

## **Cabinet**

**Tuesday, 21st September, 2010  
6.00 - 7.30 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Colin Hay (Cabinet Member Corporate Services), Steve Jordan (Leader of the Council), Andrew McKinlay (Cabinet Member Sport and Culture), John Rawson (Cabinet Member Corporate Services), Klara Sudbury (Cabinet Member Housing and Safety), John Webster (Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development) and Roger Whyborn (Cabinet Member Sustainability)

## **Minutes**

### **1. APOLOGIES**

There were none.

The Chairman asked members to stand in silence as a mark of respect for Councillor John Morris who had recently passed away. He had been a friend of Councillor Morris for many years and he had been a dedicated member of the Cabinet.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor Rawson declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a Governor of Dunalley Primary School.

Councillor Jordan declared a personal interest in agenda item 11 because of a link with the YMCA project.

Councillor Webster declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 in view of his involvement with the Wharfedale Residents Association.

Councillor McKinlay declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 as a member of St Margarets Hall User Group Committee on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council

Councillor Whyborn declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item 14 in relation to St Margarets Hall User Group.

Councillor C Hay declared personal interests in agenda items 11 and 12 as a member of the CBH Board and as a member of Oakley Regeneration Project.

### **3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

**Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of 27 July 2010 were approved as a correct record.**

### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

None received.

**5. AIRPORT RUNWAY SAFETY PROJECT**

The chairman of the Joint Airport Scrutiny Working Group introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that in December 2009 the Council had agreed the business case for the airport and had agreed to facilitate £1.2 million of the borrowing required from the PWLB for onward lending to the airport to fund the runway safety project. Since this date the project costs had increased and the project implementation period has been shortened in line with recommendations of the project manager. The business case financial projections have been revised and an additional temporary loan of £350,000 was being requested from both Cheltenham Borough Council and Gloucester City Council as joint shareholders of the airport. Gloucester City Council had already agreed to support the additional funding on 1 September 2010.

The Treasury Management Panel had approved the necessary changes to the Treasury Management Policy to facilitate the loan at their meeting on 14 September 2010. The report had also been considered by the Economy and Business Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 20 September. An extract of the minutes of both meetings had been circulated to all members so that the comments made could be considered by Cabinet.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. It be recommended to Council to approve the additional temporary borrowing facility of £350K (maximum) to support the implementation of the Runway Safety Project and that the Treasury Management Policy be amended accordingly.

**6. SUPPORTING PEOPLE STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The Partnership Board had agreed to refresh the 2005-2010 strategy to ensure the Supporting People programme retains its fitness for purpose in the changing local government landscape and financial climate. Cabinet's views were being sought to feed into the formal consultation on the draft strategy 2011-2016. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Safety informed members of the issues raised at the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 6 September 2010 which included reference to support for carers, care villages and questions relating to the consultation.

The Supporting People Interim Manager, Gloucestershire County Council gave members an overview of the Supporting People programme. He drew attention to the considerable reduction in funding which meant that services could not continue to be provided in same way and in some cases services may need to be stopped. The new strategy addressed this reduction and the changing population. They were currently reviewing services for the elderly and mapping areas of highest social deprivation and this data would be used to target services more effectively. He referred to the 'Hub and Spoke' network which it

was hoped could be expanded in the next 5 years. He also mentioned the development of drop-in centres across the County. In many cases they were dealing with people who were not ready to live independently so some specialist accommodation would still be provided but on a reduced scale. There would be more emphasis on short term intervention so that a problem did not escalate into a crisis. There would also be more emphasis on greater activity and engagement with the community and closer association with GP practices.

The Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development asked if there were any guarantees that in view of the forthcoming cuts money would not be moved to support other projects in the County. The Supporting People Interim Manager stated that he could not say how the Gloucestershire Cabinet would view this issue. He was asked to pass on to the County Council the view that the finance for the Supporting People programme should be guaranteed. Reference was also made to the Home Improvement Service which it was noted had not yet been commissioned and it was felt that this would be crucial with an aging population. In this respect the Supporting People Interim Manager confirmed that the partnership agreement had recently been signed which would allow procurement to proceed. This was a priority within the proposed strategy.

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety welcomed this information and asked for it to be reinforced to the County Council that this council valued the services provided and if available finance was reduced it could mean that other areas of Council business could cost much more. She also asked for careful consideration to be given to the decommissioning of services in view of the potential impact. The Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development asked that a briefing paper be provided for members' information following the County Council's decision.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The comments from Cheltenham Borough Council be submitted to the formal consultation process.
2. Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety to endorse the Gloucestershire Supporting People Strategy 2011-2016, as per the process on pp 9-10 of Appendix 1; on condition that:
  - no further significant amendments are made to the final strategy as a result of the consultation process and;
  - that the issues raised by Cheltenham Borough Council during the consultation period are adequately addressed in the final version, and if they are not then this matter will be reported back to Cabinet.

**7. GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT WASTE PROJECT**

The Cabinet Member Sustainability introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that Gloucestershire

authorities had been looking at the case for joint working in waste to understand the value of potential savings and the implications of realising the savings. Appendix 1 set out the updated business case for Gloucestershire as a whole and Appendix 2 the case for Cheltenham Borough Council, taking into account service changes to increase recycling and partnership efficiencies. He referred in detail to the recommendations and in particular to the arrangements for shared depot services with Tewkesbury Borough Council and to the possibility of extending the shared partnership arrangements with Cotswold District Council.

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services was pleased to note shared services did not require services to be provided in exactly the same way. The Cabinet Member Built Environment congratulated Councillor Whyborn and officers for the work undertaken and he was reassured that the business case was considered to be robust by other Gloucestershire local authorities. These comments were endorsed by the Leader of the Council.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. Cheltenham Borough Council's participation in the development of the Gloucestershire Waste Partnership be confirmed.
2. The approval of a maximum of £37,125 in 2010/11 as a contribution to the cost of developing partnership arrangements be confirmed.
3. The project initiation document for the development of the business case for shared waste, recycling and ground maintenance services with Tewkesbury Borough Council as first step towards such a partnership be approved, recognising that the project scope may be subsequently amended to accommodate other partners as and when conditions are favourable.
4. The interim management arrangements already in place for depot services with Tewkesbury Borough Council be endorsed.
5. Officers be instructed to investigate the viability of extending shared collection services with Cotswold District Council commencing April 2012, and that an outline business case and draft heads of terms be prepared for consideration by cabinet on 14 December 2010.

**8. ENERGY MANAGEMENT POLICY**

The Cabinet Member Sustainability introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that managing energy use and the associated costs within the Council's own estate was an issue which will become increasingly significant. The Council had also signed up to 10:10 and had an ongoing commitment to reducing carbon emissions from its activities, a large percentage of which comes from the consumption of energy. Adopting an energy management policy would ensure a coherent and coordinated approach to help deliver these commitments.

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services endorsed the policy but suggested the policy should be amended to recognise the role of members in saving energy

which was not mentioned in the document. He also felt that regular reports on this subject should be presented to Overview and Scrutiny. The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety agreed and mentioned several areas where she felt that energy could be saved within the council buildings. These proposals were accepted by the Cabinet Member Sustainability.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

The Energy Management Policy set out in Appendix 1 be adopted subject to the addition of 'and member' in the 1st bullet point on page 1 of the policy

**9. GO PROGRAMME**

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report informed members of the progress of the GO programme and the final business case.

He explained that the report had been considered by the Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 20 September 2010. An extract of the minutes had been circulated to members of Cabinet. He confirmed that since the report had been prepared the Forest of Dean District Council had signed up to the Programme. He referred in particular to the agreement for CBC to become the Support and Hosting Centre of Excellence and he felt that the work by officers in achieving this should be recognised. He also mentioned the suggestion which had been made that the County Council system should be considered. He confirmed that an investigation had been carried out but the costs were not competitive with the system being recommended.

The Cabinet Member drew attention to the comments of the Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee with regard to risk and confirmed that this would be reviewed to see if any amendments were necessary. In conclusion he drew attention to paragraph 9 of his report which stressed the important of effective performance management in ensuring successful delivery.

Members felt that it would be interesting to see what the GO programme could lead to in the future and that the long term benefits might be greater than the business case indicated. It was clear that considerable effort had been put into this project and the programme management board would play a key role in ensuring the project remained on track.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The GO Programme Business Case and appendices be approved.
2. The GO Programme moving to the implementation phase (Phase 1) be approved.
3. Authority be delegated to the Section 151 Officer in consultation with the relevant strategic director and Cabinet Member Corporate Services to enter into the following agreements on terms approved by the Borough Solicitor, subject to all GO partners entering into similar relevant agreements at the same juncture:

- GO Programme Collaboration Agreement.
  - S101 Agreement for the Support and Hosting Centre of Excellence.
  - ERP System supply contract.
4. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services be nominated as the elected member representative to the GO Strategic Partnership Management Board (SPMB).

## **10. REVIEW OF JOINT CORE STRATEGY TIMETABLE**

The Leader introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that all regional spatial strategies had been revoked by the coalition government on 27 May 2010. This had created a policy vacuum for the JCS area as a result of the removal of strategic requirements for housing and employment. The JCS authorities were committed to putting in place a Joint Core Strategy as quickly as possible and the method and timetable were set out in this report.

Reference was made to the 5 year supply of housing sites and to the fact that it might be necessary for this to be compiled locally in view of the localism agenda. The general consensus was that this would be the case and members hoped that the new rules would be produced by the government as soon as possible.

### **RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The revised role and function of Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy as recommended by Joint Core Strategy Cross Boundary Programme Board and Member Steering Group as set out in paragraph 1.4-1.7 of this report be approved.
2. The format of Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy as set out in appendix 1 be agreed.

The indicative timetable set out in this report be agreed and that a detailed work programme and consultation schedule be prepared.

## **11. LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Leader introduced a report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report was concerned with the allocation of funding for the delivery of affordable housing which was now the responsibility of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). The report explained the process and sought to gain support for the list of sites the council now wishes to support for HCA investment. The latest view of the HCA was that it would be unrealistic to produce a priority list at the present time in view of the impending announcement on public expenditure on 20 October. Each district had been asked to produce a list of sites and Appendix 1 listed the potential sites. It was suggested that agreement to any future priority list should be delegated to Graham Lewis, Strategic Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member Built Environment and the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety and this was supported.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The sites as listed in Appendix 1 for inclusion in the Cheltenham section of the Local Investment Plan be approved.
2. Authority be delegated to the Strategic Director, Grahame Lewis, in consultation with the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety and the Cabinet Member Built Environment to agree any future prioritisation of sites.

**12. FINAL REVIEW OF 3 YEAR COMMUNITY INVESTMENT GRANTS 2008 - 2011**

The Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development introduced his report which had been circulated with the agenda. The report explained that the council's three-year funded community investment grants were now in their final year of funding arrangement. A review had been undertaken by a working group on behalf of the Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee and their findings were set out in appendix 1 for Cabinet's consideration. He felt that the organisations had met the review evaluation criteria with notable achievements and the long term aim was to gently reduce the resource over a period of time as the Partnerships became more financially secure. It was also suggested that the period for the grants should be extended from 3 to 5 years which allow the organisations to do better planning of resources.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Social and Community's final review of the council's community investment grants 2008-2011 as per Appendix 1 be noted.

With reference to the outcomes of the review group and subject to the council's budget process:

- 2) It be agreed in principle to continue to award funding to each of the named three organisations via Community Investment Grants, with levels determined subject to the council's budget process and with the following provisos:
  - a) That Hester's Way and Oakley regeneration partnerships continue to work with officers to identify potential collaborative models to achieve efficiencies. Consideration will be given to an annual reduction in the grant, which will be built into each year of the funding period going forward for both Hester's Way and Oakley.
  - b) To allocate funding in principle, to each of the named organisations, for a grant term period of five years commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011. Each award of grant to be for a term of an initial period of three years, with an opportunity for a formal extension of the grant period

for a further two years, conditional upon i) satisfactory performance by the organisation, ii) the availability of funding and iii) that the grant continues to meet corporate priorities.

3) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Community Services, to complete any grant documentation required, in consultation with the Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development and on terms approved by the Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

### **13. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER**

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. The council had acknowledged that members need to be aware of the corporate risks which may impact on the council and the decisions it takes. The risk register had been updated by the Senior Leadership Team in August and sets out progress against mitigating actions. Members were asked to consider the document and identify any additional risks or actions they would like to be added.

He referred members to the minutes of the Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the risks they had highlighted. He confirmed that these areas would be looked at.

The Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development suggested that the risk associated with Concessionary Fares should be revisited as he felt that there might be a higher risk than that detailed in the report. The Leader agreed that this would be revisited.

It was also felt that a regular report on risk should be brought to Cabinet at least quarterly and that discussions on risk should also be included in Cabinet Members' 1:1 discussions with Assistant Directors.

#### **RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The Assistant Chief Executive be requested to discuss the following risks and associated actions identified during the meeting with the appropriate lead officers and update the register accordingly.
  - GO program
  - Potential industrial action arising from government cuts
  - Revisit risks associated with concessionary fares
  - Strategic Commissioning – additional risks beyond skills and experience
  - One particular sector or area of the community may be adversely affected by multiple cuts by different partners
2. A quarterly report on the Corporate Risk Register be considered by Cabinet and risks are discussed with Cabinet Members at their 1-1s with Assistant Directors.



#### **14. COMMUNITY PRIDE GRANTS**

The Leader introduced the report which had been circulated with the agenda. At Cabinet on 1 June 2010, he had presented details of the community pride grant scheme using £40,000 set aside in the 2010-11 budget which had been agreed by Council on 12 February 2010. 27 applications had been received since the grant scheme went live on 7 June 2010. These had been evaluated by a panel and their recommendations were contained in the report for consideration by Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member Housing and Safety felt this to be a very positive report and it was regrettable that the Council could not support all the applications. She considered it inspiring that the community cared enough about their communities to make these improvements.

The Leader referred to the application from The Friends of Cheltenham Racecourse Station and he confirmed that it had been withdrawn in view of the fact that the station could not be used at present because of the landslip. He suggested however that discussions should take place with this group to ascertain if there was any other way in which the Council could assist in trying to reopen this station and this suggestion was supported.

#### **RESOLVED THAT:**

1. The list of projects to be funded from community pride funds as set out in appendix 1 be approved.
2. The list of projects already funded through the small-scale fund as set out in appendix 3 be noted.
3. Authority be delegated to the Leader of the Council to determine how best to allocate the remaining sum of £10,080 across the five projects as set out in appendix 4.

Officers consider alternatives ways of assisting the work of the Friends of the Cheltenham Racecourse station in view of the withdrawal of their current application

#### **15. NOMINATION TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Leader introduced his report which had been circulated at the start of the meeting. The report set out the nominations for representatives on external partnerships and outside bodies. He indicated that the representative on the Local Government Association Urban Forum would be Councillor Hay and not Councillor Rawson as indicated in the report. He explained that all nominations to bodies external to the Council would be made by Cabinet unless consensus on a particular nomination/appointment could not be reached between all the political groups on the Council. Group Leaders were all in agreement on the nominations and hence they could all be approved by Cabinet.

#### **RESOLVED THAT:**

1. Nominations/appointments to the bodies in Appendix 1 (subject to

Councillor C Hay being appointed to the Local Government Association Urban Forum) were made in accordance with the following principles :

- all nominations are made on the basis that the nominee/appointee is a representative of Cheltenham Borough Council insofar as that is compatible with any overriding legal duty to the outside body; and
  - Cabinet reserves the right at any time to withdraw/terminate a nomination/appointment which it has made
  - Cabinet should refer a nomination/appointment to Council for determination where consensus on that nomination/appointment cannot be achieved between all the political groups on the Council
2. The representation of Cabinet members on Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Partnerships arising from their position as portfolio holders, as circulated at the meeting, was noted.

**Chairman**