



## Notice of a meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 25 June 2018**  
**6.00 pm**  
**Pittville Room - Municipal Offices**

<b>Membership</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Chris Mason (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Sandra Holliday, John Payne, Paul Baker, Max Wilkinson, Dilys Barrell, Iain Dobie, Jo Stafford and Dennis Parsons

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

## Agenda

<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b> Apologies received from Councillor Baker and Councillor Willingham is substitute	
<b>2.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b> To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 23 April 2018	(Pages 3 - 12)
<b>4.</b>	<b>PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>APPOINTMENT OF BUDGET SCRUTINY WORKING GROUP</b> To appoint members to the standing cross party budget scrutiny budget working group (members to be appointed from the non-Executive Members on the Council)	
<b>6.</b>	<b>END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT</b> Report of the Strategy and Engagement Manager	(Pages 13 - 24)
<b>7.</b>	<b>FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED</b> Gloucestershire Health and Care O&S Committee (8 May)  Gloucestershire Economic Growth O&S Committee (20 June) – update from Councillor Paul McCloskey	(Pages 25 - 26)

		Police and Crime Panel (16 March) - reported at the April meeting	
8.		<b>CABINET BRIEFING</b> An 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.	
9.		<b>NEW SCRUTINY REGISTRATION FORMS</b> To consider the attached scrutiny registrations forms for possible inclusion in the overview and scrutiny work plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urban Gulls</li> <li>- Cheltenham Transport Plan</li> <li>- Events</li> <li>- Consultation</li> </ul>	(Pages 27 - 38)
10.		<b>REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN</b> Review of latest workplan and prioritisation of any new items.	(Pages 39 - 42)
11.		<b>ARLE NURSERY STRATEGIC REVIEW</b> Report of the Cabinet Member Finance (please note the meeting will need to go into exempt session if the committee wish to discuss the business case or exempt risks)	(Pages 43 - 68)
12.		<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXEMPT INFORMATION</b> <b>The committee is recommended to approve the following resolution:-</b>  <p>“That in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 and 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:</p> <p>Paragraph 1; Information relating to any individual</p> <p>Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</p>	
13.		<b>UPDATE ON NORTH PLACE</b> Report of the Head of Property and Asset Management	(Pages 69 - 70)
14.		<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b> 10 September 2018	

**Contact Officer:** Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 775153  
**Email:** [democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk)

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 23rd April, 2018**  
**6.00 - 8.00 pm**

Attendees	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Colin Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, John Payne and David Willingham (Reserve)
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Gary Angove (Building Surveyor), Councillor Coleman (Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment), Councillor Jordan (Leader) and Mike Redman (Director of Environment)

## Minutes

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillors Baker and Wilkinson (Councillor Willingham attended as a substitute for Councillor Wilkinson).

The Chairman acknowledged that this would be the last meeting for Councillors Hay, McCloskey and Walklett, all of whom were standing down in the upcoming elections. He took the opportunity to thank them for their contributions to the success of the committee and wished them well for the future. This also stood for any members who might not be successful in their bid for re-election.

He also took the opportunity to thank the Democracy Officer, Saira Malin, for her hard work and support of the committee and all the best with her impending new arrival, as this would be her last meeting before she commenced maternity leave.

### 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.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 28 March 2018 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

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

None had been received but the Chairman noted that a number of requests had been submitted (Appendix 1) with regard to possible future scrutiny of residents parking schemes in Cheltenham and issues they wished to form part of any considerations; namely particular issues within the streets and roads in which they resided. The Chairman thanked members of the public for their interest

and confirmed that their requests would be considered as part of any scrutiny if and when undertaken (no decision would be taken on this until Agenda Item 8 of the agenda).

### **5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

No matters had been referred to the committee.

### **6. SUPPORT FOR AREAS OF DEPRIVATION - UPDATE**

Unfortunately the report author was not present at the meeting and as such this item was taken at the end of the agenda.

Members felt that the paper that had been produced was informative and agreed that they should not lose sight of this issue and therefore tasked the lead members with deciding how this would be taken forward by scrutiny.

A member felt that the key questions were: how do we measure success in these areas of deprivation, could an explanation for why the same areas were still featuring on the indices of deprivation because the support being given was improving people's lives and enabling them to move out of the area. Also, he felt that the council and its partners needed to be clear about what they were trying to achieve in these areas and why.

### **7. CREMATOR PROBLEMS UPDATE**

In recognition that the concerns that members (and the public) had voiced regarding the recent shutdown of the cremators at Bouncers Lane Crematorium, the committee had requested an overview of the issue, details of how it had been resolved and what lessons had been learnt. The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment, the Director of Environment and a Building Surveyor from Property Services.

The Director of Environment introduced the discussion paper which had been circulated with the agenda and whilst he did not propose to talk through it, he did refer members to Section 7 (Lessons Learnt) and the principle lesson learnt related to communications. The council had relied heavily on Funeral Directors to communicate relevant information to their clients on their behalf and from the small number of complaints received it was clear that consideration needed to be given to the council's role in communicating any future business continuity issues. Similarly, members views on how they felt they should be briefed in future given that during the recent issues members were briefed at the same time as the press, often in the form of a press release. It was also noted that the Building Surveyor had been liaising closely with the maintenance contractor with regard to the existing, sub-standard plant equipment.

The Cabinet Member explained that communications would be a key issue in terms of the next 12 months with the existing equipment and admitted he was in a dilemma about which approach the council should adopt: contact bereaved families directly or leave it with the Funeral Directors to communicate business continuity issues. He explained that there were two schools of thought: it was a council service and therefore the council should take responsibility for all communications or: the bereaved families had a relationship with Funeral Directors which made it more appropriate for them to communicate any issues. Discussions were ongoing and he would welcome a view from members, highlighting that any procedure would apply beyond the context of the defective

plant equipment. He had acknowledged at the time, in a statement to Council, that members' were receiving information in the form of a press release, at the same time as the press and whilst this was not his favoured approach, it had been necessary at the time he queried whether members had thoughts on an alternative approach, perhaps including text messages or phone calls. He was also aware that a resident had contacted a Gloucestershire County Council representative who was not aware of the issue and did members have any thoughts on this going forward.

The following responses were given to member questions:

- The existing cremators had historically operated at the higher end of temperature that you'd expect and this had created problems with flues and other parts, as well as causing the electrics to fail. The chapel was small and cremators obviously generated heat, normally 40 degrees but in the case of the defective cremators this ranged from 50 – 66 degrees and where you would ordinarily mitigate this by installing more windows, for example, this was not possible because the chapel itself was a listed building. In the short term the number of fans had been increased and discussions were ongoing with the Planning Team with regard to other options, though clearly this process would take time given the listed status of the building. The advice from those running the maintenance contract was that maintenance should be undertaken every 3 months but this had been reduced to every 6 weeks in light of the recent issues and the council had also increased the level and range of stock parts.
- The Emergency Planning Team had been made aware of the difficulties posed by the defective equipment and the recent shutdown had highlighted a deficit of capacity in the locality.
- The council had previously been given assurances from neighbours that they had spare capacity should cremations have to be transferred to other crematoria in the locality (Gloucester and Worcester) but at the time of the issues they were catering to higher demand and were therefore not in a position to take displaced cremations from Cheltenham. Instead, Westerleigh, a private funeral provider which had sufficient capacity at their brand new facility in a countryside location just outside of Newport.
- With the robustness and reliability of the defective plant still a concern, transitional arrangements for the coming 12 months were being considered. This included the option of a temporary installation, but there was a process to be gone through, which would take time and there was a judgement to be made about the cost/benefit of doing this given the new equipment was due on line in Spring 2019. Discussions with the suppliers of the new plant equipment about accelerating the programme was another option being explored, but this also involved discussions with those delivering the service to establish how the service would be delivered whilst maintaining a sufficient level of dignity.
- Coffins were transferred to the place of cremation by private ambulance (free of charge) and the ambulance was used to return the ashes the next day, which for cremations carried out at Cheltenham generally took 3 days.
- In his time as Cabinet Member, Councillor Coleman and the team had worked hard to improve relations with Funeral Directors, which had been

badly affected by the issues with the sub-standard equipment. The plan was to engage with Funeral Directors about their views on who should communicate business continuity issues in the future and whilst he would welcome member views on this, he would not go against the decision of the Funeral Directors.

- Obviously CBC councillors were concerned about residents of Cheltenham but what about the larger, catchment area, for want of a better word, people who lived outside of the Borough but who used the crematorium.

A number of members took the opportunity to commend everyone involved for their handling of what had been a very unfortunate situation.

The Cabinet Member added his thanks to officers for how they had dealt with the crisis, which he could not fault and seized the chance to thank Councillors Payne, McCloskey and Ryder who had formed part of his Cabinet Member Working Group for the last 4 years, as he was aware two were standing down. He had found this an invaluable sounding board and urged groups to nominate replacements following the upcoming elections.

Members were of the view that the Funeral Directors were best placed to communicate any business continuity issues, having a relationship with the bereaved which the council did not. A member commented that this would not be acceptable to all but that it would be impossible to develop a procedure which met the expectations of everyone.

There was consensus across the committee that members of Gloucestershire County Council should, along with Borough Councillors, be made aware of any issues at the first opportunity and where possible, in advance of the press, though members appreciated that this was dependent on the circumstances of a particular issue.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for their attendance.

### **8. SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM**

Councillor Hay raised the issue of Councillor Harman chairing this item given his role as Cabinet Member at Gloucestershire County Council. The Chairman did not agree that this was an issue, given his support for scrutiny of this topic, but suggested that the Deputy (Councillor Walklett) take the chair for this item, and the committee agreed.

Councillor Willingham as the proposer of the topic explained that on the 1 August 2017 permit parking was introduced in areas around Cheltenham Spa Station, and the West End area near the Lower High Street, following formal consultation in May of the previous year (2016). In representations made at the time, Councillor Willingham had advised that this was likely to cause parking to be displaced into adjacent areas, and the need for a post-implementation review to be performed. Within days of implementation, as he had predicted, parking displacement had occurred, with commuters having simply moved from one area to another. In December 2017 Councillor Willingham was advised by the relevant Cabinet Member at Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) that a technical assessment of parking availability would be undertaken in January 2018 and when he queried, in February, if this had been completed, he was

advised that they had carried out a survey in December but that the initial results indicated that there would be benefit in repeating the consultation in January, which had also been completed and the data was, at that time, being analysed. With still no details of any planned review, residents felt that they were in limbo, with no end in sight and it was a testament to the level of local concern that so many residents had made requests for scrutiny and were in attendance at the meeting. He was aware, from discussions with representatives from other wards that the issues he had described were not isolated to his ward but included St Paul's and All Saints. He felt that the fact that CBC were responsible for off-street parking and GCC responsible for on-street parking was irrelevant to the public and far from being about political expedience, joined up thinking between the two authorities was necessary in order to devise a town-wide strategy for Cheltenham and whilst this would not be a quick process, it was a must. Whilst acknowledging the needs of commuters to be able to park in the town, the piecemeal approach that had been adopted was frustrating for residents and he also had concerns about future planned resident parking schemes in areas with predominantly CBH tenants, given that GCC didn't appear to have a policy on cost and means testing.

All members of the committee voiced their support for further scrutiny of this issue, in addition to which the following comments were made:

- A revised residents' parking scheme was introduced in All Saints, with a post-implementation review promised after 6 months, but 12 months on and the message from GCC was that there was no budget to undertake these reviews. Having raised this issue again recently the ward member was advised that he could use Local Highways Challenge Fund to progress the issue more quickly, which he did not consider acceptable.
- The consultants, Arups, who had been commissioned by CBC to do a report into Cheltenham's car parking arrangements, had concluded that a piecemeal approach was the right one but this did not take account of the fact that it would impact streets differently. A town-wide strategy was required.
- In London, to address the issue of all day commuter parking, limited parking restrictions were introduced and in time zones, which made enforcement more efficient and effective. The suggestion was that to resolve the issue of commuter parking you simply had to disrupt it.
- In the ward of St Marks, resident parking schemes had addressed the issue of commuter parking but had only served to push the issue into other roads. GCC had since advised that they were not able to commit to any timescales for a post-implementation review as there were no funds for them to be able to undertake such reviews.
- There appeared to be a lack of consistency, strategy and communication. East Approach Drive in Pittville was subject to restrictions, residents were given permits and seemed to be working well, however, in West Approach Drive there were no restrictions and no problems but now the proposal was that bays would be introduced with all day parking available on one side and 4 hour limits on the other. When this apparent discrepancy was raised, the ward member was advised that East Approach Drive had been a mistake but that it was too complicated a process to change again.

- An issue for residents in some streets in All Saints ward and possibly others was that business permits, which were readily available, often impacted a residents ability to park anywhere near their properties.
- GCC had undertaken 15 months of what was described as excellent consultation in the St Pauls ward various schemes were implemented in all streets except those which contained, predominantly social housing. At the time of implementation a commitment was made to undertake a review in 9-12 months and despite numerous requests by the ward members and Councillor Fisher as the GCC representative, no response had been given.

In response to a member question, another committee member confirmed that residents could apply for a maximum of two permits per household, regardless of whether they had off-street parking or not.

A member did raise the question of whether the GCC member reps on this committee had ever raised the issue of post-implementation reviews or town-wide strategy with the O&S Committee at the County Council. Councillor Hay confirmed that he had raised questions at Council but had not referred the matter to the O&S Committee to scrutinise. The suggestion was that this would be beneficial.

At this stage the Chairman invited any residents who were in attendance, to address the committee if they so wished.

Mr Walker explained that since the introduction of parking schemes in adjacent streets to his own, it was not only residents who struggled to park but also trades people. He felt that there were failings in an approach which saw some streets empty all day and others so full that residents couldn't park anywhere near their own property and had GCC to be unresponsive to his concerns.

Mr Shepherd explained that he had never had any issue parking near his property prior to August last year and yet since that time, Monday to Friday, and to his mind a result of commuter traffic, it sometimes proved impossible to park anywhere near his home, when in adjacent streets such as Lansdown Parade, where parking meters had been installed, were all but empty. He suggested that a drop in on-street parking fees as you radiated out from the town centre might make it more attractive to commuters to park in these streets and thus generate more income. The ward member for Lansdown refuted that it was the cost that was prohibitive to commuters but rather the 4 hour limit that had been introduced as a means of attracting shoppers rather than commuters.

Mr Jaynes reiterated that the issue of commuters parking in his street often meant that residents, some with young families, were not able to park in anything like close proximity to their home.

Ms Atherstone, a candidate for St Peters ward in the upcoming Borough elections reaffirmed that the prediction made by Councillor Willingham had come to be and following a number of surveys it was clear that some of the bays and lines that had been introduced in some streets were, either blocking driveways or inexplicably reducing the number of spaces available within a street. In some instances they were also creating dangerous parking situations resulting in pedestrians being unable to get a clear view of the road when



attempting to cross. She agreed with Councillor Hay's suggestion about the adoption of a similar approach to that adopted in London and felt strongly that Cheltenham required a town-wide strategy.

The Chairman thanked the members of the public that had addressed the committee for having provided a better understanding of the issue, before inviting the Leader to address the committee if he wished. The Leader, invited by the Chairman, explained that the Station was the final of the 'new schemes' which represented a timely opportunity to undertake post-implementation reviews of schemes across the town and which he would fully support. He did note that there had been a Parking Board which had facilitated open dialogue on issues such as this, but that this had been scrapped when enforcement for on-street parking was taken back by GCC.

The Chairman asked that the committee, who were clearly in support of further scrutiny of this issue, to decide what form this should take.

Councillor Willingham, as proposer of the topic felt that there were two matters to be addressed, a town-wide strategy was one, but the more urgent, from the standpoint of residents, was the post-implementation reviews.

A member suggested that, in terms of a strategy, it would be sensible to first hear from the relevant Cabinet Members and Lead Officers from both CBC and GCC and members of the committee supported this approach. The Democracy Officer advised that, in line with the county-wide protocol for the attendance of officers and members of one public authority at meetings of another public authority, she would write to the Chief Executive of Gloucestershire County Council and make the request. The committee would be updated as to any response.

Another member proposed that Councillors Hay and Payne, as County Councillors as well as members of this committee, submit a Call for Action to the O&S Committee at GCC, regarding post-implementations which are yet to be undertaken. The committee supported this proposal.

Upon a vote it was

### **RESOLVED that:**

- 1. The relevant Cabinet Members and Lead Officers from both CBC and GCC be invited to discuss on-street and off street parking at a future meeting of the committee.**
- 2. Councillors Hay and Payne submit a Call for Action to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at Gloucestershire County Council, seeking post-implementation reviews of all new parking schemes introduced in Cheltenham.**

### **9. FEEDBACK FROM OTHER SCRUTINY MEETINGS ATTENDED**

Councillor McCloskey had produced a written update on the recent meeting(s) of the Police and Crime Panel and this was circulated at the start of the meeting (Appendix 1). She explained that the meeting on the 16 March had been relatively short, and included an update on Restorative Justice. Having begun as a small project in 2010 in HMP Gloucester it had now expanded into

Cheltenham and Gloucester and members would recall having had a presentation, some months ago, prior to a Council meeting. It was noted that the service was recognised nationally having received the Restorative Service quality mark, the Police Support Volunteer Team of the Year award in 2015 and 2016 and the PCC Spotlight award.

There were no member comments or questions.

Councillor Harvey had not submitted an update on the recent meeting of the Health and Care O&S Committee, nor was he present to provide a verbal update.

A written update from Councillor P McCloskey on the recent meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee had been circulated with the agenda. Members were asked to contact him directly with any comments or questions.

### **10. CABINET BRIEFING**

The Leader referred members to the briefing which had been circulated with the agenda, and which focussed on 2050. He asked whether members were supportive of the proposal to hold a second seminar on the 28 June, in the hope of having a cross-party discussion and deciding whether it was possible to achieve agreement on a motion, which could then be debated at Council on the 23 July. Members were happy with the proposed approach.

### **11. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

The work plan had been circulated with the agenda and the Democracy Officer outlined the items scheduled for consideration at the next meeting (25 June): End of year performance review Arle Nursery Strategic Review and a North Place update, which would only come if sufficient progress had been made since the last update and it was noted that this was likely to be exempt.

A member believed that the LGGA would soon be publishing a report on scrutiny and suggested that this was something that should be reviewed by the committee. The Democracy Officer confirmed that Democratic Services would review any such publication and decide if and how it would be presented to the committee, in consultation with the Chairman.

### **12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for the 25 June 2018.

Tim Harman  
**Chairman**

## **REQUEST ONE**

Page 11

Dear Sir

Concerns about parking displacement in Alstone Croft

The Bramery on Alstone Lane has seen town working commuters parking on site since the displacement, and has introduced its own parking scheme limiting businesses on site to how many permits they can have for each worker. This has in turn displaced both the town working commuters and also workers from the Bramery from parking there. Many town workers are now parking their cars in Alstone Croft and using fold up bicycles to get into town, which is affecting our own residents and their own visitors ability to park outside their own houses, , and many Bramery workers have been observed to be parking in Alstone Croft and walking across to their place of work on a daily basis. We are now suffering the fallout from an ill thought out scheme, which will only get worse when the Boots corner scheme forcing more traffic into residential area's is implemented. Does anyone involved with decision making process actually live in the area's affected, as scant regard is being given to those who do, and is there any plan to counter this newly manufactured problem!

Mr Filmer

## **REQUEST TWO**

Dear CBC

Could the Chairman please ensure that the following parking problem in Gloucester Road is highlighted for investigation when the committee decides how it will investigate parking in Cheltenham. Details below:

I've written to Gloucestershire CC on numerous occasions as the amount of available parking on Gloucester Road has been reduced near our house since the introduction of the new parking scheme. The problem started when the the new parking bay was painted in with a large gap between the end of the bay and our neighbours drop kerb. When I parked partly on the new bay and partly on the unmarked piece of road I was approached by two parking enforcement officers who told me I couldn't park like this. I first questioned this in August 2017 and was told that it would be checked. Without coming back to me, however, the unmarked section of road was covered with double yellow lines, reducing the amount of available parking. Despite numerous requests for their removal, the new double yellow lines are still in place, and I cannot see why this additional restriction has been put in place? It does not appear to match the plan and hinders rather than helps our parking issues.

Thank you and kind regards

Ms Woods

## **REQUEST THREE**

Dear Sir or Madam,

I have a question to ask under Item 8 of the agenda:

"Could the Chairman please ensure that the problem of displaced commuter parking in Alstone Avenue is highlighted when the Committee decides how it will investigate parking in Cheltenham?"

Yours sincerely,

Mr Walker

### **REQUEST FOUR**

Could the Chairman please ensure that the problem of ... Displaced Parking Problems due to new parking zone boundaries in Alstone Croft Cheltenham is highlighted for investigation when the committee decides how it will investigate parking in Cheltenham.

Many Thanks

Mr Jaynes

### **REQUEST FIVE**

Could the Cabinet Member/ Chairman of Committee please ensure that the problem of ... vehicles contravening the No Entry on the junction of Alstone Croft and Alstone Lane Cheltenham and the wish of the residents (via a poll handed to the Road Safety Hub ) of Alstone Croft to have this junction closed to stop this happening daily ... is highlighted for investigation when the committee decides on highways in Cheltenham.

Many Thanks

Mr Jaynes

### **REQUEST SIX**

4 visitors parking bays were installed at the top of Great Western Terrace, yet given the reduction in actual parking spaces these bays have created, it is only residents who are using these spaces since there is nowhere else to park.

An easy 'fix' which would create some extra spaces for parking, would be to remove the Visitors bay outside numbers 33 & 35 Great Western Terrace and the single yellow line opposite - this would create an extra 3 parking spaces for residents, whilst still leaving 2 Visitor spaces.

The implementation of this parking scheme has only served to make the road quieter during the day, which is not when a problem previously existed. The problem still remains that some residents are unable to park in the road during the evening due to space not being available - this has simply been made worse by the single yellow lines which have reduced the amount of parking available.

**Therefore, could the Chairman please ensure that the problem of reduced parking and ineffectively used visitors bays in Great Western Terrace is highlighted for investigation when the committee decides how it will investigate parking in Cheltenham?**

Ms Hindle

# ***Information/Discussion Paper***

## **Review of the council's end of year performance 2017/18**

**25 June 2018**

### **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

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 financial year 2017/18 ie April 2017 to March 2018.
- 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 2017-18 action plan that was agreed by Council on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017
- 2.3** The performance report is attached as appendix A.

#### **3. End of year Performance Overview**

- 3.1** In the 2017-18 action plan, we identified 82 milestones to track our progress. Out of these:
  - 51 (62%) are complete within the financial year.
  - 7 (9%) are green and are on track to be delivered on time within agreed timescales.
  - 23 (28%) are amber. These are projects that were not delivered within the financial year but have been pushed back into the current financial year with commitments set out in the 2018/19 corporate strategy.
  - 1 (1%) is red.
- 3.2** The red milestone relate to the highways agency agreement.

ENV 7 Working with GCC	As part of the	Mar-18	Tim	Red	This work was being led
Scrutiny Committee 25 June 2018		Page 1 of 2		Q2 2017-18 Performance	
				Last updated 14 June 2018	

to develop a sustainable approach to managing highway matters in Cheltenham	Highways Collaborative working consultation, work with GCC to increase local influence in the management of highways matters in Cheltenham		Atkins		by GCC as the Highways Authority. Phase 1 on the consultation was completed in March 2017. The first stage of stage 2 was commenced. CBC await the next steps to be initiated by GCC.
---	--	--	--------	--	---

#### 4. Next steps

- 4.1 The end of year performance report will be taken to Cabinet on 10 July. The comments from Overview and Scrutiny will be fed into that meeting.

<b>Background Papers</b>	2017-18 Corporate Strategy action plan, Report to Council, 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2017.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager. 01242 235354. richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk
<b>Accountability</b>	Cllr. Steve Jordan, Leader of the Council

## DRAFT END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR O+S

Cheltenham's environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced					
Priority actions	Key milestones	Dates	Lead	R-A-G	Commentary
ENV 1 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	JCS adoption	Dec-17	Tracey Crews	Complete	Council on 11 December 2017 agreed to adopt the Joint Core Strategy
	Cheltenham Plan ready for submission	Dec-17	Tracey Crews	Amber	Consultation undertaken on the pre-submission which closed on 9 April 2018. Delay in progress due to having to align with JCS timescales. Responses being reviewed to determine whether there are any issues which require further Council decision making. Timetable for examination to be agreed with Planning inspectorate Summer 2018.  <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Community Infrastructure Levy adoption	Mar-18	Tracey Crews	Amber	The CIL examination was held from Tuesday 15th to Thursday 17th May 2018. It is hoped that the examiner will recommend adoption. Council decision required to adopt CIL, but date is dependent on receipt of Inspectors report and recommendations she sets out.  <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
ENV 2 Vision for Cheltenham's town centre and its public realm	Work with stakeholders to develop a vision for the town centre including a significant upgrade of the public realm in the High Street	Apr-17	Tracey Crews	Complete	Ongoing engagement with key stakeholders Agreement with Leader that no decision making in regard to this therefore will not be taken to Cabinet
	Implementation (part) of improvement works	Mar-18	Tracey Crews	Amber	Works started on site for Phase 1 High Street. Project is Amber as there are challenges in regard to works to buildings within Phase 1  <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
ENV 3 Cheltenham Transport Plan	Phase 3 works prior to phase 4 Boots Corner,	Mar-18	Tim Atkins	Complete	Phase 3 was implemented in January 2018 and phase 4 (Boots Corner trial) will now be implemented from 28 June 2018
	Cabinet agreement to car parking strategy	May-17	Mike Redman	Complete	Cabinet approved the new car parking strategy in June 2017.

	Cycling and walking strategy	Mar-18	Tracey Crews	Amber	Despite 2 rounds of advertisement for recruitment we have been unsuccessful in recruiting to transport officer post. Procurement undertaken on consultancy project 'connecting Cheltenham and modal shift' 9 bids were received and are currently being reviewed. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
ENV 4 We will deliver CBC's commitments contained within the Joint Waste Committee plan and the Waste service redesign	Route optimisation and stakeholder engagement	Sep-17	Martin Stacy	Complete	Initial route optimisation work was completed and sense checked prior to launch, along with a continuous media/comms campaign has been underway to promote awareness of the service changes. Following implementation of the new service, and the unprecedented levels of recycling being presented at kerbside, further route optimisation work has been undertaken. This will be finalised during 18/19.
	Implement new service	Sep-17	Martin Stacy	Complete	Implementation was launched as planned on 16th October.
	Review of bring sites	Sep-17	Martin Stacy	Amber	Priority has been given to the review of the route optimisation work (above), and time was needed to allow for the new service to bed down. The review of the bring sites is now underway and will be finalised during 18/19. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
ENV 5 We will progress the building of the new Crematorium	Obtain planning permission	May-17	Mike Redman	Complete	Planning consents from both CBC and TBC secured by 4th Aug 2017.
	Agree contracts for the construction of the new facility	May-17	Mike Redman	Complete	Contractual agreements for the main crematorium and road building were completed on 20th Sep 2017. Work started on site in October 2017 with the new crematorium building expected to be open in Spring 2019
ENV 6 Project Solace implementation – shared approach to ASB with the police, CBC and Gloucester City	Approval of business cases	Jun-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	Cabinet agreed the proposal for Cheltenham Borough Council to join the Solace partnership on 11 April 2018.
ENV 7 Working with GCC to develop a sustainable approach to managing highway matters in Cheltenham	As part of the Highways Collaborative working consultation, work with GCC to increase local influence in the management of highways matters in Cheltenham	Mar-18	Tim Atkins	Red	This work was being led by GCC as the Highways Authority. Phase 1 on the consultation was completed in March 2017. The first stage of stage 2 was commenced. CBC await the next steps to be initiated by GCC.



Sustain and grow Cheltenham's economic and cultural vitality					
Priority actions	Key milestones	Dates	Lead	R-A-G	Commentary
ECON 1 We will work in partnership with key stakeholders to develop a longer term strategy for place making	Further engagement on place strategy	To Dec 2017	Richard Gibson	Complete	Following consultation and engagement with a range of stakeholders, the Cheltenham Place Vision document was agreed by council in March 2018
	Implement key projects	Ongoing	Richard Gibson	Amber	<p>Nine actions identified within the place vision agreed in March 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and skills</li> <li>• Cycling, walking, public transport and digital connectivity</li> <li>• More flexible business space</li> <li>• Residents, businesses and visitors feel safe.</li> <li>• Increase numbers of affordable, accessible, safe and secure housing</li> <li>• Build strong, healthy and inclusive communities</li> <li>• A sustainable future for our cultural organisations and buildings.</li> <li>• Marketing the town, nationally and internationally.</li> <li>• Invested in public spaces and heritage.</li> </ul> <p><b>All carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b></p>
ECON 2 Promote cyber-growth	JCS strategic allocation	Autumn 2017	Tracey Crews	Complete	Adoption agreed 11th of Dec 2017
	Implementation of Growth Deal 3 bid	Mar 2021	Tim Atkins	Amber	<p>The GD3 project is the development of road infrastructure for the new Cyber Business Park next to GCHQ. Work is progressing on this. Recent agreement with DfT that programme will be de-retained (i.e managed locally instead of by central government). LEP to take the role of managing the funding. Some challenges regarding defining schemes, but working with all relevant parties to move this forward.</p> <p><b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b></p>
	Engaging with cyber-partners	ongoing	Tracey Crews	Green	<p>On-going with commercial interests and academia</p> <p><b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b></p>

ECON 3 CDTF to support CBC with delivery on various key sites and themes including	Brewery II	Jun-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	The new look Brewery quarter was opened in Spring 2017
	John Lewis	Spring 2018	Tim Atkins	Complete	Planning consent granted, public realm scheme underway and John Lewis to be opened in October 2018.
	North Place	Ongoing	Tim Atkins	Amber	Homes England HIF bid submitted for Portland Street was successful and £3M grant provisionally awarded. Now requires the developer to bring the scheme forward. CBC negotiations regarding North Place continue, yet again this is a developer led scheme. The council will be reviewing the position in October 2018.
	Cheltenham Spa station	By 2020	Tim Atkins	Green	Works to extend northbound platform on site and public consultation on remainder of scheme underway.
	Honeybourne Place	Summer 2019	Tim Atkins	Green	Developer led scheme. Works started August 2017 and are proceeding to plan.
ECON 4 We will develop our strategic approach to tourism, work with the tourism partnership to ensure that there is alignment behind the strategy and agree appropriate delivery mechanisms	Development of brand platform	Jul-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	New branding for Marketing Cheltenham complete.
	Develop a sustainable tourism business model	Jul-17	Tim Atkins	Amber	Interim model in operation. Marketing Cheltenham being operated by CBC via Tourism partnership supported by a number of stakeholders. Options for longer term delivery model being investigated – target date for report – Sept 18 (with options for future of TIC)  <b><i>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</i></b>
	Consultant to deliver 5yr tourism strategy to CBC	Jul-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	The strategy was approved by Cabinet on 11 July 2017 and recommendations being implemented
ECON 5 Work in partnership with cultural providers to support investment into Cheltenham's cultural assets including the Town Hall and leisure@	Appoint consultants to undertake master plan scoping study for options for re-purposing the Town Hall.	Jun-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Focus consultants appointed. Benchmark visits to other venues undertaken. Joint outcomes proposition agreed by the Joint Commissioning Group (CBC and TCT)
	Approve preferred option for the re-development of the Town Hall.	Mar-18	Mark Sheldon	Amber	Concept ideas are being drafted which will be subject to stakeholder consultation. Target date for cabinet is September 2018  <b><i>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</i></b>
	Procure contract for phase 1 redevelopment of leisure@	Jun-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	In Dec 2017, Council agreed a revised programme of improvements to Leisure-at-Cheltenham with a total scheme cost of £2.5m.
	Complete phase 1 scheme.	Jul-18	Mark Sheldon	Green	The project is both on time schedule and on cost schedule – works to be complete in July 2018.

ECON 6 Event infrastructure / commercial opportunities	Tour of Britain	Sep-17	Tracey Crews	Complete	Event successfully delivered.
	Events infrastructure project	Dec-17	Tracey Crews	Amber	<p>Impact of resource to deliver the Tour of Britain impacted on key milestones for the events infrastructure project.</p> <p>Project re-scoped to focus on current priorities which are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop event sites and services to support opportunities for Cheltenham to continue to expand as a national and international event destination by 2019 in line with the place-making, tourism and inward investment strategy</li> <li>2. Increase income generation to support the provision of services from CBC by 2019</li> <li>3. Expand opportunities for visitor and resident engagement through attendance at events dispersed across the borough by 2019</li> </ol> <p><i>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</i></p>

People live in strong, safe and healthy communities					
Priority actions	Key milestones	Dates	Lead	R-A-G	Commentary
COM 1 Work with CBH to build more houses for rent and support community regeneration projects	Discussion with CBH to identify priority estates	Jun-17	Martin Stacy	Complete	CBC and CBH have reviewed site opportunities HRA and GF land and have developed a potential pipeline of supply, which includes a number of new garage sites. This pipeline will continue to be reviewed and developed as new opportunities emerge, and will be facilitated by the development of a Housing Investment Plan, to be brought to Cabinet and Council for approval during Sep/Oct 2018.
COM 2 - Housing strategy and enabling	Refresh housing and homelessness strategy	Jul-18	Martin Stacy	Green	Consultation undertaken on the draft housing and homelessness strategy and this is due to go to Cabinet in July for approval
COM 3 Estates Regeneration approach in West Cheltenham	Milestones to be developed pending outcome of bid	Apr-18	Tracey Crews	Amber	The master-planning exercise has begun and is on target to report in July 2018. A series of consultation events have taken place in Hesters Way. Engagement with stakeholders such as local members and neighbourhood groups was good but the level of the response from the general public was disappointing. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
COM 4 We will update our safeguarding policy to reflect our wider work to safeguard people including recognition of DA, hate crime and modern slavery	Updated policy to cabinet	Jul-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	The updated safeguarding policy was agreed by Cabinet on 10 October. In addition, we have now established an internal officer safeguarding group that met for the first time in August 2017 and a cabinet member working group that is reviewing arrangements for safeguarding children following the Ofsted Inspection.
COM 5 We will work in partnership with Gloucestershire Constabulary to review town centre CCTV provision and associated monitoring arrangements.	Review and update public realm CCTV coverage requirements.	Apr-17	Mike Redman	Amber	Phase 1 of the project to reinstate CCTV coverage along part of the Honeybourne Line between Cheltenham Spa station and the Jubilee footbridge complete.  Specification being drawn up for the works required to upgrade town centre public realm CCTV cameras from analogue to digital. The extent of the coverage will be dependent on the assessed costs of the project relative to the available budgets. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Determine the feasibility of linking into the Brewery quarter CCTV system.	Jun-17	Mike Redman	Amber	Under consideration as part of public realm CCTV project phase 2. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Update and sign Data Sharing Agreements.	Sep-17	Mike Redman	Amber	Draft CCTV agreement regarding responsibilities is close to completion with Gloucestershire Constabulary. It is anticipated that this will be available via a CBC website link once published. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
COM 6 Install a Changing places toilet facility in Pittville park and another in a town centre location.	Engagement with user groups	Apr-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Initial consultation completed. Pittville park option agreed
	Complete design & build	Mar-18	David Roberts	Amber	Works to begin on site imminently with an expected end date of August <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>

COM 7 Enable a range of community building and celebration events through taking a facilitative role to working with community groups and organisations	Coordinate & deliver the Children's Festival	May-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	Successfully delivered; three day festival around the end of May bank holiday weekend
	Coordinate & deliver the Midsummer Fiesta	Jul-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	A very successful Fiesta held this year, 58 volunteers helped out, attendance was between 7 and 8,000 people, 70 stall holders, 21 acts, 45 ratings of 5 stars on facebook
	Support Black History Month	Oct-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	BHM 2017 comprised 10 community events held over the month gave BME communities to opportunity to share their stories and experiences in recognition that our diverse history is something to be celebrated
	World Mental Health Day	Oct-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	WMH day was celebrated at an event at the Municipal Offices that also marked the end of Heads Up Cheltenham, our year long programme of events to raise awareness of mental health issues. The WMH event was attended by the Council's three elected mental health champions
	Support Inter-Faith week	Nov-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	Successful inter-faith event held on 15.11.17 that was hosted by the University of Gloucestershire
	Domestic abuse awareness week	Dec-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	A number of events were held in Cheltenham to mark the 16 days of action including; The War on Women in Bosnia event on 2.11.17; GRASAC Reclaim the Night March on 24 November and a Soroptimists Event on 28 November - a forum on violence against women being held at the Muni
	Support Holocaust Memorial Day	Jan-18	Richard Gibson	Complete	Successful Holocaust Memorial Day held on 25 January in the Council Chamber
	LGBT history month	Feb-18	Richard Gibson	Complete	The Cheltenham LGBT Partnership group took the lead on this with a high profile social media campaign, the Council marked the month by flying the rainbow flag side our offices.
	International Women's Day	Mar-18	Richard Gibson	Complete	Successful event held on Saturday 10.3.18 which involved schools, the Everyman, the Trust, Armed Forces, Police and other employers. 340 people attended
COM 8 Organise a programme of events to mark the Centenary commemorations of the end of WW1.	Event co-ordinator recruitment	Jun-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	WW1 project coordinator now in post
	Website redevelopment	Oct-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	The new Cheltenham Remembers website went live on May 3 2018
	Events programme Commences	Apr-18	Richard Gibson	Complete	The events programme has been developed and published in a booklet and online. The first event was held at the Jet Age Museum on 27 March
	Dedication Ceremony	Nov-18	Richard Gibson	Green	Plans for the Centenary Commemoration day are taking shape including the Civic Service and Parade at the War Memorial, a performance at the Everyman a festival of remembrance at the Town Hall and lighting a beacon at the Town Hall
	Events programme completed	Dec-18	Richard Gibson	Green	All events currently on target <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
COM 9 Undertake a community governance review to decide whether there should be a parish council for Pittville	Agreement to ToR	Mar-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	Council agreed revised terms of reference on 24 July
	Consultation	Jul-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	Consultation completed with a closing date of 8 October. Over 3000 responses were received with an average turn-out of 32%
	Recommendations to council	Nov-17	Richard Gibson	Complete	The recommendations for revised boundaries for Charlton Kings, Leckhampton with Warden Hill and Up Hatherley were agreed by council on 11 December 2017 with the Reorganisation Orders being agreed in January 2018.

## Our council can continue to facilitate the delivery of our outcomes for both Cheltenham and its residents

Priority actions	Key milestones	Dates	Lead	R-A-G	Commentary
VFM 1 Implementation of the PED Transformation project to provide a clear commercial focus for the division delivering the MTFS savings, smarter working and income streams will enable delivery of priority work-streams to assist in the delivery of the place strategy.	Implementation of a Business Management Framework	Jun-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	Delivery programme now being developed around performance framework, business support, marketing etc.
	Design and production of management reporting suite	Jun-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	Project complete.
	Development of a Marketing Strategy to identify internal and external business goals, leading to the production of a strategic plan.	Jul-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	Marketing strategy being shaped and implemented. New programme to be scoped for next iteration of plan.
	Report on progress to cabinet	Jul-17	Tim Atkins	Complete	Financial targets and improvements delivered.
VFM 2 2020 Partnership/Publica	Create and agree specifications for services delivered by Public Business Support Company.	Oct-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Work complete to develop the legal agreement between partner councils and Publica to include specification of the functions to be provided, approach to annual service plans, service standards and KPI's
	Go live for new company	Oct-17	Pat Pratley	Complete	Publica went live on 1 November.
VFM 3 Review the space needs of the current tenants at the Depot and develop a masterplan for its future use including investment needs and identify options for delivering savings or additional income to support the MTFS.	Evaluate future needs of current occupiers	Apr-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	All users requirements are captured including TCT storage requirements.
	Identify and evaluate options for space use	Jun-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Business case completed which includes evaluation of financial modelling of a number of options.
	Make recommendations on masterplan proposal	Jul-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	Initial proposals completed and presented to Executive Board who requested that other commercial opportunities be explored. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Scope location options for a public sector hub for development of a business case	Apr-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	Option for a public sector hub included as an option in the business case. <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
VFM 4 Review CBC's accommodation requirements and options including the development of a potential public sector hub with other public sector partners	Evaluate options and develop business case	Sep-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	Delta Place not available until 2023 but exploring options. Prudent investment in the Municipal Offices until then. Roll-out of smart-working to reduce our foot-print and to provide staff with the equipment to work more flexibly <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Make recommendations for delivery of option	Oct-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	as above
VFM 5 Review CBC's property portfolio and make recommendations for investment / disinvestment or development opportunities in order to deliver additional income to support the MTFS:	Review the nursery and make recommendations for its future including options for delivering existing or alternative planting regimes.	Jun-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	Council now agreed revised planting approach which has now been reflected in revised modelling of the business case. Recommendations to come to cabinet in July 2018 <b>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</b>
	Strategic review of existing property portfolio.	Dec-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Review completed and considered by Executive Board. Review identifies assets which should be retained, reviewed or disposed of.



