

## Review of progress on cabinet recommendations (approved 18 October 2011)

Cabinet recommendation	Progress
Team restructure to assist delivery of outcomes and agreed service specification	As outlined in the annual report, a restructure was implemented to support the new way of working. A further restructuring process will commence in 2013/14 to reflect the agreed outcomes for the Cheltenham Futures change programme.
Report back to Cabinet, once there is clarity on the legislation, with regards to the local setting of planning fees and identify additional planning income which may be realised	The government decided not to pursue the implementation of local fee setting, but did increase nationally set planning fee rates by 15% with effect from November 2012. The service has also introduced fees for pre-application advice, generating additional revenue. The Council has chosen to take the revenue from these additional income streams as a budget saving, rather than reinvesting in service delivery.
Continue to improve the customer experience by embedding the systems thinking approach across the full range of its services	Progress on this has been disappointing. After achieving promising initial results, systems thinking in planning stalled, due in part to turnover of staff. The commissioning division will be working with development management to get this back on track now that the Head of Planning has returned from maternity leave. Systems thinking work has been undertaken with the building control service and this service has recently started to implement the 'new world' way of working identified by the systems thinking approach. A "light touch" systems thinking process resolved some issues in the Conservation team which freed professional officers' time and facilitated some marginal enhancements to response times
Explore with partners the opportunities to undertake collaborative working, where it will provide service resilience and make the most efficient use of resources	The potential for sharing elements of planning (including conservation) and enforcement with neighbouring authorities has been considered by the director of built environment, but it was concluded that other authorities would gain the greatest benefit and it would not increase service resilience for CBC, or be the most efficient use of resources. However, given the working with GO partners there may be an opportunity to reconsider how services could be redesigned to gain economies of scale. The building control service has been providing short term support for Gloucester City and the potential for a long term arrangement by expanding the current shared service is being considered, but it will only be taken forward if there is a clear business case benefit for CBC.
Hold regular (at least twice per year) stakeholder sessions including	The built environment service has a good relationship with both the Civic

Cabinet recommendation	Progress
agents, developers, conservation and heritage groups, architects panel as well as councillors to discuss progress in delivering the outcomes	Society and Architects Panel, but capacity issues within the service have meant that wider stakeholder sessions have not taken place. A joint member/officer session is scheduled to discuss issues and priorities around enforcement and in particular, the perception that developments are not always being built in accordance with approved plans.
Explore opportunities to extend the charging for pre-application process to other areas currently not within scope	As noted above, all pre-application advice is now subject to a fee, subject to the availability of staffing resources to offer this discretionary service. Following good initial take-up of the service, some recent capacity issues within the conservation team have restricted our ability to provide advice in relation to pre-purchase enquiries relating to listed buildings. Measures have been introduced to ease the capacity issue and the situation will be reviewed as soon as practicable. The team will be looking again at this issue to see whether an alternative charging regime can be introduced to at least cover the costs of this discretionary service.
Undertake review of alternative delivery models for building control in 2013, as part of the programmed review of the current shared service arrangement with Tewkesbury Borough Council	Following an informal investigation of alternative delivery models it was concluded that no significant benefits can be achieved at this time and the work to explore widening the current arrangement with other councils was felt to be a more appropriate option.
Test in-scope range of built environment services against private sector service alternatives in 2013/14, to confirm whether internal service continues to deliver value for money, based on an assessment of both cost and quality	The in-scope range of services referred originally to planning services and this will not be progressed. The Cheltenham Futures change programme sets out how the service as a whole will be managed from April 2014; this is covered in the main body of the cabinet report.
Work with Voluntary and Community Sector to support market development in areas which will underpin the Localism Act 2011	Some very positive developments in this area including:-  1) review of the Public Art Panel volunteer membership to bring in project and design expertise to promote the delivery of schemes funded through Section 106 contributions – for example, St Mary’s churchyard regeneration, the Promenade ‘phone boxes refurbishment (involving the Art gallery and Museum), Bath Road mural project (with Cheltenham Connect, BARTA and St Philips and St James Residents’ Association) and Hester’s Way partnership (the reading chair project);  2) the Environmental Improvements fund, which has led to engagement

Cabinet recommendation	Progress
	<p>with a range of community organisations in the delivery of projects including, Pittville Residents' Association (Pittville Gates restoration), Whaddon Residents (Mersey Road triangle scheme), Cheltenham Connect &amp; BARTA (Exmouth mural and street redesign) and St Paul's Residents' Association (St Paul's Edible Garden project)</p> <p>3) Engagement with the C5 group of Parish Councils regarding the opportunity offered by Neighbourhood Plans – this has included engagement with the Leckhampton Parish Council regarding south Cheltenham, leading to their submission of a document in response to the draft JCS consultation.</p> <p>4) Discussions with the St Paul's Residents Association have highlighted concerns about the impact of studentification on the local community and the imbalance and instability caused by a high concentration of private rented HMOs. We are expecting that the community will shortly be submitting evidence to support their concerns and a request to consider the introduction of a local licensing scheme, backed by an Article 4 direction to help control issues arising. Evidence shows that St Paul's does have an HMO concentration well above that known to unbalance residential communities.</p>