

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**Monday, 26th February, 2018**  
**6.00 - 8.40 pm**

Attendees	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Tim Harman (Chair), Jon Walklett (Vice-Chair), Colin Hay, Sandra Holliday, Chris Mason, John Payne, Paul Baker and Max Wilkinson
<b>Also in attendance:</b>	Martin Chandler (Development Manager), Councillor Coleman (Cabinet Member Clean and Green), Gareth Edmundson (Ubico), Richard Gibson (Strategy and Engagement Manager), Peter Hatch (CBH), Councillor Jordan (Leader), Wayne Lewis (Joint Waste Team) and Paul Stephenson (CBH)

### Minutes

**1. APOLOGIES**

Councillors McCloskey and Hegenbarth had given their apologies. Councillor Holliday arrived at 6.55pm and Councillor Wilkinson excused himself at 8.10pm.

**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 22 January 2018, be agreed and signed as an accurate record.**

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

None had been received.

**5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

No matters had been referred to the committee.

**6. CBH MASTERPLAN**

The Chairman reminded members that the committee had previously decided that it wanted to give consideration to undertaking some form of scrutiny of the indices of deprivation. The Lead Members had decided that before making a decision on if and how to scrutinise this issue, the committee should first hear from CBH with regard to the 'Masterplan' that they were currently developing, and what it could do to address some of the issues. He noted that the committee would also hear from the Communities Partnership at a future

meeting, to hear about the work they were doing to address issues relating to the indices of deprivation.

Paul Stephenson, Chief Executive and Peter Hatch, Executive Director - Properties and Communities, of Cheltenham Borough Homes (CBH) introduced themselves to the committee. Paul Stephenson thanked the committee for providing the opportunity to present details of the project, which commenced in September 2017 and would culminate in a completed masterplan by July 2018, and which represented a significant piece of work for CBH.

Nash Partnerships, independent consultants specialising in community engagement in planning and regeneration and the architects responsible for the St. Pauls regeneration scheme, were appointed to undertake the consultation. The feedback from this consultation, along with the comprehensive financial analysis for each of the 14 sites, could result in 4 to 5 options which supported the project outcomes (as detailed in the pictorial which had been circulated with the agenda) and whilst housing was a large part of this, the socio-economic benefits were a key element. This project required a collaborative approach and with this in mind, a Programme Board had been established with Tim Atkins, Managing Director of Place and Economic Development at CBC, having been appointed as Chairman. Because this project was not simply about housing, Nash Partnerships were undertaking a lot of work on other areas including health and employment and there was a wide range of partnership involvement. Improving the indices of deprivation was the integral benefit of the project, which would need to improve in order to demonstrate success, but these were long-term proposals which would take some years to deliver. It was suggested that quarterly updates would be made available to members and there was a request that CBH be given the opportunity to make a more detailed presentation to members in the Autumn.

The following responses were given to member questions:

- As yet there had been no further detail regarding eligibility in relation to the proposed increase to the borrowing cap of local authorities to allow for increased development of new housing. The expectation was that this would be included in the impending green paper on social housing, which was expected to be published in Spring 2018. However, given the property prices and the cost of land in Cheltenham it was assumed likely that CBC would indeed be eligible. CBH had attended a meeting with Homes England at which it had made clear its interest to explore the viability and CBH were maintaining a watching brief on this.
- Resources were not an issue for the project at this stage, with CBH having appointed a Project Manager. However, more resources would certainly be required after July 2018, but CBH did not anticipate that this would be a problem as they would simply up-scale resources; the cost of which would be included within the cost of a particular scheme, which incidentally, would also cover the cost of consultants, architects, etc.
- A consultant had recently commented that they had not previously encountered customer satisfaction at the level that CBH Repairs was achieving and this, in part, had lead CBH to increase the level of work done in-house (including kitchen and bathroom replacements which were previously undertaken by a contractor). CBH had recently visited Nottingham City Council, an ALMO which had an in-house development

arm and this was something to which they were giving consideration and a likely timescale for a decision on this would be 12 to 18 months. It was noted that establishing links with Gloucestershire College and providing local employment opportunities would arise from the Masterplan project.

- Consideration was being given to all tenure types and it could be that some schemes would need to include freehold properties in order to ensure the overall viability of the scheme.

A member stressed the importance of capturing some measure of where people in an area of deprivation achieve better education and work outcomes as a direct result of any regeneration works, but where these people then subsequently go on to leave the area, resulting in levels of deprivation seemingly remaining unchanged. The Chief Executive commented that the dilemma that had been described was a dilemma that faced all regeneration projects. Evidence of this would need to be captured and this would only be possible by having undertaken sufficient research and data gathering at the outset. Diversification of housing tenure and type would play a role in addressing this also, and it was important to CBH that regeneration of any given area was real and sustainable, resulting in a positive human outcome, as well as other socio-economic benefits.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive and Executive Director for their attendance and on behalf of the committee accepted the offer of a detailed presentation later in the year.

## **7. DRAFT PLACE STRATEGY UPDATE**

Richard Gibson, the Strategy and Engagement Manager introduced the update as circulated with the agenda and the draft Place Strategy which was starting to take shape. With the final draft scheduled to go to Council at the end of March, it was considered timely to seek the views of the committee, on the changes that had been made since the committee last looked at it in January. Efforts had been made to simplify the framework and condense the vision, to which three ambitions had been aligned (Cheltenham is the most digitally enabled town, Cheltenham champions physical and mental wellbeing and Cheltenham has an international reputation for culture, heritage and sport). He noted that the four values had been retained, which he and other officers had felt was important and the document was deliberately short, with an open and accessible style, in order that it would not be seen as a weighty policy document.

The following responses were given to member questions:

- The reference to 'mental wellbeing' had been used in its broader definition rather than simply relating to clinical mental health. The recent study in Frome was given as an example of where connecting people and reducing social isolation, amongst other things, had helped to improve people's mental wellbeing.
- The Place Strategy was a partnership document rather than a CBC document and the ambition around an international reputation for culture, heritage and wellbeing was important to all partners. Cheltenham certainly had an international reputation for horse racing but this needed to be translated into other areas and the Tour of Britain represented an attempt to do this. There was something around

capturing and harnessing the energy and possibilities, rather than this being something for the council to deliver directly.

- Education was captured in one of the nine aspirations and there was agreement across partners that Cheltenham had a state and private education offer to be proud of. But there was admittedly a skills gap and more needed to be done to address this at the same time that work was ongoing to co-ordinate this to respond to the expected growth in terms of cyber/digital skills.
- Whilst recognising that economic growth was hugely important in order to allow culture and communities to grow and prosper, there was a need for this document to be balanced and to progress all three ambitions together. The Corporate Strategy would contain specifics about what this council would be doing to support these ambitions and this might be the place to highlight particular priorities.
- Although some might feel that certain aspects of Cheltenham (for example the 'supply of business space') were being undersold in this document, there was a need for honesty in terms of areas where there was the desire or need to invest. It was acknowledged that the University were critical to enabling the success of some aspects of this strategy and members could be assured that links had been established.
- The point about the document appearing insular as a result of there being nothing about the town's relationship with the county or neighbouring towns and cities was an important one, and would be addressed before the document was taken to Cabinet.

The Strategy and Engagement Manager highlighted that the Corporate Strategy was usually tabled with this committee at this time each year but due to various other pressures, this had not been possible. The intention was that this year, the Corporate Strategy would be relatively light-touch and simply reiterate existing commitments, with a more developed strategy being devised in July, after the elections.

The Chairman thanked the Strategy and Engagement Manager for his attendance.

## **8. LEISURE@ PROJECT**

Mark Sheldon, the Director of Resources and Corporate Projects and Richard Gibson, the Strategy and Engagement Manager introduced the discussion paper as circulated with the agenda. Members were reminded that in December 2017, Council had agreed a £2.5 million scheme to revitalise Leisure-at Cheltenham, as well as a revised approach to the project management of the scheme, with the council contracting Alliance Leisure Services (ALS) to deliver the project on their behalf. Paragraph 2.4 of the paper outlined the advantages of this approach and paragraph 3-3.11 detailed the governance arrangements that had been put in place. It was highlighted that, in recognition that this represented a significant project for CBC which was not without some risks; a client-side Project Manager had been appointed. The Director of Resources and Corporate Projects explained that a lot of work had been done upfront in terms of cost development, which had resulted in a fixed price being agreed, though there was various contingency budgets to address any unforeseen issues. Highlight reports would be considered by the Senior

Leadership Team as well as the Joint Commissioning Group (JCG) and the JCG had also asked for regular reports on any variances.

The following responses were given to members:

- The council had entered into a fixed-price contract with ALS, who in turn had contracted with Savernake Property Consultants (SPC) to co-ordinate project on behalf of ALS. The council had spent a significant amount of time with ALS to fully understand what cost-certainty actually meant but given the set of risks that accompanied the Council report, it was considered prudent to appoint a client-side Project Manager. The £30k was a provisional sum, to allow the Project Manager, Jane Stovell, to dedicate 1 day a week to co-ordinate and maintain an overview of the project.
- The build programme was relatively short, at 20 weeks and the suggestion was that the Audit Committee might want to undertake a review of the approach once works had been completed.
- A contingency of c.5% had been set aside which included £35k having been retained for any cost over-runs with the piling work. Work would be completed and signed off before any payments were made and ultimately Savernake were contracted to ALS, not the council, should there be a problem.
- There were no escrow arrangements and the justification for this decision would be emailed to members for information.
- The Project Initiation Document (PID) had been drafted at the outset but needed to be revisited to reflect the client-side arrangements and once this was completed, a copy would be circulated to members by email.

The Chairman thanked both the Director of Resources and Corporate Projects and the Strategy and Engagement Manager for their attendance and looked forward to receiving emails regarding the justification for deciding having any escrow arrangements and a copy of the finalised PID.

## **9. RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY THE CHELTENHAM FLOOD AND DRAINAGE PANEL**

Martin Chandler, the Development Manager introduced the officer response which had been circulated with the agenda. He reminded members that the Cheltenham Flood and Drainage Panel had given a presentation to the committee in November 2017 and in response to this, the committee had posed three questions to officers: could comprehensive training be arranged for officers and members of the Planning Committee on flooding and drainage issues; could officers outline the Council's responsibilities in terms of planning, and; could officers explain if and how the panel could be given the same status as the Civic Society and Architects' Panel. The paper set out, in detail, the Council's responsibilities, as well as the responsibilities of the Lead Local Flood Authority which was GCC. In response to the question of giving the panel the same status as the Civic Society or Architects' Panel, he urged caution in the first instance, given that these bodies had been recognised in the Constitution given their ability to provide design advice in the absence of a statutory consultee. His suggestion was that the panel engage with the GCC as the LLFA to improve lines of communication. In terms of the officer and Planning

Committee member training, he was able to confirm that the date had been set for 6pm on the 9 April.

Councillor Baker, as the member who had made the original request for a presentation from the panel thanked the Development Manager for what he considered to be a very comprehensive report. However, he maintained the view that the panel should be given the same status as the Civic Society, and noted that as a member of Planning Committee, he could think of two recent instances where their input would have been helpful.

The Chairman thanked the Development Manager for having produced such a detailed response and whilst he welcomed news that a training date had been scheduled, he did feel that it may be necessary to repeat it after the elections, should new members be appointed to the Planning Committee. He also requested that the Development Manager make the necessary arrangements for the panels initial meeting with the LLFA.

#### **10. WASTE & RECYCLING PERFORMANCE FOLLOWING SERVICE CHANGE**

The Chairman introduced Gareth Edmundson, Managing Director of Ubico and Wayne Lewis of the Joint Waste Partnership (JWT) and explained that Councillor Coleman, Cabinet Member for Clean and Green Environment and Tim Atkins, Managing Director of Place and Economic Development were on hand to answer any questions.

Wayne Lewis provided a brief overview of initial waste and recycling performance following the launch of the new service in October 2017, which saw the introduction of new vehicles, new collection rounds and a wider range of recyclable materials. He felt that at this early stage it was difficult to form a judgement as to whether it had been successful or not and that this had been further complicated by the two instances of adverse weather. However, compared with the previous service, recycling had increased and was likely to exceed the modelled 2%, but this was not to say that there had not been some service issues. Crews had struggled to complete some rounds and this was due to the volume of recycling being presented and inconsistent sorting of materials by some residents, which resulted in rounds taking longer than they should. Some temporary additional resource had helped to resolve the issues and work was now ongoing to understand how to address this going forward.

Gareth Edmundson introduced a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix 1) which he hoped would explain some of the issues. He stressed that failure to complete was not the same as a missed collection as a result of crew error and explained that these failures to complete were a consequence of the volume of recycling being presented at kerbside and inconsistent sorting of materials. Having gone out on a shift himself, he'd seen first-hand that whilst entire row of houses could have sorted their recycling very well, the next row of houses may not have separated it at all and explained it could take almost double the time to complete a collection when the materials were unsorted. This was relevant because crews had a finite time in order to complete rounds and Ubico had no choice but to recall crews back to Swindon Road by 5pm so as not to break regulations and risk being reported to the Traffic Commissioner and or health and safety regulations relating to working in the dark. This meant that some rounds had to be rolled forward to the next collection day and there would have been some residents who would have had repeat instances of collections on

different days to those which had been communicated to them. Narrow access streets is an historical issue and whilst advice was sought from existing users of Romaquips and Ubico operatives and drivers, to inform procurement, there was a balance that needed to be achieved between having vehicles that enabled service to all roads and buying the minimum number required to provide the flexibility and capacity required. To address the issue of non-completion of rounds, two additional vehicles have been added and have specific rounds and data was being collected and rounds adjusted to ensure that the service was as efficient as it could be. A business case will be presented back to CBC commissioners for review and decision once Ubico are confident the rounds have settled. The net additional cost of the new service would only be known once collection and recycle levels had settled but the original cost estimated in the December 2016 agreed Cabinet report was between £146k and 350k.

Responses had been provided to questions received in advance of the meeting. See table below.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	What impact has the expansion of the kerbside recycling service had on recycling rates across the town?
	<i>The expansion of the kerbside recycling service has had a positive impact on recycling rates. A month on month comparison of October to Dec 2016 to 2017 shows an increase to the monthly recycling percentage of 4% for October and 1.7% for both November and December. This should add between 1 and 2% to the annual (NI192) recycling rate, despite the service change only taking place in October. If this positive trend continues, then the full-year impact should be an increase of 2% or more to the council's recycling rate.</i>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	Some towns do not sort recycling at the kerbside as we do. Does this still mean we get a better price and does it also mean we will be better protected from the likely impact of the decision by China to stop taking our recycled plastics?
	<i>The prices obtained by council's for recyclable materials can be influenced by a number of factors such as timing of agreements, terms of sale, the volume of material sold, the council's location and the quality of the material sold. In general though, having well separated, good quality materials means that better prices can be obtained and also helps to ensure that materials can continue to be recycled when poor market conditions (such as those resulting from the Chinese restrictions) are encountered.</i>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Baker</b>
	Has the expanded service created any customer service issues? If so how have these been resolved?
	<i>Difficulties in completing rounds clearly increased the volume of telephone queries received by customer services but volumes have returned to normal now.</i>

The following responses were given to member questions raised at the meeting itself:

- Wayne did not feel that Autumn was a bad time of year to launch a new service and noted that the severe weather conditions could not have been predicted. From Ubico's perspective, there were questions around the running and maintaining the previous fleet, which was very old. Ubico couldn't have predicted the severe weather but were in the process of looking at how this risk will be managed going forward.
- The mobilisation of vehicles was a complex process. Drivers were not asked to take a vehicle down a street if they did not feel safe in doing so but this clearly depended on the knowledge and experience of the particular driver. If Councillor Walklett could give specifics about which streets previously had smaller vehicles and are now seeing larger vehicles undertaking collections, then Gareth could look into the issue for him.
- Income would increase in line with the amount of recycle being collected and income in the form of recycling credit from GCC but this would be offset by the additional cost of the new service and may not cover it.
- Smaller vehicles had been deployed to resolve narrow access properties to resolve access issues.
- After the adverse weather co-mingling of recycling enabled crews to make additional collections more quickly but it had been made clear to crews that the commissioner (CBC) had to give permission for this and Gareth would be interested to know what streets residents claimed to be witnessing co-mingling on a regular basis so that he might investigate further. It was noted that some recycling was co-mingled and then sorted manually. Overall, co-mingling of recycling should happen very rarely but the incidence was higher across December and January to enable the crews to cope with the adverse weather.
- Residual waste had decreased and figures would be circulated to members by email.
- Cameras were fitted to the new vehicles.
- Ultimately more vehicles meant more cost and a blend of vehicles was required to do the job. Smaller vehicles clearly had less capacity and required more frequent trips to unload which increases costs.
- Wayne felt that waste was an important consideration for planning as planning decisions could create future waste collection problems. Gareth was interested to know which development had been permitted with the condition that the developer had to find a private company to undertake the waste collections.
- The JWT/Ubico were aware of communal waste and where residents used black bags rather than bins and could agree these properties were given a priority as part of the emergency planning procedure, in acceptance that missed collections posed more of an issue for these residents than those with bins.
- Given the level of communications about the new service, the spike in recycling was not unexpected but there would need to be ongoing communications to maintain current levels. It would be possible to use intelligence relating to tonnage to focus messages to particular areas



and another option was to analyse where general waste included recyclable materials.

- Food waste was reducing, generally people found this messier and therefore it was important that this message was reinforced regularly.
- The JWT regularly reviewed what approaches proved successful in other areas and why.
- Home composting bins were available to purchase from the recycle for Gloucestershire website at a subsidised rate and Master Composters were on hand to give advice to residents and/or groups. Waste Doctors and multi-language leaflets were not something that had yet been considered.
- Wayne stated that it was often the case that areas with a higher turnover of residents tended to achieve lower recycling levels compared to areas with a more settled population.
- There was an established Adverse Weather Protocol which involved an assessment of the conditions first thing in the morning. The only decision reserved for Ubico in adverse weather is whether or not it was safe for crews to carry out collections. If collections are suspended the council are provided with a range of catch-up options to make a decision. It was fully appreciated that continued disruptions proved frustrating for residents and decisions to suspend collections were regularly reviewed but it was unfortunate nature of the business that service had to be suspended if crew safety was in question.
- Supervisors capacity to respond to issues was reduced during and after the adverse weather as they were supporting the service.
- Details of non-completions are reported at the end of each day and these are prioritised for the next day and whilst Ubico did not rely on residents reporting 'missed collections', this was useful for Ubico. They were pleased to report that there had failure to complete had been resolved by the provision of extra vehicles.
- There were some streets where confusion over maps and which route they were included in lead to missed collections and the difficulties to complete other rounds had compounded the issue. Gareth apologised to residents who had been impacted by issues and expressed his hope that as the service continues to settle the small numbers of residents affected will regain their confidence in the service.
- A number of members, including two members of the public commended Ubico for the service that they provided, which despite some missed collections, they felt was of an excellent standard.

There were no questions for the Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment.

The Chairman thanked Gareth Edmundson and Wayne Lewis for their attendance and wished Ubico well over the next week or so, given the bad weather which was being forecast.

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

An update on the recent Police and Crime Panel meeting had been circulated with the agenda and the update on the recent meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Committee (Appendix 2) had been circulated to members, by

email, in advance of the meeting. As neither author was present, members were asked to contact them directly with any comments or questions.

## **12. CABINET BRIEFING**

The Leader referred members to the briefing which had been circulated with the agenda. In it he had posed two questions to the committee; did O&S want further input into the Arle Nursery Strategic Review before the report was taken to Cabinet, and; did O&S have any views on the issue of scrutiny of Publica.

The committee were happy for the Arle Nursery Strategic review to be scheduled on the agenda for the next O&S meeting (23 April).

Given that there would be an annual stakeholders' meeting, the suggestion from the committee was that the Leader, as the shareholder representative, should communicate to all members, any upcoming decisions, giving said members the opportunity to raise any questions in advance.

In response to a member question, the Leader confirmed that the council had an enhanced Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP), with provision after one night of the temperature dropping below zero, where others required three consecutive nights. The charity P3 would proactively identify rough sleepers across the county to ensure that they had a warm bed for the night.

## **13. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN**

The scrutiny plan had been circulated with the agenda. In response to matters raised during the meeting or by members, the Democracy Officer confirmed that:

- The Arle Nursery Strategic Review would be scheduled for the 23 April meeting but officers would need to confirm that this fit with the current project timetable.
- As stated at the last meeting, a response to the Select Committee report on scrutiny was being tabled with the Corporate Governance Group and Lead Members for scrutiny would then give consideration to if and how a review should be undertaken, but this would be after the upcoming elections so as to get fresh perspective from new members.
- An update on the issues at the crematorium would be scheduled for the next meeting (23 April).
- The reason a briefing note had been produced on the sound system, rather than a discussion paper, was because the tenders had not yet been evaluated. The Democracy Officer would raise the issue of member involvement in this process (beyond that of the working group which had been established) and agree an acceptable approach with the lead members for scrutiny.

A member felt that briefing note on the sound system seemed to suggested that the council had already decided to take the cheapest, most basic option and he questioned the logic behind this decision. He felt that it was worth spending more if this could result in the need for less, resources in support of the democratic process. Another member disagreed and felt that the council should not be spending money on a new sound system in a building which it intended to vacate in 6 years.

**14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXEMPT INFORMATION**

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** 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 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:

**Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)**

**15. EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

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

Upon a vote it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 22 January 2018, be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

**16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

23 April 2018

Tim Harman  
**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank



## Overview & Scrutiny CBC Service Update



## Overview

- ❖ December 6<sup>th</sup> 2016 Cabinet gave approval for a re-designed service.
- ❖ Cabinet Agreed Option 2A which included:
  - ❖ Fortnightly kerbside-sort recycle collection with expanded range of materials collected
  - ❖ Fortnightly refuse
  - ❖ Fortnightly paid-for garden waste service
  - ❖ Weekly food waste
- ❖ Cabinet paper highlighted that the model was based on a 2% increase in recycling overall, once the service had settled.
- ❖ Estimated a best and worse case scenario of £146K - £305K of additional cost



## Service Launch - Operations

- ❖ Overall, crews learned their new rounds well, however, enquiries and reported missed collections were higher than average as expected due to the new service
- ❖ However, key challenge was:
  - ❖ the volume of recycling presented
  - ❖ inconsistent sorting of recycling material, sorted into a larger vehicle
- ❖ This resulted in recycling rounds being not able to complete on some days.



## Failure to Complete Recycling Rounds

- ❖ Failure to complete (leaving roads uncollected) is not the same as a missed bin as a result of crew error.
- ❖ Collection crews have a finite time in order to complete rounds and are restricted by driver hours available and hours of daylight.
- ❖ Ubico has no choice but to get crews back to Swindon Road by 5pm (this means we call them back at 4-4.15pm to tip), to ensure that:
  - ❖ we do not break regulations and are reported to the Traffic Commissioner
  - ❖ or health and safety regulations on working in the dark.

This resulted in some rounds having to roll forward to the next collection day.



## Narrow Access

- ❖ Cheitenham has a number of roads that are extremely challenging to access.
- ❖ Advice was sought on vehicle procurement from existing users of Romaquips to inform the specification.
- ❖ Assessed by existing operatives and drivers to inform procurement
- ❖ There is always a balance on buying new vehicles to buy the minimum number required to provide the flexibility and capacity to provide a service to all roads.
- ❖ Some roads, e.g. Bloomsbury street, remain extremely challenging to access and some roads have had to be reassigned and narrower vehicles used.



## Measures

- ❖ 2 additional recycling vehicles have been mobilised to accommodate the additional material and have been given dedicated rounds. As a result this has delivered a more consistent service
- ❖ Data is being collected, rounds are being adjusted and a business case is being developed to explore efficiencies and provide further options to CBC
- ❖ The net cost of the new service will only be known when collection and recycle levels settle.



This page is intentionally left blank

### Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee

Report for O&S – 26 February 2018

Thursday 22nd February was the second in the series of outvisits, this time to The Cotswolds. Remember, we will be coming to Cheltenham in October.

The format was the same, with the home district starting proceedings with a 30 minute presentation on the Cotswolds Local Plan. Their plan is further advanced than Cheltenham, it has been approved by the Inspector for some months now.

To be honest, the Scrutiny group was rather underwhelmed. I felt that The Cotswolds was relying on its pre-eminent tourism reputation. (In terms of brand recognition, the top three places in the UK, by a considerable margin over the rest, are London, The Cotswolds, Stratford Upon Avon.)

There was some disquiet amongst the Cotswolds councillors, that they had a plan, but there was no action to make anything happen. The rest of the meeting was taken up with questions from Cotswolds councillors' to the G First LEP.

I had the sense that about a dozen members of the Scrutiny group had simply facilitated a meeting between The Cotswolds and G First LEP. I wasn't overly impressed with the Cotswolds Local Plan, it seemed very parochial. There was no mention of Vision 2050 or of partnership working. Their plan did have a SWOT. I saw no evidence that Cotswolds had looked at their weaknesses and then tried to find neighbours with compensating strengths or that they were pro-actively offering their strengths and opportunities to others to work together.

Tewkesbury were bullish, outgoing and keen to play their part in developing Gloucestershire. By contrast Cotswolds seemed very introspective and not taking ownership of their problems. Moaning to us about fly-tipping was a case in point.

I don't really want to say more until the group has had a proper chance to review the meeting which it will do at the next meeting in March.

All the above said, I do feel I am getting a far better appreciation of the various Districts in Gloucestershire and their strengths and weaknesses.

Councillor P McCloskey

This page is intentionally left blank