	Review of the existing property investment property portfolio and make recommendations for disinvestment and investment proposals to increase the size of the portfolio	Mar-18	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Review completed and considered by Executive Board. Recommendations will be considered by the AMWG.
	Review Airport Business strategy and make recommendations for improving the return on the shareholders' investment.	Mar-18	Mark Sheldon	Complete	The governance review is complete and agreed at a shareholder forum in September 2017. The 10 year business plan has been agreed. GAL proposed management structure presented and considered by shareholders who have made recommendations to GAL board. Changes to and recruitment of independent Non-Executive Directors roles also complete.
VFM 6 Create an Organisation Development programme that supports the delivery of our vision for place, reflecting our values and behaviours and make recommendations as to how we support staff in transforming the organisation.	Conclude the review of the CBC senior management re-structure as proposed by Council in January 2016	Mar-18	Pat Pratley	Complete	Informal meetings took place with Chair of A&R, Leader, Group Leaders, informal cabinet. A&R committee. Council agreed executive board restructure on 19 February.
	Develop and approve an operating model and business case for customer service delivery across CBC including other potential partners	Sep-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	The work to deliver the organisational development programme to create a modern workplace with a sustainable future operating model is progressing <b><i>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</i></b>
	Create and approve a programme which uses the results of the Investors in People re-accreditation so that staff have the relevant leadership and management capabilities to deliver the council's outcomes in the future	Jul-17	Mark Sheldon	Amber	As above <b><i>Carried forward into 2018-19 corporate strategy</i></b>
	Develop a business case for smarter/agile working initiatives, using the Place and ED Project as a pilot area, to support the creation of a more flexible working environment which meets the needs of the customer and CBC	May-17	Mark Sheldon	Complete	Initial phase 1 work completed and reviewed for three teams. Now agreed to move to phase 2 of the project.
VFM 7 Develop proposals for delivering a sustainable MTFS which closes the projected budget gap	Develop options for delivering additional savings or income	Jul-17	Paul Jones	Complete	A balanced budget was agreed by Council in February 2018
	Cabinet to approve budget strategy incorporating preferred approach to bridging the funding gap	Oct-17	Paul Jones	Complete	Through our new commercial strategy, investment in growth and regeneration, and strategic approach to maximising the potential of the Council's extensive asset portfolio, the Council has an ambition to be self-financing by 2022. The revised Medium Term Financial Strategy which included the commercial strategy was agreed by Cabinet in December 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGSC) and GEGSG Scrutiny Group – Report to O&S**

I've changed the title as it can be difficult at times to focus entirely on the goings on at the Scrutiny Group without the context of what the GEGJC is doing. The crucial distinction is that GEGJC is the Judicial Body that brings together GCC and the 6 Districts to make collective decisions on the way forward for Gloucestershire (at least as far as Economic Growth is concerned). A significant part of the afternoon agenda is concerned with what happened in the morning.

For Cheltenham, the most important news was that the £22million for the Cyber Hub is now de-retained [by Government]. i.e. it is now Gloucestershire's money.

### **SUB NATIONAL TRANSPORT BODIES (SNTBs)**

Four Sub National Transport Bodies have been set up in England. The South West Region has yet to establish one. There are 120 Transport Authorities in England, and the Government has told the 120 to join together and co-operate on funding bids if they want any money. It seems likely that the South West Region will be split into two parts, with the South West peninsula doing its own thing, whilst the rest work together. A surprise addition is Bournemouth & Poole who are somewhat remote but they have a strategic interest in the transport links between Bristol Docks and Poole Harbour. They are looking for more resilience hence their interest in the A303 and the A350. At the moment, any problems on the M5 cause significant problems.

The key growth corridor is the Bristol/Birmingham corridor, and this is rising up the National agenda but it will be two years before any Parliamentary time is available to get a Statutory Instrument to make any new SNTBs.

John Baker has been appointed as Gloucestershire Strategic Planning Co-ordinator. He will be building up a relationship with Local Planning teams and hoping to produce a work plan for September.

Most of the Scrutiny Group meeting was taken up with a debate on the possibility of the AONB becoming a National Park. Cllr Lyndon Stowe, Cotswolds Leader and chair of the Joint Committee had asked the Scrutiny Group to undertake a study to determine the implications of the AONB becoming a National Park. There was complete agreement that such a study was important and necessary; the concern was whether or not the work should be commissioned by the GEGJC and scrutinised by GEGSG or actually undertaken by the scrutiny group. After a tied vote, resolved by the chair's casting vote, it was decided that the scrutiny group should undertake the work.

The AONB covers 15 districts, in several counties.

The Scrutiny Group is looking to set up a task and finish group on the impact of Brexit, particularly on women and minorities in the County, and also to review the quality of mobile coverage across the county.

**Councillor Paul McCloskey**  
**21<sup>st</sup> June 2018**

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION

<b>Date:</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
<b>Name of person proposing topic:</b>	Cllr Klara Sudbury, Cllr Tim Harman and Cllr Dilys Barrell
<b>Contact:</b>	<a href="mailto:klara.sudbury@gloucestershire.gov.uk">klara.sudbury@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:tim.harman@cheltenham.gov.uk">tim.harman@cheltenham.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:cllr.dilys.barrell@cheltenham.gov.uk">cllr.dilys.barrell@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Suggested title of topic:</b>	CBC response to the problems caused to residents of Cheltenham by Urban Gulls, particularly during the nesting season
<b>What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?</b> <p>The Council's response to reducing the urban gull population in residential areas where nesting gulls are causing problems. These areas include Tivoli, Montpellier, Lansdown, St Luke's as well as other places in the town where gulls choose to nest very close to residential property. Problems such as sleepless nights caused by the noise from parent gulls when their chicks have hatched, concerns about health problems that might arise from the large amount of gull droppings in affected areas, concern that the council budget is being invested in treating buildings in commercial use rather than treating properties where the nuisance more directly affects residents, concern that current budget is not sufficient to deal with urban gulls in areas where they are causing problems for residents.</p>	
<b>What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review (outcomes)</b> <p>There are many issues related to the urban gull problem that need proper consideration. As we imagine there is further work needed to properly scope the working group we would suggest the following could be considered (though not restricted to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hear from officers from CBC or others with specialist knowledge of dealing with urban gulls about the obstacles to effectively treat gull eggs in residential areas e.g. knowing where nests are, safe access to nests, when road closures are needed etc and to consider solutions to overcome these obstacles</li> <li>• Look at best practice from other comparable councils to find out if / how they deal with gulls, particularly in residential areas, and any related budget issues</li> <li>• Assess if additional financial investment to tackle the issue would make it possible to deal with more nests given human resource available at the council</li> <li>• Explore ways the council could give better support to those residents who are willing and able to pay a private company to deal with any nests on their property</li> <li>• Investigate what powers are available - whether statutory or otherwise - to the council to require owners with gulls nesting to gull proof their roofs</li> <li>• Consider that if the powers are not sufficient, whether the council would write to ask the government to give them further powers</li> <li>• Hear from residents affected by the nuisance caused by gulls about the impact on their quality of life, mental and physical health</li> <li>• Create a comprehensive, publicly available report on the issue, reported to O&amp;S and to Cabinet, to help all members of the council as well as members of the public understand more about gulls, the issues around effectively dealing with them and what the council can or can't and is or is not doing</li> <li>• Deliver a set of finding's and recommendations which will provide an evidenced base to support any necessary changes to the budget needed to help reduce the urban gull population more effectively in residential as well as business areas of the town</li> </ul>	
<b>If there a strict time constraint?</b>	To report back to Scrutiny with recommendations to feed

	into the 2019-20 budget setting process in time for next year's breeding season.
<b>Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?</b>	This issue is of huge interest and concern to many residents in Cheltenham, particularly in areas such as Tivoli, Lansdown, Montpellier, St Luke's and the town centre.
<b>Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public dissatisfaction with a service?</b>	The current arrangements, whereby council resource is invested mainly in business areas such as Kingsditch and the town centre are effective in reducing the overall gull population in the town but are very ineffective at dealing with problems in, often densely populated, residential areas. The high level of dissatisfaction of many local residents has been expressed by dozens of angry emails to councillors and council officers in recent months as well as feedback received about the council's response to the problem at meetings of the Urban Gulls Forum.
<b>Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?</b>	<p>This review will support the corporate objectives that Cheltenham is a place where all our people and the communities they live in thrive. Where we champion people's mental and physical health (all night noise from gulls is keeping people awake all night affecting their mental and physical health).</p> <p>Also that we will listen and respond to communities, promoting a wide range of access to services.</p>

**Any other comments:**

The Urban Gulls Forum was set up a number of years ago. Over the years local residents and councillors have met up twice a year or so to try to find a cost effective way of tackling the noise and mess issues related to nesting gulls.

The forum has provided a useful mechanism for local residents to tell councillors and council officers about the problems they are experiencing. However, there is concern that the forum does not have the time or resource to delve into the issue and potential solutions. Crucially there is a disconnect between the forum and the executive/scrutiny processes in the council which makes bringing evidence based proposals for changes in policy or budget very difficult.

A formal and organised scrutiny review will enable members to fact-find and make clear recommendations to the cabinet and into the budget setting process the issue. Without it we are concerned there is a risk that this issue which is so important to many residents could be left to drift.

The current situation is not only causing distress to residents affected but also having a significant impact on the reputation of the council. Conducting a thorough overview and scrutiny review of the situation and assessing any potential solutions will help inform what the council can reasonably do to help keep the gull population down in residential as well as business areas.

**OFFICER IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>11 June 2018</b>
<b>Officer name:</b>	<b>Mark Nelson, Enforcement Manager</b>
Officers have already had discussions with members about the option of setting up a scrutiny task group and there are no further comments at this stage.	



## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION

<b>Date:</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
<b>Name of person proposing topic:</b>	Cllr Klara Sudbury
<b>Contact:</b>	klara.sudbury@gloucestershire.gov.uk
<b>Suggested title of topic:</b>	Scrutiny review of Cheltenham Transport Plan phases 1-3 and to provide overview and scrutiny of Phase 4, the Boots Corner Experimental TRO.
<p><b>What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?</b></p> <p>Review Phase 1-3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan, to ensure there are no issues arising from them that have been missed by Cheltenham Borough Council or Gloucestershire County Council.</p> <p>To provide an overview and scrutiny of the Experimental TRO/Phase 4 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan closing 'Boots Corner', Clarence Parade, Clarence Street, North Street, Pittville Street, High Street (part of), Promenade/Colonnade and Imperial Circus to most through traffic.</p>	
<p><b>What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review (outcomes)</b></p> <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that previous phases 1-3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan are working effectively, scrutiny working group to be provided with all congestion and pollution data collected from before and after the implementation of stages 1-3, hear from local residents and businesses to find out if there are issues that have been missed and recommend mitigation works to reduce the impact of the changes if necessary.</li> </ul> <p>During the 18 months of the phase 4 trial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide member input and local knowledge into the siting of permanent and temporary pollution monitors as well as when and where traffic flow away from Boots Corner is being measured</li> <li>Receive and consider detailed evidence from the monitoring of traffic and pollution in other residential areas</li> <li>Ensure that monitoring of displaced congestion and associated pollution is appropriate and that there are no gaps which could leave problems unnoticed</li> <li>Provide a mechanism for back bench councillors whose wards might be affected by the traffic displaced from Boots Corner to have oversight of and feedback into the trial</li> <li>Ensure that any surveying of the views of businesses and residents is collected by an Independent organisation with relevant experience to ensure the results are credible</li> <li>Hear directly from representatives of local residents/businesses/schools in streets where monitoring shows there is increased congestion and pollution</li> <li>Be provided with full details of all responses received during the consultation period for Phase 4 to scrutinise that feedback and ensure all views express have been taken account of</li> <li>Make recommendations as necessary regarding where mitigation may be needed or changes to Phase 4 to ensure the health, safety and wellbeing of residents of Cheltenham</li> <li>Hear from representatives from groups representing people with sensory, physical or other disability to effectively scrutinise any permanent changes to the public</li> </ul>	

<p>realm at Boots Corner and ensure they are fully inclusive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make a recommendation to the Traffic Regulation Order Committee as to whether or not the TRO should be made permanent</li> </ul>	
<p><b>If there a strict time constraint?</b></p>	<p>The scrutiny working group would need to be up and running as soon as possible to review phases 1-3 whilst phase 4 beds in and then be ready to scrutinise the data etc. from that as it comes in.</p>
<p><b>Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?</b></p>	<p>The Cheltenham Transport Plan will affect every single person living or working in Cheltenham in one way or another. The input from backbench councillors has been very limited to date. If the TRO is to be made permanent the outcome could be much improved by the way O&amp;S can look deeply into this issue, something which can't happen at Council meetings or during member's seminars. The future economic success of our town centre depends on this plan creating a pleasant welcoming space at Boots Corner, whilst also still retaining access for people with disabilities and protecting the health and wellbeing of the many residents who may end up with more congestion outside their homes.</p>
<p><b>Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public dissatisfaction with a service?</b></p>	<p>There are a lot of people, even those who support the transport plan and its aims, who worry about the impact of displaced congestion, and impact on disabled people of changing access to the town centre and creating a shared space with a large number of very large vehicles still travelling through.</p>
<p><b>Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?</b></p>	<p>'We have improved connectivity including our cycling, walking, public transport and digital infrastructure' - Implement Phase 4 of Cheltenham Transport Plan – the trial closure of Boots corner and monitor the impact.          'Champions physical and mental wellbeing' – there is potential for the physical and mental wellbeing of many of the town's residents to be harmed by the effects of increased pollution and traffic noise and vibration by their homes.          'We ensure that all our residents, businesses and visitors feel safe' – safety concerns of shared space at Boots Corner for people with sensory disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Any other comments:</b>          I have asked for this scrutiny review because the Cheltenham Transport Plan is a hugely significant issue for Cheltenham. It has been planned as THE way our town centre retail area will be more attractive and successful and so scrutinising that to help ensure this really is the case is vital. The traffic modelling does show traffic will increase in residential areas which also needs very close scrutiny.</p>	

Page 31  
**OFFICER IMPLICATIONS (for office use only)**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>12/06/2018</b>
<b>Officer name:</b>	<b>Tracey Crews</b>
<b>Officer title:</b>	<b>Director of Planning</b>
<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Tracey.crews@cheltenham.gov.uk</b>
<p><b>Please give your comments on this proposed topics, for example is there any other similar review planned or in progress, are there any potential resources constraints etc</b></p>	
<p>Phases 1 -3 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan have all been subject to monitoring and through this monitoring changes implemented to ensure the changes work effectively. The reason why the plan was broken down into phases was to build in monitoring and changes as required. The monitoring reports for phases 1 – 3 are public documents and can be made available to the Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>A member seminar was undertaken on 5<sup>th</sup> June, this meeting was well attended and some of the issues raised in this request to scrutiny were identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to members questions around air quality a further member seminar is being organised so that members can discuss the detail of air quality monitoring in respect of the Phase 4 trial with specialist officers in the context of the wider borough and implications on air quality.</li> <li>• Impact on individuals with mobility issues. Officers advised that active engagement is in place with accessibility group, disable spaces removed have been recreated in car parking, greater awareness being drawn to Shopmobility scheme.</li> </ul> <p>Officers have an open dialogue with all members and are happy to receive input on the points above and wider issues; and respond to implications arising as we proceed through the trial; this would be a more responsive approach to dealing with any issues as they arise.</p> <p>Phase 4 is subject the subject of a Traffic Regulation Order consultation and it is important that communities and businesses directly engage with this process  <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-rights-of-way/major-projects/cheltenham-transport-plan/phase-4-boots-corner-trial/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-rights-of-way/major-projects/cheltenham-transport-plan/phase-4-boots-corner-trial/</a></p> <p>It is acknowledged that Phase 4 of the Cheltenham Transport Plan is a major project and there is a clear value to scrutiny. As advised through the member seminar, it is important that we give a suitable amount of time to allow the Phase 4 trial to bed-in and also to collect sufficient data over time which enables effective analysis. Scrutiny too early would not provide members with sufficient information to provide guidance, nor allow enough time to understand how traffic patterns have settled down and how communities and business have been affected.</p> <p>I would suggest the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation by GCC to the Scrutiny Committee on the implementation of phases 1 -3, update on findings from the monitoring data and resultant changes made to enable the trial of Phase 4 to begin.</li> <li>• Scrutiny Committee to receive an update report on monitoring against an agreed timeline, enabling Committee to engage directly with officers on potential modifications/interventions during the course of the trial.</li> <li>• Scrutiny to receive a review of the TRO consultation responses and undertake a review of the Cheltenham Transport Plan as a whole (phases 1 – 4) and for GCC to</li> </ul>	

consider this as formal evidence ahead of a decision being made on the outcome of the trial.

It should be noted that requests regarding a different approach to surveying public and business perception over and above that already identified will have a budgetary implication. Officers are reviewing the implications of this and working with the lead Member in respect of impact on the budget.





## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION

<b>Date:</b>	8 June 2018
<b>Name of person proposing topic:</b>	Councillor David Willingham (as chair of Licensing Committee)
<b>Contact:</b>	
<b>Suggested title of topic:</b>	Events impact
<p><b>What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?</b></p> <p>At Licensing Committee on 6 June, during the item of business which considers any other item that the chairman considers urgent and which requires a decision, the issue of noise nuisance from large outdoor events was raised as a matter of concern. While there are some issues which are purely Licensing matters, a number of the issues affect many parts of the Council including the Place Strategy, Licensing and Enforcement. Members of the Licensing Committee felt that the most appropriate way to ensure that these issues were properly considered was for the matter to be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as it is best placed to consider the wider picture and to make recommendations to Council, Cabinet and the Regulatory Committees in respect of any changes which should be considered.</p> <p>As background, the specific issue which brought this to the committee's attention was the Steps concert at Whaddon Road on Saturday 26 May, which attracted a considerable number of noise complaints to councillors and the council, but there have previously been matters such as Picnic in the Park, in Pittville Park which caused some concern for local residents.</p>	
<p><b>What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review (outcomes)</b></p> <p>Review the process for events and understand how potential impact is assessed.          Understand the consultation process with residents and councillors and in particular the process by which the council consults with councillors and local people prior to allowing council-owned land (such as Pittville Park) to be used for such events, as this is much earlier in the process than any licensing applications.          Review the process for reporting problems when they occur and taking enforcement.          Make recommendations accordingly.</p>	
<b>If there a strict time constraint?</b>	No but under the heading of " Culture and creativity thrive' in the council's corporate strategy and action plan there is an action to deliver a co-ordinated approach to the events programme by Dec 2018 so the impact on communities need to be considered as part of that overall approach and strategy.
<b>Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?</b>	Yes – for reason above
<b>Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public dissatisfaction with a service?</b>	There has been some dissatisfaction expressed by local residents regarding the impact of specific events.
<b>Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?</b>	Yes.
<p><b>Any other comments:</b></p> <p>The O&amp;S committee set up a scrutiny task group which reported in December 2016 to</p>	

Cabinet so it would be worthwhile reviewing their report and recommendations and how they have been implemented.

## OFFICER IMPLICATIONS (for office use only)

<b>Date:</b>	<b>14 June 2018</b>
<b>Officer name:</b>	<b>Tracey Crews</b>
<b>Officer title:</b>	<b>Director of Planning</b>
<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Tracey.crews@cheltenham.gov.uk</b>
<p><b>Please give your comments on this proposed topics, for example is there any other similar review planned or in progress, are there any potential resources constraints etc</b></p>	
<p>Officers from the Licensing, Environmental Health, Community Engagement and Green Space teams are currently working on a Commercial Expansion of Events Infrastructure (Events) project, sponsored by Tracey Crews and Cllr Clucas.</p> <p>The objectives of the Project are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop event sites and services to support opportunities for Cheltenham to continue to expand as a national and international event destination by 2019 in line with the place-making, tourism and inward investment strategy</li> <li>2. Increase income generation to support the provision of services from CBC by 2019</li> <li>3. Expand opportunities for visitor and resident engagement through attendance at events dispersed across the borough by 2019</li> </ol> <p>The project is focusing on three areas to achieve these objectives. These are the development of existing and new locations, expansion of the commercial benefit opportunities and improvements to the process for organising events.</p> <p>This third area of focus is key to improving the service offered to both event organisers and local stakeholders and, both neighbourhood and stakeholder engagement is within the scope of the project. Similarly, the project intends to review the current process for considering the impact of an event on the local neighbourhood and will propose a clear strategy for engaging with councillors and residents, where appropriate, as part of the event consideration process.</p> <p>With regard to noise generated by outdoor events, some local arrangements already exist to supplement statutory provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environmental health (EH) team are involved in the current event application process, enabling them to engage with organisers prior to events on council owned land to mitigate the likelihood of a statutory nuisance being caused.</li> <li>• The EH team use the nearest available standard when recommending noise limits for new event locations (eg Cheltenham Town Football Club) and this guidance is also available on our website – it is the <a href="#">Noise Council Code of Practice on Environmental Noise at Concerts</a>.</li> </ul>	

- Noise limits and mitigation measures are often embedded in the premises licence conditions, using the Noise Council Code of Practice to determine what they should be.
- In addition, the council has noise conditions in Land Use Agreements (LUA) on specific sites (Montpellier and Imperial Gardens) and these are also reflected in the planning consent for those sites. Breaches of LUAs are a civil matter for the council to respond to as it decides appropriate.
- The council's website also contains information on how to make a complaint if affected by unreasonable noise from an event – eg alleged statutory noise nuisance.
- There is a legislative procedure for investigating and abating statutory noise nuisances under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The EH team can serve an Abatement Notice for the likely occurrence of a statutory nuisance or when a nuisance has been determined to exist if they have the appropriate justification/evidence.

*The O&S committee set up a scrutiny task group which reported in Feb 2013 to Cabinet so it would be worthwhile reviewing their report and recommendations and how they have been implemented.*

After a number of iterations of the recommendations, the final report was taken to Cabinet in July 2013 and it was resolved that -

- An Events Consultative Group (ECG) had been established and has been operating in accordance with the agreed Terms of Reference.
- A Safety Advisory Group (SAG) had been established;
- An information page had been created on the council's website;
- the draft Safety Advisory Group Terms of Reference was approved
- the draft Events Consultative Group & Safety Advisory Group Communication Protocol were approved.
- An events form has been developed to capture all pertinent information.

The ECG membership includes ward councillors, CBC officers from Environmental Health, Green Space, Licensing, and other departments as required and is chaired by the Licensing Manager.

Officers propose that the Commercial Expansion of Events Infrastructure (Events) project process improvements and engagement proposals continue to be developed by officers and shared with Scrutiny, for feedback, prior to being put forward to cabinet for approval and that existing mechanisms for moderating and mitigating the impact of events (including noise) are utilised in the most effective way possible

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION

<b>Date:</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
<b>Name of person proposing topic:</b>	Paul Baker
<b>Contact:</b>	<a href="mailto:cllr.paul.baker@cheltenham.gov.uk">cllr.paul.baker@cheltenham.gov.uk</a>
<b>Suggested title of topic:</b>	Consultation – do we consult enough?
<b>What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?</b>	
<p>I am concerned that as a Council we don't always consult and engage with residents as much as we should. The Local plan was excellent but some things such as planning applications, licensing, events in our park seem a little haphazard.</p>	
<b>What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review (outcomes)</b>	
<p>A better understanding of what we currently do, what legally we have to do and opportunities for doing better appreciating staff resources.</p>	
<b>If there a strict time constraint?</b>	No
<b>Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?</b>	Yes
<b>Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public dissatisfaction with a service?</b>	No although there is some dissatisfaction and a chance to improve.
<b>Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?</b>	Yes-resident engagement
<b>Any other comments:</b>	
<p>I think we do a pretty good job but two recent incidents have focused my attention to how we could do better.</p>	
<b>OFFICER IMPLICATIONS</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Officer name:</b>	
<b>Officer title:</b>	
<b>Contact:</b>	
<p><b>Please give your comments on this proposed topics, for example is there any other similar review planned or in progress, are there any potential resources constraints etc</b></p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Report Author/Presenter
------	---------	-------------------	-------------------------

**Meeting Date: 25 June 2018 (report deadline: 13 June 2018)**

End of year performance review	Consider the end of year performance and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson
Arle Nursery Strategic Review	Consider draft Cabinet recommendations and comment as necessary	Discussion	Mark Sheldon / Emma Morgan
North Place update	Update on progress relating to this site (this will be exempt)	Discussion	Tim Atkins

**Meeting date: 10 September 2018 (report deadline: 29 August)**

Parking strategy in Cheltenham	Invite GCC and CBC Cabinet Members and lead officers	Q&A	To be confirmed
Scrutiny annual report	Endorse draft scrutiny annual report and forward to Council for comment	Decision	Democratic Services

**Meeting date: 29 October 2018 (report deadline: 17 October)**

Taxi policy	Update on the consultation	Report	Louis Krog (to be confirmed)
Publica Annual Report	Review the annual report (and performance) of Publica	Discussion	Dave Brooks (Chair) and David Neudegg (MD)

**Meeting date: 26 November 2018 (report deadline: 14 November)**

Quarter 2 performance	Consider performance and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson
-----------------------	---	------------	----------------

**Meeting date: 14 January 2019 (report deadline: 02 January 2019)**

Budget proposals (2019-2020)	Consider views of the BSWG on the budget proposals for the coming year	Discussion	Chair of BSWG
------------------------------	--	------------	---------------

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Report Author/Presenter
------	---------	-------------------	-------------------------

**Meeting date: 11 February 2019 (report deadline: 30 January 2019)**

Draft Corporate Strategy	Consider the draft Corporate Strategy and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson
--------------------------	--	------------	----------------

**Meeting date: 1 April 2019 (report deadline: 20 March 2019)**

--	--	--	--

**Meeting date: 3 June 2019 (report deadline: 22 May 2019)**

End of year performance	Consider performance and comment as necessary	Discussion	Richard Gibson
-------------------------	---	------------	----------------

**Meeting date: 1 July 2019 (report deadline: 19 June 2019)**

--	--	--	--

**Items for future meetings (a date to be established)**

North Place	Further update as necessary	Ongoing	Tim Atkins
Cheltenham Spa Railway Station STG	Review progress against recommendations 12 months on	12 months on from Cabinet response (not yet scheduled on forward plan)	
Cycling and Walking STG recommendations	Review progress (further update will be delayed until further progress has been achieved in this area)	2018	TBC



Item	Outcome	What is required?	Report Author/Presenter
------	---------	-------------------	-------------------------

Gloucestershire Airport Ltd	An update on the governance review and chance to meet the Board – a site visit may be arranged	2018	Tbc
Indices of Deprivation (work ongoing)	Raised as a possible STG. The committee have heard from CBH on the Masterplan and the Communities Partnership on their work and now need to decide if and how they want to scrutinise this issue	Tbc	CBH / Communities Partnership
Private schools in Cheltenham	To be invited along to give details of what they do to maintain their charitable status and an overview of what they are doing for Cheltenham as a whole (Lead Members to consider if this is a priority for the committee??)	Tbc	Tbc
Police and Crime Commissioner	Invite the P&CC along to give an overview of performance and highlight any issues	Tbc	Martin Surl, P&CC
Car Parking in Cheltenham (on and off street)	Relevant officer(s) and Cabinet Member from CBC and GCC to be invited to attend a meeting to discuss on and off street parking in Cheltenham (GCC will be formally invited and provided with options regarding meeting dates)	Tbc	GCC and CBC Officer(s) and Cabinet Member for car parking (on and off street)
CBH Masterplan	A <b>member seminar</b> arranged at the request of the O&S Committee (DSU to make necessary arrangements and to communicate to members nearer the time)	11 October 2019	Paul Stephenson and Peter Hatch (CBH)

Item	Outcome	What is required?	Report Author/Presenter
------	---------	-------------------	-------------------------

Budget proposals (for coming year)	January	Chair, Budget Scrutiny Working Group
Draft Corporate Strategy	February	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
End of year performance review	June	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager
Scrutiny annual report	September	Democracy Officer
Publica Annual Report	October	Dave Brooks (Chair) and David Neudegg (MD)
Quarter 2 performance review	November	Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager

# ***Discussion Paper***

## **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**25<sup>th</sup> June 2018**

### **Arle Nursery Strategic Review**

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** Several significant emerging factors (captured below) have prompted the need to consider the long term future and viability of Arle Nursery.
- 1.2** The business case for options in relation to the asset has now been prepared for consideration by the overview scrutiny committee.

#### **2. Summary of the Issue**

- 2.1** A Cabinet decision was taken in December 2017 to adopt a mixed public realm planting scheme within the borough. As a result, there will be a reduced requirement for annual bedding plant stocks to be grown at Arle Nursery.
- 2.2** Commercial revenue from the nursery has reduced year on year as organisations move away from bedding plant regimes, and public sector cuts drive reductions in contract values. Reduced income means there is less to subsidise the Council's bedding plants, and therefore the cost to the council for its own planting is increasing.
- 2.3** An independent site inspection has identified the need for substantial investment in the Nursery to ensure that the existing buildings are fit for current purpose, in order for the facility to continue to operate well in the future and satisfy its commercial contractual obligations.
- 2.4** In addition to the premises maintenance programme, and in view of the mixed planting approach, operational equipment requires replacement and has been assessed in developing the options contained in the business case.
- 2.5** As part of the recently approved Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS), the area of land at the nursery site has been removed from green belt designation. This opens up options for its redevelopment which will result in a substantial increase in the commercial value of the land. In December 2017, the Planning committee approved an application for 90 homes on land adjacent to the nursery site.
- 2.6** The business case outlines the financial and none financial evaluation of each option for consideration by the committee.

- 2.7** The business case and evaluation has been developed with the support of Publica working with the existing service provider Ubico.
- 2.8** The project team welcomes feedback from the committee on the options being presented which are set out in the attached Cabinet report (please note the business case in Appendix 2 is exempt).

### **3. Next Steps**

- 3.1** The Cabinet is due to make a decision in July 2018.

#### **Contact Officer**

Mark Sheldon

Director of Resources & Projects

01242 264123

[mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:mark.sheldon@cheltenham.gov.uk)

#### **Accountability**

Councillor Rowena Hay

#### **Scrutiny Function**

Overview and Scrutiny committee

**Cheltenham Borough Council**  
**Cabinet – 10th July 2018**  
**Arle Nursery Strategic Review**

<b>Accountable members</b>	<b>Councillor Rowena Hay, Cabinet Member Finance</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Mark Sheldon, Director of Resources &amp; Corporate Projects</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key/Significant Decision</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<p>This report considers the business case for retaining Arle Nursery site, selling it or developing it to be a fully-fledged garden centre for the public.</p> <p>Each option assesses the community, economic, environmental, legal, HR and technological implications. A detailed financial assessment of each option is also provided.</p> <p>The recommendation supports the delivery of additional affordable housing units which is a priority for the Cabinet.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p><b>Cabinet is recommended to:-</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve option 2 i.e. dispose of Arle Nursery site, and procure the plants for our public realm planting externally; and</li> <li>2. Authorise the Head of Property and Asset Management to determine the most appropriate means of disposing of the property (in one or more parts) in order to obtain best consideration, and to enter into such negotiations as he considers necessary to achieve that outcome</li> <li>3. Authorise the Executive Director, Finance and Assets, in consultation with the Cabinet Member Finance, to accept an offer (or offers, if sold in more than one part) for the purchase of the property (in one or more parts) which in his reasonable opinion (following receipt of supporting professional advice) represents the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained for the site overall;</li> <li>4. Authorise the Borough Solicitor to conclude such documents as she considers reasonably necessary or advisable to reflect the terms agreed under paragraph 3 above</li> </ol>

## Page 46

<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>A summary of the business case that has been created for the 2 options to retain or dispose is included at section 5 and a detailed analysis of the business case is set out at Appendix 2.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Andrew Knott</b> <a href="mailto:andrew.knott@cheltenham.gov.uk">andrew.knott@cheltenham.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p>If Option 1 is adopted, the Council would have to ensure that the buildings are in a fit state for use by employees, and meets current statutory environmental requirements.</p> <p>If Option 2 is adopted, the Council has a statutory obligation under s123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to secure the best consideration reasonably obtainable when disposing of a freehold or long leasehold interest in a property.</p> <p>If Option 3 is adopted, the Council would have to do so through an existing or new company due to the statutory requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Local Government Act 2003.</p> <p><b>Contact Officer (legal property implications): Rose Gemmell</b> <a href="mailto:rose.gemmell@tewkesbury.gov.uk">rose.gemmell@tewkesbury.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Any purchasing requirements of the Council will need to be carried out in accordance with the Council's contract rules and the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.</p> <p><b>Contact officer (legal contract/procurement implications): Donna Ruck</b> <a href="mailto:donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk">donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	<p>There are no direct HR implications arising from this report for employees of Cheltenham Borough Council.</p> <p>There are a number of HR implications arising from the report for Ubico Ltd and these are being managed by the Publica HR team.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy</b> <a href="mailto:julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk">julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk</a></p>
<b>Key risks</b>	<p>If cabinet members decide not to select the option with greatest financial benefit then the MTFS will be negatively impacted.</p>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<p>This review supports CBC's review of its property portfolio, specifically for appropriate disinvestment opportunities in order to deliver additional income to support the MTFS provision of housing.</p>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>Disposal of the nursery will save on fuel and carbon emissions. The impact of the sale of the land has already been considered as part of the JCS strategy.</p>
<b>Property / Asset implications</b>	<p>Significant and immediate investment is essential in order to keep Arle Nursery fit for purpose.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Dominic Stead</b> <a href="mailto:dominic.stead@cheltenham.gov.uk">dominic.stead@cheltenham.gov.uk</a></p>

## Page 47

### 1. Background

- 1.1 A Cabinet decision was taken in December 2017 to adopt a mixed public realm planting scheme within the borough. As a result, there will be a reduced requirement for annual bedding plant stocks to be grown at the nursery. Specifically, annual bedding plants will remain in the Long Garden and Imperial Gardens, and perennial planting will be phased in over the next three years in all other locations. For these reasons, it is prudent to review the long term future and viability of the nursery.
- 1.2 Revenue from the nursery sales of bedding plants for commercial use has reduced year on year as organisations move to alternative more sustainable planting regimes and public sector cuts drive reductions in contract values. This reduction in income means there is less to subsidise the Council's bedding plants, and therefore the cost to the council for its own planting is increasing.
- 1.3 Substantial investment is required at Arle Nursery to ensure that the existing buildings are fit for current purpose has been identified. An independent review was commissioned on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017 from Kirkham Pryer, a firm of Chartered Building Surveyors based in Cheltenham, to assess the condition of Arle Nursery and provide a view on the investment sum necessary in order for the facility to continue to operate well in the future and satisfy its commercial contractual obligations. Their report is contained in Appendix B of the Business Case.
- 1.4 In addition to the maintenance programme, and in view of the mixed planting approach, operational equipment requires replacement and has been assessed in the options analysis.
- 1.5 If the council significantly invests in the nursery facility to make it fit for purpose, there is a risk that the council will not see an appropriate level of return on that investment as more local authorities move away from annual bedding plant schemes.
- 1.6 As part of the recently approved Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS), the area of land at the nursery site has been removed from green belt designation. This opens up options for its redevelopment which will result in a substantial increase in the commercial value of the land. In December 2017, the Planning committee approved an application for 90 homes on land adjacent to the nursery site.

### 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 Disposal of the nursery is the least costly of the options available to CBC over a ten year period.
- 2.2 A substantial capital receipt sum from the nursery site asset disposal will contribute to the Medium Term Financial Savings (MTFS) targets.
- 2.3 Asset disposal will realise an opportunity to release land for housing since the Cabinet is committed to delivering additional affordable housing units.
- 2.4 Asset disposal will deliver additional council tax revenue within the JCS boundary.
- 2.5 Asset disposal avoids the need to invest significant maintenance costs and replenish operational equipment.
- 2.6 There is a potential opportunity for local plant growers to tender for CBC annual bedding supply contracts.
- 2.7 Seasonal temporary staff costs will be reduced.
- 2.8 Solutions for the storage of street trees and bedding plants prior to planting in designated spaces have been verified and factored into the business case.

## Page 48

### 3. Key recommendations

- 3.1 The recommendation is to dispose of Arle Nursery site, and procure the plants for our public realm planting externally.

### 4. Options considered

Option 1: Asset Retention.

Option 2: Asset Disposal.

Option 3: Asset Development as a retail garden centre / wholesale grower.

### 5. Financial summary

- 5.1. A high level summary is stated below. A full assessment detailing the asset cost projections over the next 10 years is captured in the business case at Appendix 2.
- 5.2. Option 1, retaining the nursery, will cost £2.5m over a ten year period from 2018/19. This includes over £1m for ongoing maintenance as per the Kirkham Pryer report. This is currently not covered within the MTFS. Also, there is a risk that we cannot reach the income that is projected due to reduced sales to councils. This is because other councils are taking similar decisions to ours and introducing sustainable planting.
- 5.3. Compared to option 1, the projected saving in option 2 is £369k over a 10 year period from 2018/19. This does not include any potential significant capital receipt (as it will be a council decision how this is used) or any expected additional council tax, new homes bonus or NNDR from any development in this area.
- 5.4. Option 3 would require significant investment and it is unlikely that the council would see an appropriate level of return given the competition and there would be significant risk in the current economic climate.

### 6. Consultation and feedback

- 6.1. The Council's own Property team engaged with Kirkham Pryer, a local firm of Chartered Building Surveyors, specifically for an independent view on the condition of Arle Nursery and level of investment required to make it fit for purpose. Their findings are contained in Appendix B of the Business Case at Appendix 2.
- 6.2. The business case comparing the options was considered by the Asset Management Working Group on 14th June 2018. They were supportive of option X i.e. to..... [to be completed after 14<sup>th</sup> June]
- 6.3. The business case comparing the options was considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 25th June 2018. They were supportive of option X i.e. to..... [to be completed after 25<sup>th</sup> June]

### 7. Performance management – monitoring and review

- 7.1 The project team have provided regular updates to the lead Cabinet member to ensure their draft output has been within the requirements of the brief.



## Page 49

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer: Emma Morgan emma.morgan@cheltenham.gov.uk</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk assessment <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Risk assessment - Exempt</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Options appraisal and business case - Exempt</li> <li>3. Kirkham Pryer Condition Survey – Exempt (Available on request )</li> </ol>

## Appendix 1: Risk Assessment

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
AN001	If cabinet members decide not to select option with greatest financial benefit then the MTFS will be negatively impacted	Mark Sheldon	19.7.17	4	2	8	Reduce	Ensure the options appraisal covers all options, considerations and assumptions to enable an informed decision to be made	10.07.18	Andrew Knott	no
AN002	If the council significantly invests in the nursery facility to make it fit for purpose, there is a risk that the council will not see an appropriate level of return on that investment as more local authorities move away from annual bedding plant schemes.	Mark Sheldon	19.7.17	4	2	8	Reduce	Independent assessment sought from local Chartered Building Surveyors to inform decisions to be made	10.7.18	Garrie Dowling	no
<p><b>Explanatory notes</b></p> <p><b>Impact</b> – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p><b>Likelihood</b> – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p><b>Control</b> - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank