will be included or when the existing Housing benefit cases will be transferred over to Universal credit. |
| COM 06 - Early Help - To provide an effective, reliable multi- agency approach for early help provision for children and families across Cheltenham | COM 06A - Working with Gloucestershire County Council to develop a hub-model for the delivery of early help based on a partnership between Inspiring Families, Families First, the Our Place project and the local Targeted Support Team | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Richard Gibson | | The hub model is now in place, but local partners remain concerned about its ability to deliver; PLP has agreed an "amber" risk - around the concern from partners whether there is capacity to support the numbers of families that may require 'early help' especially in the climate of future reductions to service delivery. Further positive discussions have been held with the team manager for Cheltenham and a revised governance model will be proposed at PLP on 19 November. |
| COM 07 - Social prescribing - to link patients who have non-medical health needs with a range of voluntary and community support | COM 07A - Carry out county-wide evaluation of the pilots to assess impacts on come forward with a preferred option for future delivery in Cheltenham | Tue-30-Jun-15 | Richard Gibson | | County Community Projects has been commissioned by G-Doc (the GP provider company) to provide social prescribing for the Cheltenham locality, which includes Bishops Cleeve and Winchcombe for a 12 month period |

Progress against indicators












| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------|-----|-------------|
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------|-----|-------------|

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|-------|---|--|
| Outcome Measure | Growth in numbers of food businesses rated 3 stars and above | There are currently 777 food premises rated 3 stars and above out of 836 food premises | 690 |  | 690 out of 773 are rated 3 and above. Reprioritisation of resource at the inspection of A, B and uncompliant C premises has considerable impact on ability to undertake unrequested revisits outside of the ratings brand standard. The service does however, reinspect and re-rate every premises that requests a revisit through the scheme. |
| Outcome Measure | Increase the provision of new affordable housing | 11 affordable housing completions to date in 2014-15. | 4 |  | There have been 4 affordable housing completions in the past quarter, making 28 for the year as a whole. |
| Outcome Measure | Reduce the numbers of households who are homeless | Currently there have been no households accepted as homeless in 2014-15 | 6 |  | There have been 6 Homeless acceptances in the past quarter |
| Outcome Measure | Reduction in anti-social behaviour incidents | As at January 2015, there had been 5,483 anti-social behaviour incidents in the previous 12 months. | 1,307 |  | There were 1307 ASB incidents in the last quarter, 156 less than in the previous quarter |
| Outcome Measure | Reduction in domestic burglary | 1453 | 136 |  | In the past quarter there were 136 domestic burglaries, a small increase of 13 compared to the previous quarter. However, comparing the previous 12 months, there has been a fall of 220 compared to the same period last year |
| Outcome Measure | Reduction in recorded crime | As at January 2015, there had been 7,829 recorded crime incidents in the previous 12 months | 1,699 |  | There were 1699 recorded crimes in the past quarter, a small decrease of 4 crimes compared to quarter 1. |
| Outcome Measure | Reduction in the number of residential properties with significant health hazards | In 2011, there were 3,352 properties with one or more category 1 hazards (7.5% of housing stock.) | | | This number will be updated via the private rented sector stock condition survey that is currently being procured. |

| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---------------------|---|---------------|--------|--------|---|--|
| Key Service Measure | Number of disabled and older persons able to stay in their own homes as a result of Council action | 126 | 115 | 34 |  | Performance has been impacted by a change of policy at County level. Social Services / Health are moving towards more strip washing rather than provision of level access showers. In the short term, this will reduce referrals to CBC, but will only delay the necessary provision of level access showers for many cases. |
| Key Service Measure | Number of private sector dwellings made safe by the Council | 237 | 225 | 140 |  | 70 Q1 add 70 Q2 = 140 |
| Key Service Measure | Number of vacant homes for more than 12 months brought back into use as a direct result of Council action | 112 (2013/14) | 110 | 117 |  | Q1 59 add Q2 58 = 117 |

Our Outcome - Transform our council so we can continue to enable delivery our outcomes for Cheltenham and its residents

