

Cheltenham Borough Council
Cabinet – 11 December 2012
Scrutiny Review – Grass Verges

Accountable member	Cabinet Member Sustainability – Councillor Roger Whyborn
Accountable officer	Commissioning Director – Jane Griffiths
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee set up a task group looking at verge maintenance. A copy of their report and recommendations is attached. The working group involved officers in the discussions so that there is a consensus on the approach which is being outlined within their report.</p> <p>The working group have been mindful of the current financial situation and have considered their recommendations in this light. It should be noted however that the council does contribute to the maintenance of the verges which is a highways authority responsibility. In accepting the recommendations it is on the assumption that the council can for the foreseeable future continue with this level of financial subsidy.</p> <p>The overview and scrutiny committee at their meeting on 26 November 2012 have seen the task group report and were happy to recommend it to be presented to cabinet. An extract of the minutes is attached.</p>
Recommendations	<p>The Cabinet is recommended to resolve to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider the recommendations of the Scrutiny Task Group Report, and 2. Consider the implications set out in this report when deciding whether to adopt the recommendations of the Scrutiny Task Group Report.
Financial implications	<p>The current top up provided by Cheltenham Borough Council is budgeted for in the 2012/13 base budget at £109,500.</p> <p>Contact officer: Andrew Powers, Accountant (GO Shared Services) andrew.powers@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264121</p>

Legal implications	<p>Any changes to the manner in which the Borough Council co-ordinates with the County Council or undertakes its functions under the mini agency agreement, such as those referred to in STG recommendations vi and vii, will need to be negotiated and agreed between the two Councils and reflected in a formal variation to the agreement or a side letter depending upon the extent of the agreed changes. With regard to STG recommendation v, this could be progressed through the County Council expressing appropriate comments in their statutory responses to planning applications.</p> <p>Contact officer: Peter Lewis, Head of Legal Services peter.lewis@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01242 775074</p>
HR implications (including learning and organisational development)	<p>There are no HR implications arising from the recommendations of the task group.</p> <p>Contact officer: Amanda Attfield, Head of Human Resources (GO Shared Services) amanda.attfield@cheltenham.gov.uk</p>
Key risks	None identified.
Corporate and community plan Implications	The recommendations will help support the council's corporate plan objectives relating to the environment and overall quality of life for Cheltenham.
Environmental and climate change implications	The review has made a number of recommendations and observations in relation to climate change and biodiversity and the recommendations will help support adaptation and mitigation of climate change.

Report author	<p>Contact officer: Jane Griffiths, Commissioning Director</p> <p>jane.griffiths@cheltenham.gov.uk</p> <p>01242 264126</p>
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment (to be completed for Cabinet) 2. Report of the scrutiny task group – grass verges 3. Extract from minutes of O&S Committee 26 November 2012

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
	If the council does not look at ways to adapt to climate change then additional costs could be incurred.	Jane Griffiths		2	2	4	Reduce	Look at biodiversity			

Explanatory notes

Impact – 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)

Likelihood – 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)

Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close