Progress against milestones

| Priority Action | Key Milestone | Predicted End Date | Lead | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|--|--|--------------------|---------------|---|---|
| VFM 01 - We will implement the findings of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services and deliver improved outcomes | VFM 01A - Consultation starts on draft restructure | Thu-30-Apr-15 | Andrew North |  | Consultation on new structures completed |
| VFM 01 - We will implement the findings of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services and deliver improved outcomes | VFM 01B - Complete systems thinking cycle | Fri-31-Jul-15 | Andrew North |  | Phase 1 & 2 work is continuing in licencing, public protection, planning and new business/customer journey Position statement detailing process improvements and benefits identified to be taken to REST Programme Board on 5 August |
| VFM 01 - We will implement the findings of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services and deliver improved outcomes | VFM 01C - Restructure implemented | Mon-31-Aug-15 | Andrew North |  | Restructure proposals were taken to REST Member Working Group on 24 June and Budget Scrutiny Working Group on 7 July Plan for financing the new senior management structure (Section 4 report) to be taken to Council on 20 July Recommendation that Budget Scrutiny Working Group monitor the staffing budget for the Division to ensure that cost savings achieved from phase 2 restructure are not at the expense of service outcomes, quality or effectiveness |
| VFM 01 - We will implement the findings of the commissioning review looking at Environmental and Regulatory Services and deliver improved outcomes | VFM 01D - Complete project | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Andrew North |  | The work progresses well with the outcomes and reporting framework now complete, the proposal for restructuring being reported to full Council on 20 July 2015 and the 'systems thinking' work delivering tangible benefits for customers of the service |
| VFM 02 - We will have developed and agreed with our 2020 Vision partner councils interim proposals to deliver services in the future together with the necessary management arrangements to implement and with member involvement. | VFM 02A - Implementation of new interim partnership proposals | Thu-30-Apr-15 | Andrew North |  | New interim management structure agreed and in place |
| VFM 02 - We will have developed and agreed with our 2020 Vision partner councils interim proposals to deliver services in the future together with the necessary management arrangements to implement and with member involvement. | VFM 02B - Consideration of full business case | Mon-30-Nov-15 | Andrew North |  | Full business case to go to council in the autumn |
| VFM 02 - We will have developed and agreed with our 2020 Vision partner councils interim proposals to deliver services in the future together with the necessary management arrangements to implement and with member involvement. | VFM 02C - Initial implementation of agreed arrangements | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Andrew North |  | Draft proposals for sharing of services and management of the partnership have been provisionally agreed and will be discussed (together with a detailed business case) by full Council in the Autumn. |
| VFM 03 - We will develop collaborative working with partner councils and prepare for the creation of the following shared services: | VFM 03A - Revenues and benefits service: Develop a shared service model ready for implementation | Thu-31-Dec-15 | Mark Sheldon |  | CBC have won the tender for the client role for the FOD civica revenues and Benefits service contract for a 3 year period. |
| VFM 03 - We will develop collaborative working with partner councils and prepare for the creation of the following shared services: | VFM 03B - Customer Services: Develop and agree a roadmap with partner councils / organisations to determine the future direction of customer services linked to the accommodation strategy | Thu-31-Dec-15 | Mark Sheldon |  | The Project Outline Document (POD) was approved by the 2020 vision programme board. A project manager has been appointed to manage the project. ICT are reviewing options for developing 'forms' options to support customer service improvements. |
| VFM 03 - We will develop collaborative working with partner councils and prepare for the creation of the following shared services: | VFM 03C - Property Services: Explore a shared service model with 2020 vision partner councils | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Mark Sheldon |  | Discussions with councils outside the 2020 programme with a view to joining a 2020 vision shared property service are scheduled to take place in October 2015. |
| VFM 03 - We will develop collaborative working with partner councils and prepare for the creation of the following shared services: | VFM 03D - ICT Services: We will develop collaborative working with partner councils and prepare for the creation of a 4 way shared ICT service to support the 2020 Vision programme | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Mark Sheldon |  | The ICT Leadership Board has continued the work to align ICT infrastructure and stabilise the ICT infrastructure. CBH have agreed to continue to use the ICT shared service for a further 3 years. Work has been undertaken to determine all council / client's application needs to feed into the 2020 vision programme to support the allocation of TCA funding. |
| VFM 04 - We will agree an Accommodation Strategy which delivers more modern, flexible and cheaper office accommodation linked to the 2020 Vision programme | VFM 04A - Review options for alternative office and develop and approve the business case for the preferred option | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Mark Sheldon |  | Informal dialogue has continued to consider the potential of a redevelopment of the Municipal Offices. The financing of the acquisition of Delta Place have been completed delivering net income of £100k in 2016/17 to support the MTFS gap. |
| VFM 05 - Asset Management Plan | VFM 05A - Implement the action plan arising from the Asset Management Plan approved by council in March 2015 | Thu-31-Mar-16 | David Roberts |  | Officers have visited Eastleigh BC to explore arrangements in place used to develop their significant investment property portfolio. The council agreed an Asset Management policy in March 2015 along with revised terms of reference for the council's Asset Management Working Group plus the allocation of the receipt from the sale of North Place and Portland Street car parks. Officers are in the process of working with CIPFA to finalise their review report prior to seeking AMWP endorsement of the action plan which included a recommendation to develop an investment property portfolio. |
| VFM 06 - We will consult on options and agree a car parking strategy, to determine where council investment should best be directed in support of the local economy | VFM 06A - Develop and consult on options | Fri-30-Sep-16 | Mike Redman |  | The draft parking strategy has been subject to legal consultation which has highlighted the need for a robust public consultation process to minimise the risk of legal challenge to any proposed change in the off-street parking charging structure. It is likely that external consultancy support will be needed to take the strategy forward to public consultation and this will have budgetary implications. There are key links to the Council's MTFS, capital investment and economic strategies. A member working group has now been established to oversee the development of the Council's parking strategy, taking account of the issues identified above. An initial meeting will agree terms of reference and the scope of evidence and stakeholder input required. |
| VFM 06 - We will consult on options and agree a car parking strategy, to determine where council investment should best be directed in support of the local economy | VFM 06B - Report to Cabinet | Fri-30-Sep-16 | Mike Redman |  | A member working group has now been established to oversee the development of the Council's parking strategy, taking account of the issues identified above. An initial meeting in October will agree terms of reference and the scope of evidence and stakeholder input required. |
| VFM 07 - We will explore options for the two cremators at the Cemetery and Crematorium | VFM 07A - Explore cost effective options for resolving the cremator problems, including the potential delivery of a new crematorium | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Mike Redman |  | The appraisal process is complete and will inform a recommendation to Cabinet and Council in October on the preferred new build option. |
| VFM 07 - We will explore options for the two cremators at the Cemetery and Crematorium | VFM 07B - Report to Cabinet on options | Mon-30-Nov-15 | Mike Redman |  | The appraisal process is complete and will inform a recommendation to Cabinet and Council in October on the preferred new build option. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---|
| VFM 07 - We will explore options for the two cremators at the Cemetery and Crematorium | VFM 07C - Implementation of crematorium solution | Sat-30-Sep-17 | Mike Redman | | Following a decision in October on the preferred option for the future of the crematorium service, the project will move into the implementation phase, with a new project initiation process to be reported through overview and scrutiny. There will also be oversight from the Cabinet Member Working Group which it is proposed should continue its successful input to date. |
| VFM 08 - We will further invest in the ICT infrastructure to support effective service delivery | VFM 08A - Implement the next phase of the ICT infrastructure upgrade strategy and identify any opportunities for further rationalisation and alignment of CBC/FOD infrastructure | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Mark Sheldon | | <p>The additional investment was approved by council in July 2015 and work is ongoing to deliver improvements to the ICT infrastructure.</p> <p>Significant progress in delivering the ICT Infrastructure Upgrade Programme has been made resulting in major upgrade of the Council's core infrastructure including increasing the capacity and stability of the networks, rollout of new physical and virtual desktops, migration from unsupported servers, data storage improvement, virtualisation and improvements to disaster recovery arrangements. All of these improvements have helped to create a more stable ICT environment.</p> <p>However, further work has been identified which is required to ensure that the Council's ICT infrastructure is 'fit for purpose' and aligned with the other councils involved in the 2020 Programme. This includes establishing a disaster recovery environment for the 300 plus virtual desktop users, as without this reliance is placed entirely on the systems based at Coleford; continuing to roll out the new server and storage infrastructure to ensure the Council has better storage arrangements, processing performance and stability; replacement of the current disaster recovery infrastructure which is inadequate in term of data replication / recovery; development of a cluster of high speed servers to run the databases to support shared working arrangements and help reduce overall licensing costs; phase 2 of the network improvements to improve speed of link between all Council sites including the Municipal Offices; and the upgrading of video conferencing facilities to support staff working across partner sites.</p> <p>A further budget allocation of £276k is included in the outturn report to council for approval on 20/7/15.</p> |
| VFM 08 - We will further invest in the ICT infrastructure to support effective service delivery | VFM 08B - Accept and test the ICT business continuity arrangements developed by ICT shared service | Thu-31-Mar-16 | Bryan Parsons | | ICTSS delivered a progress report to Audit Committee relating to their project to put in place a disaster recovery plan. This has now reached the stage where Service managers will need to update their Service Continuity Plans, ICTSS will be meeting with Client officer to agree the best approach within the next month. |
| VFM 09 - Implement recommendations from the LGA Peer Review | VFM 09A - Implement the action plan arising from the peer review | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Mark Sheldon | | GOSS and the Section 151 Officer are reviewing the information provided by another council which models the MTFS over a longer term period. |
| VFM 10 - Findings and recommendations from Audit report into Wilson over-spend | VFM 10A - Implement the recommendation arising from the Grant Thornton review of the project overspend | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Mark Sheldon | | Revised procurement strategy agreed by Cabinet. Work to review project management process is ongoing. |
| VFM 10 - Findings and recommendations from Audit report into Wilson over-spend | VFM 10B - Implement the recommendations arising from the Audit Partnership review of the project overspend | Wed-30-Sep-15 | Mark Sheldon | | The Audit Partnership has completed the report into 'why' the project overspent and proposed recommendations which were supported by members at a special audit committee meeting on 25/9/15. The recommendations will be monitored by the Audit committee. |
| VFM 11 - We will implement the 'Bridging the Gap' programme and budget strategy for meeting the MTFS funding gap | VFM 11A - identify further savings / income to close gap for 2016/17 and residual MTFS budget gap | Mon-29-Feb-16 | Mark Sheldon | | The MTFS has been updated to take into account the latest projection of funding cuts, car park income levels and future business rates growth resulting in a budget gap of £3.9m over the period 2016/17 to 2019/20. The budget strategy has been updated to include savings targets for 2020 vision, additional use of New Homes Bonus and a £500k savings / income target for REST services to be approved by Cabinet in October 2015. |

Progress against indicators

| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|-------------------|---|--|--------|-----|---|
| Outcome Measure | Bridging the Gap savings / increased income | The 2015-16 budget gap was £1,044,000. The predicted gap for 2016-17 is £1,363,000 | | | Budget strategy agreed at Cabinet on 13 October; draft budget to come to cabinet on 15 December |

| Type of Indicator | Measured by This Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual | RAG | Q2 Progress |
|---------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--------|-----|---|
| Key Service Measure | No. days lost due to sickness absence | 7.5 days per FTE | 6.5 days per FTE | 3.34 | | Total for quarters 1 and 2. This is just above target of 3.25 |
| Key Service Measure | Number of stage 3 complaints upheld/partially upheld in favour of the customer | 7 | 6 | | | annual figure |
| Key Service Measure | Percentage of staff appraisals completed | 100% | 100% | 77% | | This is the figure at end of September; managers have been requested to ensure all appraisals are completed and an update will be made at the end of Q3 |
| Key Service Measure | Turnover - number of leavers as a percentage of average headcount - Controlled | (1.4.14 - 28.2.15) 41.77% | No targets set - turnover to be monitored | 0.43 | | This represents 1 person leaving out of an average headcount of 230 people |
| Key Service Measure | Turnover - number of leavers as a percentage of average headcount - Uncontrolled | (1.4.14 - 28.2.15) 13.58% | No targets set - turnover to be monitored | 1.30 | | This represents 3 people leaving out of an average headcount of 230 people |

Information/Discussion Paper

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

30 November 2015

Joint Waste Committee Draft Business Plan

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

1. Why has this come to scrutiny?

- 1.1 To update members on the work of the Joint Waste committee and provide an opportunity to comment on the key issues for inclusion in its draft Business Plan 2016-19.

2. Summary of the Issue

- 2.1 The Joint Waste Committee oversees the work on recycling and waste related issues across Cheltenham Borough, Cotswold District, Forest of Dean, Gloucestershire County and Tewkesbury Borough Councils under an Inter Authority Agreement. The Committee is required to approve a Business Plan with a three year horizon, updated on an annual basis.

3. Summary of evidence/information

- 3.1 The Joint Committee received a report on 13th October 2015 outlining key issues for inclusion in the plan. The report is attached to this Discussion Paper. Members are invited to make comments or suggestions regarding the key issues / proposed content.


4. Next Steps

- 4.1 The Joint Waste Committee will formally consider a Draft Business plan on 15th December 2015. Any comments or suggestions from the partners can be included in the covering report / and or draft plan.

Background Papers

Contact Officer

Steve Read, Head of Service, Joint Waste Team
01823 625707,
Steve.read@gloucestershire.gov.uk

| | |
|---|---|
|  | <p>OUTLINE OF BUSINESS PLAN 2016-19</p> |
| <p>Committee</p> | <p>Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee</p> |
| <p>Committee Date</p> | <p>13 October 2015</p> |
| <p>Significant Decision</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p>Responsible Officers</p> | <p>Steve Read, Head of Service, Gloucestershire Joint Waste Team (01823 625707; steve.read@gloucestershire.gov.uk);</p> |
| <p>Main Consultees</p> | <p>Partner Councils and key stakeholders in due course</p> |
| <p>Purpose of Report</p> | <p>The report sets out key areas identified for potential inclusion in the next iteration of the JWC Business Plan to cover a three year horizon 2016-19. The actual draft plan will be considered at the December Board meeting. Members' views are sought at the meeting and at an informal meeting due to take place in November.</p> |
| <p>Recommendations</p> | <p><i>It is recommended that the Committee:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments on and approves the broad approach and proposed priority areas for inclusion in the Business Plan 2016-19 as set out in the report. 2. Discuss and provide further ideas for any particular service changes, projects or programmes for potential inclusion in the Draft Business Plan to be approved at the December 2015 meeting. 3. Convenes an informal non-decision workshop in November to further discuss progress on key action areas, along with the formulation of the plan and associated resource implications. |
| <p>Resource Implications</p> | <p>As constituted, budget setting for the delivery of core services remains with the partner councils. The detailed financial implications of any new areas of work, or any changes to existing services will therefore be agreed with the partner council concerned prior to seeking endorsement of the Committee where this may have an impact on the Committee's overall objectives.</p> |

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. The Committee is required to approve a Business Plan with a three year horizon, updated on an annual basis. Producing an outline at this stage helps the Board to identify key areas for inclusion and to direct officers to prepare more information on any area it highlights. This also gives the Committee an opportunity to identify any potential service changes so that these can be further assessed at an informal, non-decision making workshop (date in November to be confirmed) and set out for approval in the Draft Plan.
- 1.2. As constituted, budget setting for the delivery of services remains with the partner councils. The detailed financial implications of any new areas of work, or any changes to existing services will therefore be agreed with the partner council concerned prior to seeking endorsement of the Committee where this may have an impact on the Committee's overall objectives.
- 1.3. At the time of preparing this report, the detailed savings requirements of individual partners are being formulated. The report recognises that Partner authorities will seek to respond to ongoing financial pressures in the period of this Business Plan.

2. OVERVIEW

- 2.1. It has been helpful to the Joint Waste Team to consider its main priorities as:
 - Broadening the partnership (encouraging Gloucester City & Stroud to join)
 - Integration – seeking synergies and avoiding duplication of effort and resources
 - Diversion – minimising the amount sent for disposal through waste avoidance, reduction or material recovery (reuse, recycling, composting, AD, etc)
- 2.2. These remain useful categories and in the development of this iteration of the plan it is helpful to extend the scope of “Integration” to include *Optimisation* – the priority of making systems as efficient as possible regardless of whether they apply to multiple or single partners. Optimisation can cover, among other things, operations, finance and governance.

3. MATTERS OF KEY CONCERN TO THE COMMITTEE

- 3.1. The apparent growth in waste volumes with increases seen over the last 3 years against an historic tendency to decline year on year
- 3.2. Continuing apparent difficulties, in Gloucestershire and elsewhere in the UK, in improving and maintaining recycling rates beyond a level which was locally reached several years ago except at times of major service change.
- 3.3. Lack of respite on cumulative year on year financial pressures facing the partner authorities, including loss of recycle values where this risk is with the local authority.

4. OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1. The regulatory environment is not expected to change significantly over the period although there may, possibly through case law, be more clarity regarding interpretation of the Waste Regulations and so called “TEEP” requirements. The European Union is expected to publish a new action plan for a “competitive circular economy” before the

end of the year. A previous iteration of the proposal contained very ambitious recycling targets and it remains to be seen if these will still be included. In any event it is too early to determine what proposals, if any, may be transposed into UK law. Defra is currently reviewing how England will meet its existing 2020 target of 50% recycling. The main material of interest (due to weight and availability of separate collection) appears to be food waste, however Gloucestershire is well ahead of the game in this field.

- 4.2. The financial pressure on partner councils remains a major constraint. The Joint Waste Team will continue to seek opportunities to reduce costs through service integration and where possible through renegotiation of existing contracts and obtaining best value for materials. With systems in place, minimising the amount sent for disposal has a positive benefit for all partners.
- 4.3. The demand from the public for a wider range of materials to be recycled will continue and opportunities will be sought to improve this as part of the review and redesign of services and vehicles. There is a proposal elsewhere on this agenda which may reshape the way we engage with customers, maintaining an emphasis on education but more directly with individual householders and being prepared to intervene more directly where justified.

5. KEY PROJECTS

- 5.1. A summary of projects and other work streams already identified is attached within an Appendix to this report.
- 5.2. There are a cluster of projects involving review and re-specification of collection contracts with, in some cases, associated capital procurement of vehicles. Value can be optimised by sharing information and processes within the single client team
- 5.3. Similarly when projects are through the review phase (eg the current FoDDC Collection review) there will be preparation for, and delivery of, the implementation phase. This also applies to the mobilisation of the UBB Javelin Park contract now that the way appears clear for this project to commence.
- 5.4. There are a number of projects which the JWT will work with contractors to reduce costs through optimise existing services. This includes round reviews, improvement to customer services sitting alongside other joint projects.
- 5.5. JWT will continue to conceive and deliver campaigns and “nudge” opportunities.

6. OTHER OPPORTUNITIES

JWT will continue to seek ways of sharing resources with other councils. In addition to the continuing shared Head of Service arrangement with Somerset, the Head of Operations at Somerset Waste Partnership is currently giving specialist support to Gloucester City and the JWT in Tewkesbury in relation to collection contract reviews. This is a more cost effective way of obtaining experienced advice and project support than interim management or consultancy support.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix to Outline of Business Plan 2016-19

| | Project | Affecting | Objective and /or Outcomes |
|----|--|------------------|--|
| 1 | Waste Transfer Options | GCC, CBC, | To consider the options for the transfer of waste after August 2018 (see report on this agenda). |
| 2 | Increasing recycling participation by engagement eg the <i>Helping People to Recycle More</i> project | All | To minimise waste to disposal on an average per household basis. |
| 3 | Support for Stroud DC service change | GCC, SDC | To assist Stroud as required in ensuring the service change happens smoothly diverting more waste away from landfill. |
| 4 | Javelin Park project handover | GCC | To develop a plan to transfer responsibility for the contract to the JWT. |
| 5 | Javelin Park Communications | GCC | Continue to make it very clear that the delivery of Javelin Park does not take the pressure off the need to minimise waste for disposal |
| 6 | Work with Ubico to develop a Procurement Strategy for vehicles and other capital items | All | To be used for projects from April 2016, eg TBC , CBC and other partners as required. |
| 7 | TBC vehicle procurement | TBC | New vehicle fleet in place by April 17 |
| 8 | Review options for recycling service redesign in Cheltenham including round optimisation across all services | CBC | To consider the service options available and assess the affordability of being able to implement mixed plastics and cardboard collections from the kerbside and to minimise additional costs as a result of property number increases |
| 9 | Support Ubico in making preparations to implement chosen recycling service model in 2017 | CBC | To ensure that any new service is effectively introduced within time and financial parameters |
| 10 | Support CBC in enforcing no-side waste and closed bin lid policy | CBC | To control levels of residual waste being presented - in support of <i>Helping People to Recycle More</i> project |
| 11 | Support Ubico in transferring operations to permanent depot in Cotswold | CDC | To reduce revenue cost to CDC |
| 12 | Support Ubico in presenting options for and implementation of round re-routing in Cotswold | CDC | To optimise collection resources available as household numbers increases in some areas and rounds become unbalanced |
| 13 | Promote garden waste collection schemes in all districts | Districts | To promote and sustain uptake in garden waste services |

| | Project | Affecting | Objective and /or Outcomes |
|----|---|------------------|--|
| 14 | Explore new recycling opportunities at HRCs including Swindon Road | GCC & CBC | Carry over from 2015/16 if not completed |
| 15 | Actions associated with outcome of FoDDC review (see item on this agenda) | FoDDC | To implement improved recycling collections from the kerbside and reduce waste to landfill |
| 16 | Monitor recycling banks usage in FoDDC | FoDDC | To assess if recycling banks can be removed by 2018 to reduce costs |
| 17 | Planning for mobilisation of FoDDC street cleaning contract in 2018 | FoDDC | new contract mobilisaton |
| 18 | Maximise income for recycling | FoDDC and CBC | To increase income to councils through promotion of quality and (CBC) effective marketing of materials |
| 19 | Support 2020 project changes - e.g. changes to CRM systems that impact on service delivery | 2020 partners | To ensure continuity of service, and quality of service delivery and customer satisfaction |
| 20 | Flytipping and Litter Prevention | FoDDC | To improve the natural environment and reduce costs |
| 21 | Monitor Health and Safety and Support Health & safety Executive's anticipated intervention program | Districts | To ensure safe working practices are in place and risks are eliminated or mitigated |
| 22 | Complete review and implement options for TBC recycling service redesign including round optimisation across all services | TBC | New service would be implement in line with vehicle fleet replacement due April 17 and would depend on outcome of service review |
| 23 | TBC MRF contract procurement | TBC | New contract in place by April 17 |
| 25 | Continue to support Gloucester City (on a cost recovery basis) | JWT | Move toward full membership of the JWC |

| O&S Task group | Purpose | Status summary | Nominations/Membership (chairman in bold) | Facilitating Officer | Sponsoring Officer | Cabinet Member | Proposed by | Terms of Ref agreed by O&S | Recs to O&S | Report to Council | Report to Cabinet | Cabinet follow up | O&S Follow up scheduled |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| KEY TO COLOURS | Active STGs | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | On hold | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Standing group | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not prioritised by O&S | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Broadband | Members at the O&S meeting in April asked if a task group might want to look at what and where the issues in relation to slow broadband are in Cheltenham (and possibly Gloucester City if they want to undertake joint scrutiny) and use this information to help lobby GCC and/or BT and Virgin to make improvements. | the task group met for the first time on the 20/10 but after a presentation from Fastershire were unable to agree aims and objectives for th review. Matt Smith from Fastershire would investigate what data he could share with the task group and whether they could in turn share it with the public and the task group would meet again then to discuss a way forward. The task group are still waiting for this informaiton and the One Page Strategy will be tabled with the O&S Committee once the task group have decided what they aim to achieve. | Cllrs Babbage, Britter and Whyborn and Cllrs Gordon Taylor and Neil Hampson (Gloucester City Council) | Annette Wight | Exec Board | tbc | Cllr Tim Harman | tbc | | | | | |
| Devolution | The Leader asked if O&S would set up a task group to maintain an overview of the ongoing discussions in relation to devolution and explore the opportunities and benefits for Cheltenham. | Membership has been confirmed and the first meeting took place on the 12/10 and Cllr Mason was elected as Chair. The one page strategy was approved by the O&S Committee at the meeting on the 26/10. The group continue to meet and an update will be provided at Council on the 14/12. | Cllrs, Clucas, Harman, Whyborn, Payne, Mason and C. Hay (Cllrs Jordan and Reid will observe) | Rosalind Reeves | Andrew North | Leader (Cllr Jordan) | Leader, Cllr Jordan | Oct-15 | | | | | |
| Budget scrutiny working group | The working group's role is to develop the budget process, support the development of Members' scrutiny role and to consider ideas from Members for reducing the budget gap. | The working group has a schedule of meetings arranged throughout the year. The new members held their first meeting on 10/07/2014 when the Chief Executive attended to outline his vision and the group considered the financial implications of Vision 20/20. | Cllrs Babbage, Nelson, Payne, Thornton, Whyborn, Wilkinson Cabinet Member Finance to attend by invitation. | Rosalind Reeves | Mark Sheldon | Finance (Cllr Rawson) | Council | May-12 | Jan-15 | Feb-15 | Jan-15 | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

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

| Meeting date: 30 November (report deadline: 18 November) | | | |
|---|---|------------|---|
| ICT | Review progress on the implementation of the ICT strategy and follow up of recommendations from the scrutiny task group | Discussion | Mark Sheldon and Rachael McKinnon |
| Review of the council's performance at end of Quarter 2 (April to September 2015) | Review performance and comment as necessary | Discussion | Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager |
| Joint Waste Committee Business Plan 2016-18 | Consider what is included prior to the budget setting process | Discussion | Steve Read, Head of Service – Joint Waste Committee |
| Meeting date: 25 January (report deadline: 13 January) | | | |
| Budget recommendations | STG recommendations to the Cabinet on the budget proposals for 2016/17 | Report | Paul Jones |
| Cemetery and Crematorium | Consider the programme definition document | Discussion | Ken Dale |
| Gloucestershire Association for Voluntary and Community Action (GAVCA) (O&S to confirm whether they want the committee to look at this) | Consider the findings of the Voluntary and Community Sector organisation (VCS) survey about how they value GAVCA | Discussion | Richard Gibson |
| 2020 vision – customer focus (the chair is due to have a discussion with the Andrew North about this) | This could be dealt with by the cross party Member working group | Discussion | Tbc |
| Tourism Project | Update from Tourism member working group?? | Discussion | Tbc |
| Meeting date: 22 February (report deadline: 10 February) | | | |

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

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

| | | | |
|--|---|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Public Art Panel STG | Review progress on the STG recommendations which went to Cabinet (Feb 2015) and agreed in March 2015 | Discussion | Rowena Hay/Wilf Tomaney |
| Members' ICT STG | Review progress on the STG recommendations which went to Cabinet (Feb 2015) and agreed in April 2015 | Discussion | Jon Walklett/tbc |
| DRAFT Corporate strategy | Consider final draft of corporate strategy | Discussion | Richard Gibson |
| Tourism? | Presentation from the consultants? | Presentation | Tbc |
| Meeting date: 11 April (report deadline: 30 March) | | | |
| Deprivation STG | Progress against recommendations (18 months since Cabinet and 12 since last at O&S) | Discussion | Various |
| Cheltenham Trust | Successes and lessons learned following the first 12-18 months in operation. Set parameters for future scrutiny | Discussion | Tbc |
| NHS Trust | Overview of plans for Gloucestershire Hospitals (date yet to be accepted) | Presentation | Clair Chilvers and Dr Sally Pearson |
| Meeting date: 27 June (report deadline: 15 June) | | | |
| Procurement and Contract management strategy | 12 month review of whether 'culture' has changed since adoption of the revised strategy | Discussion | Cabinet Member Corporate Services |
| Scrutiny annual report 2015-16 (might go to a later meeting) | Consider the draft annual report before it is noted at council | Discussion | Chairman of O&S |

Items for future meetings (a date to be established)

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

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

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| North Place | Watching brief and further in-depth scrutiny as necessary | Tbc | Tbc |
| Economic Development | Consider draft cabinet proposals on options for future support of economic development | Tbc | Mike Redman |
| Cheltenham integrated transport issues | Look at issues (if any) that are identified by various scrutiny task groups once they have completed their work and consider how to take them forward?? | Tbc | Tbc |
| Review of milestone relating to developing a more collaborative approach to tackle drug dealing | This was 'amber' in July 2015 when the committee considered the end of year performance and asked to review progress | Tbc | Tbc |
| Cheltenham Festivals | Consider future plans for the Festivals in Cheltenham | Tbc | Tbc |
| Cheltenham Spa Railway Station STG | Review progress against recommendations 12 months on | 12 months on from Cabinet response | Jeremy Williamson |
| Cycling & Walking STG | Review progress against recommendations 12 months on | 12 months on from Cabinet response | Wilf Tomaney |

| Annual Items | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|
| Budget recommendations | January | Chair, Budget Scrutiny Working Group |
| Draft Corporate Strategy | March | Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager |
| Quarter 3 performance review | March | Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager |

O&S Committee 2014/15 work plan

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---|
| End of year performance review | June/July | Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager |
| Scrutiny annual report | July/Sept | Saira Malin, Democracy Officer |
| Quarter 2 performance review | November | Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager |