

**COUNTY COUNCIL –15 February 2017
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<p>1. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>Will the Leader reaffirm his opposition to any building of any kind on the Clearwater Open Space in his Division? Furthermore will he commit to ensuring that Clearwater Drive is recognised as a legally protected public space before May this year?</p>	<p>Local residents will know that I am fully committed to public open space at Clearwater drive. I have been actively campaigning with residents on this since the initial announcement was made by the dioceses last year.</p> <p>One of the issues raised by residents has been what happened to the push to have the site designated as a Village Green, a process I believe you were involved in. I have received written confirmation from the parish council that the bid was never submitted to the county council and therefore was never considered. Due to changes in the law since that time, a village green application can no longer be considered while active planning uses are being pursued.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>Can the Leader please confirm why only 80 surveys were sent out to Aspen Drive only, and did not include surrounding areas, i.e. Clearwater Drive (where the proposed school may be built), Deerhurst Place, Apperely Drive, Hasfield Road, and Pendock Close; surely these are the important areas?</p>	<p>The consultation relating to the proposed new free school at Clearwater Drive is being carried out by the school sponsor the Diocese of Gloucester Academy Trust. The Diocese devised their own plan to consult with local residents.</p> <p>According to the Dioceses it has undertaken the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was advertised on Radio Gloucestershire on 17 and 18 January • There is an article in the parish magazine of St James 'Around the Spire' • It was in the Citizen 15 January

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first delivery of leaflets was made to the following areas: Dunlin Close, The Causeway, Teal Close, Sandpiper Close, Clearwater Drive, Eldersfield Close, Aspen Drive and Acer Grove, Severnvale Drive was also leafleted as well as Mallard and Millers' Dyke.
3. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Can the Leader please advise me as to where the 106 money has gone which was allocated for play equipment of Clearwater Drive, and also that £30,000 was transferred from Green Farm to Clearwater Drive?	This is a city, rather than a county council issue. I'd suggest that Mrs Mozol might like to raise it with her city councillors, whose contact details are available on the city council website www.gloucester.gov.uk
4. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Can the Leader provide information on the take up of places for Primary Schools in Quedgeley 2016/2017, and also Secondary Schools in Quedgeley 2016/2017?	All 7 schools (Infant/junior/primary & secondary) in the Quedgeley Parish were full to capacity for September 2016 admissions.
5. Questioner's name: Anna Mozol	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
Will the Leader advise us of what activities the County Council will be organising to support the Festival of Learning 2017 which includes Adult Learners Week? Can he also confirm that Adult Education as well as Schools and Colleges will be expected to promote learning throughout the Festival of Learning in May and June this year?	GCC liaises with the organisers of Festival of Learning and will be promoting events organised in the county during the Festival by local colleges, private training providers, etc.

6. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
<p>Does Glos County Council accept that the adopted Waste Core Strategy's commitment to 60% recycling with a 70% aspiration, means that the contract with UBB needs to ensure that any such improvements do not cost GCC more in Waste Collection Authority credits than it would cost to have UBB continue to burn it?</p>	<p>GCC's residual waste contract has been specifically procured to support the County Council's aim of 70% recycling by 2030. This would make Gloucestershire one of the highest recycling areas in Europe.</p>
7. Questioner's name: Gerald Hartley	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
<p>Does Glos County Council now consider that making money from the sale or use of electricity generated from waste justifies abandoning recycling targets?</p>	<p>We aren't proposing to abandon recycling targets – Gloucestershire is pursuing ambitious recycling targets that would make us among the most successful recyclers in Europe.</p>
8. Questioner's name: Dennis Parsons	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>I and residents of Albert Drive in Pittville in Cheltenham have been in correspondence with the Parking Team and have received assurances that finance will be available in 2017/18 to enable consultations to go ahead regarding a Traffic Regulation Order to bring about improved protection from inappropriate parking in Albert Drive and the approaches from Albert Road when the University of Gloucestershire Pittville Campus accepts nearly 800 students in September 2017 following construction of their student village.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member confirm that funding is included in the 2017/18 budget for this scheme? Will the Cabinet Member also give an indication of timescales and specifically the probability of the scheme, if approved, being in place for Fresher's Week 2017?</p>	<p>Funding for this scheme is included in the draft budget.</p> <p>I wouldn't want to talk about the timescale prior to any consultation taking place - in a legal process like this, it is particularly important not to have prejudged these issues in advance.</p>

9. Questioner's name: Dennis Parsons	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>I have been in correspondence with the Parking Team regarding parking in Albemarle Gate in Cheltenham where residents have expressed concerns that overflow parking during events at the Pittville Pump Rooms leads to cars parking in Albemarle Gate between Evesham Road and Saville Close making the sharp bend in the road at that point very dangerous. Can the Cabinet Member give any reassurance to local residents on the possibility of including consultation on introducing appropriate parking restrictions designed to reduce the risk of serious accidents there?</p>	<p>I am always happy to raise areas of concern with our road safety partnership to investigate.</p>
10. Questioner's name: Marcus Spencer	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>As residents of Market Street for fourteen years and who currently pay for a permit and visitors vouchers we will be hugely disadvantaged by the above proposed scheme.</p> <p>My working hours tend to be 8am to 6pm and it is often already difficult to park at 6pm. Should the suggested scheme go ahead including the four hour "shoppers parking", this essentially means anyone can, in theory, park in our street for free from the time of 4pm to 8pm in the evening blocking a space and not enabling me to park despite having paid for a permit. The suggestion is that it will just be shoppers parking there in the day is not realistic and may well include people going to the cinema or restaurants in town and worse still, perhaps people who refuse to purchase a permit but work only to 4pm therefore parking all night.</p> <p>The TRO report (Page 37) states:</p> <p><i>Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)</i></p> <p>This is a perfectly valid objection to which the report does not</p>	<p>We recognise that people in Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road are concerned about being able to find parking near their homes in future. Currently there are some parking bays solely for the use of permit holders which are well used in the evenings but where spaces are available during the day. Most of the parking in these streets is not restricted and can be used by anyone. Under the new scheme all the spaces will be available to permit holders, however other motorists will be restricted to parking for no more than four hours.</p> <p>The underlying policy basis for this review is our Local Transport Plan. This sets out a parking strategy that supports economic activity, discourages long stay commuter parking in favour of more sustainable travel and recognises that parking zones are likely to be required in residential areas where there are conflicting needs. In practice this means that more restrictive parking controls, including parking charges, are found nearer the town centre and less restrictive ones are further out. In the new scheme a two hour restriction applies on New Street up to the bollards and a four hour restriction applies further from the town centre on Great Western Road, Market Street and Park Street.</p> <p>The process which the council has used to review parking here is no different to others which we have used in the town and has been independently scrutinised. It started in June 2015 with informal public</p>

<p>respond.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member re-consider the decision to impose this scheme without local support, and force all residents to buy a permit and at the same time take away any benefit a resident only scheme offers"</p>	<p>consultation and concluded with formal statutory consultation last summer. The responses from this area were mixed with a wide range of preferred solutions suggested. In analysing the feedback we reviewed parking survey data and also took into consideration a residents' petition and sought the advice of local councillors before making a recommendation. Full details of this process are set out in the TRO Report published on the Council's consultation portal. Given the wide range of public preferences expressed during the consultation the decision to adopt a four hour waiting limit and shared use parking was considered to best accommodate these diverse views. Whilst we accept that some people will be concerned about the changes, the same types of parking restrictions have been applied successfully elsewhere in the town.</p> <p>I know that both Cllr Tim Harman and Alex Chalk have raised concerns about some aspects of the scheme, and we will keep working to see if there are ways to address those concerns.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: Fern Limbrick</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The shared use permit parking scheme giving free parking for 4 hours is not suitable in our streets when we are so close to the town centre. In this entirely residential area, encouraging anything other than short term shared use will make the parking here much worse.</p> <p>With permit only and P&D (maximum 2 hours) being introduced in the very next road, Burton Street, less than a minutes walk from the middle of Market Street, and the 3 hours limit in Waitrose car park, shoppers etc. will soon see the advantage of the 'super cul-de-sac' of Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road.</p> <p>Why is it considered appropriate to encourage free medium stay parking for 4 hours in our streets when it is considered demand will</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

<p>be so high in the neighbouring street that charges are being introduced?</p>	
<p>12. Questioner's name: Sally-ann Rhodes</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review.</p> <p>I'm more than happy to pay for a permit for my one car, as I do now, but I'm totally against free parking for non- residents for 4 hours as it's difficult to get a space even now. Allowing non- paying non-residents to possibly park from 4pm till 12pm the following day is unacceptable .</p> <p>We are a 'super' cul-de-sac with only one access so it makes parking in other streets unreasonable and time consuming if we are forced to do so. Also, we are the last street before pay and display/town car parks are enforced so we'll attract a huge number of people who do not wish to pay for parking, it's unacceptable for us as permit-paying residents.</p> <p>The TRO report (Page 37) states: Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)</p> <p>This is a perfectly valid objection to which the report does not respond.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member please explain how the needs of residents in this cul-de-sac are being safeguarded, in line with policy objectives, when competition for spaces may mean unreasonable travel distance via Gloucester Road to get to other streets, and any benefit from resident only permits is being lost?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

13. Questioner's name: Risa E-Collins	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Scheme</p> <p>The TRO report states</p> <p><i>'The waiting periods proposed for non-permit holders reflect the local context and requirements in each street. Close to the town centre, and in the most congested areas where residents most rely on on-street parking, a relatively short waiting period of 2 hrs is required to provide good accessibility.'</i></p> <p>The Market Street, Park Street and Great Western Road cul-de-sac is close to the town centre, is in one of the most congested areas, and residents rely almost entirely on on-street parking. In spite of a 'full house' as regards meeting the criteria for a waiting period of 2 hours, a 4 hour free waiting period has been applied here, making our roads more attractive to non permit holders than the 2hr P & D and 3 hour limit in Waitrose, both very close by.</p> <p>Will the Council please tell me why this has happened, and agree to look again at the <u>detail</u> of the scheme and see if it can be changed to the more appropriate 2 hr free parking to give residents, who will pay for the scheme, a better chance to find a space near their homes?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
14. Questioner's name: Jenny Rooze	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The problem for the residents in Market Street, Great Western Road and Park Street where there is <u>almost no off street parking</u> is not exclusively or even primarily commuter parking during the working day, but difficulty finding a space in the evening when <u>every</u> available space is needed for residents' vehicles.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

This scheme will lead to the loss of spaces, and force residents to buy a permit to fund a scheme which will not benefit them, and is grossly unfair. This scheme will not make more spaces in the three roads that make up the 'super cul-de-sac' and having a permit is useless if spaces are not available.

The access and egress only via Gloucester Road makes a mockery of concern shown by the council about unnecessary journeys, if residents are forced to seek spaces in other parts of the zone. There is no unrestricted parking anywhere within a reasonable distance of our homes, and the 'coralled' nature of our streets makes a case for a very specific solution, even including being omitted from this scheme until a better solution can be found.

Can the Cabinet Member please explain why the council parking team are unconcerned if there are more permits issued than spaces and what residents who do not have the luxury of off street parking are supposed to do in an area with no extra capacity?

15. Questioner's name: Yasmin Wilson

Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith

Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review.

As a resident of Market Street who currently pays for a permit and visitors vouchers I will be greatly disadvantaged by this scheme. Not all residents in the existing resident only bays leave for work in the morning and return in the evening. There is considerable turnover during the day, and any empty spaces is in the large part due to low up-take, with most of the eligible residents clearly not wanting to buy a permit. We, along with all other residents, have difficulty finding a space after restrictions end at 5pm, and this scheme will mean the same difficulty during the day for possibly any 4 hour period up to 8pm.

The TRO report (Page 37) states:

Market Street - The detail of the comments submitted indicates most

See response to question 10

objections were to the conversion of existing Permit Holder Parking spaces to shared use (allowing non-permit holders to park for 4hrs)

I'm sure the Cabinet Member can see this is a perfectly understandable objection, given that the benefit permit holders now enjoy will be lost, so I ask:

Why it was decided to have shared use, free for 4 hours throughout this cul-de-sac, and why some resident only bays were not retained, while still accommodating short term parking for visitors and shoppers, as in some other roads ?

16. Questioner's name: John Cant

Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith

Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review

In response to residents' worry about the cap on visitors vouchers which will apply with this scheme, the 4 hour free parking was presented as a benefit to residents by giving flexibility for their visitors so they won't need to use purchased vouchers.

The existing situation is far more visitor friendly in the unrestricted areas for longer stays, for example a day, over a week or a weekend. The 4 hour waiting will not make this any easier to manage, and any benefit from the removal of all day intruder parking is likely to be watered down by still allowing half day parking. A 2 hour waiting limit would still give access for a visit, and offer a better chance of finding a space as turnover would be quicker.

We all have visitors but it is more important to retain reasonable access for residents to their homes.

As the objective of the scheme was to remove long stay commuters, and improve access to short term parking for visitors and shoppers, why is this residential area close to the town centre designated as

See response to question 10

longer stay waiting of 4 hours?	
17. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>In the TRO report the stated Policy background refers to obligations in the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>It is the LTP objectives that this scheme relies on, aims to fulfill policy commitments to benefit short stay over long stay parking, to encourage shopping and support economic activity, discourage longer stay commuters, and the application of parking controls.</p> <p>However, within the LTP, there is also reference to the Resident Parking Policy (2010), which clearly lays out the criteria for a resident parking scheme to be considered.</p> <p>The policy states:</p> <p>All requests for a Residents Parking Scheme must be put forward by and fully supported by at least one County Councillor in the Division affected.</p> <p>A high proportion of residents surveyed within the scheme boundary (at least 70% of respondents) must support the introduction of permit controls for the scheme to go ahead with a minimum response of 50% of households within the area.</p> <p>It is very obvious that there is no regard to this policy in this scheme, it is just being imposed on residents as part of the policy to displace commuters, even in areas such as ours, where the report admits commuter parking is not significant, and with very little, if any, support.</p> <p>There will I'm sure be some clever reason why LTP trumps any</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

Resident Parking Policy, but I always believed that a permit scheme could not be implemented without support by residents, perhaps because they would be paying for it.

So I ask the Cabinet Member why residents who would really like a resident parking scheme need to jump through numerous hoops and have an extremely high threshold of responses and support, yet the Council can impose this resident funded scheme on our area (Z12) when the response rate alone was under 10%?

18. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes

Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith

Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review

The residents of Park Street submitted 2 petitions to the consultation on the Cheltenham West Parking Review, the second to the formal process, opposing the plans and wanting no paid permit scheme in their street.

This is referred to in the TRO report thus:

Page 51. 130. One petition was received signed by 51 individuals, representing 34 properties of Park Street, requesting Park Street be omitted from the proposed scheme (Zone 12) and the existing situation retained. This doesn't reflect the feedback received directly from that street, where more respondents supported the proposed scheme than opposed it.

The actual direct responses from Park Street are 5 in support 5 support but with changes and 7 opposed. These are the only responses recorded for Park Street, and although the petition is mentioned and the request for no permit scheme rejected, the opposition was not recorded.

Mr Daniels accepted the first petition at one of the 'events', and a second petition was submitted to the formal consultation. If the petition carried no weight, and their opposition to the scheme would not be counted, then the signatories should have been told.

See response to question 10

<p>Can the Cabinet member please tell these 51 residents why their views were not included in the analysis of responses on which the decision on this scheme was said to be made?</p>	
<p>19. Questioner's name: Alistair Randall</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Scheme - Zone 12 Westend</p> <p>I am in support of a permit scheme, but definitely not in support of allowing non permit holders to park for 4 hours. A shared scheme with 4 hour free parking is non-sensical and will create more problems than the scheme is promising to solve. The report says that the car parks in Cheltenham are underused, yet you are encouraging people to park for a fairly long period in residential streets where there is no off street parking. People who wish to park for 4 hours should use the car parks, rather than competing with residents, and the shared use space should be used for short term parking of no more than 2 hours. There is 3 hours parking at the nearby Waitrose, suitable for shoppers and visitors to the area, and I fail to see the thinking behind making the roads nearby available for a longer period. What can the Cabinet Member say to someone like me, who supported a permit scheme but not the waiting period, and now feel duped, as my views were not taken into account?</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>20. Questioner's name: Jeremy North</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Cheltenham West Parking Scheme - Westend Z12</p> <p>Residents in my area have no alternative but to park on the road and the single access through the very heavily congested Gloucester Road, makes this large 'super cul-de-sac' unsuitable to be included in the wider scheme. The 4 hour free parking will still allow half day parking and will attract shoppers forced out of streets slightly closer to the town, where charges are being introduced, meaning there is no advantage for residents, but a detriment to their pocket by being forced to buy a</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>

permit.
 The distance to drive to access other, just as over capacity streets in zone 12, is unreasonable to seek a very scarce available space if none is available in Market Street, Park Street or Great Western Road. There is no available unrestricted parking anywhere in the surrounding area, and as the report states, unrestricted capacity for commuters displaced from this scheme can be found within 800m of the scheme boundary.
 I ask the Cabinet Member, is 800m (about half a mile) a reasonable distance for residents to be expected to park away from their homes if 'displaced' for possibly 4 hours or longer?

21. Questioner's name: Kate Haigh

Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou

To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
 Gloucester City Council is proposing to half its funding of the City's advice services provided by the CAB and the Law Centre. These services support people with debt, threat of eviction and many other issues. What is the County Council doing to ensure these services, which it also supports financially, continue to be viable?

The County Council will continue to support the funding of the CAB and the Law Centre, despite the significant pressures on our budget.

22. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise

Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith

Answering of correspondence - breaches of Council policy
 The Customer Care Policy at <http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/customercare> requires all officers to respond to emails within three working days. It continues that if it is not possible to answer the mail then a full response should be sent within 10 working days or at least the sender must be kept informed. In any event an automated response should also be sent informing the sender that the email has been received.

The Commissioning Director has sent Mr Wise a letter explaining why his emails to an officer in the Parking team were not acknowledged or responded to in full within the timescales set out in the council's customer care policy. In both instances his emails were held up by our IT firewall. His first email was blocked and not delivered.

Mr Wise has raised the main subject matter of these emails with the council on repeated occasions over the past year. Officers in several teams have spent a considerable amount of time corresponding with him.

In a matter concerning the Council's gross failures to comply with

Mr Wise has been asked to only communicate with the Commissioning

<p>prescribed parking enforcement procedure, the Parking Department has repeatedly and wrongly failed to respond to my emailed correspondence, not even acknowledging receipt of my emails. As the appointed, recognised and continuing representative of a motorist who received a number of improperly-issued penalty charge notices in Cheltenham where, among other things there were and remain manifestly-obvious noncompliances with parking signage legislation and the legislation on the processing of these PCN's, I emailed the Parking Department on 7th January 2017 setting out full details of the irregularities but received no response whatsoever.</p> <p>I emailed again on 24th January requesting a response to my unanswered email of the 7th January and quoted the Council's Customer Care Policy. Yet again no response has been provided. I have provided herewith copies of these emails attached to these questions.</p> <p>What steps will now be taken to cause officers of the Parking Department always to comply with the Council's Customer Care Policy in responding to customer correspondence and what steps will be taken to investigate any fuller extent of the misconduct in this respect reported by me?</p>	<p>Director and not to contact officers in the Parking team directly. If he is unhappy our complaints policy is set out on our web site.</p>
<p>23. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Council punitive non-compliance with legislation in the processing of penalty charge notices.</p> <p>My unanswered email of 7th January 2017 to the Parking Department reported details of the unlawful processing of six PCN's issued by APCOA on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>What steps will now be taken to ensure that the processing of a set Penalty Charge Notices, being the subject of unanswered email correspondence and involving representations presented by me on behalf of the recipient, are properly revisited and conducted correctly for the first time fully in accordance with</p>	<p>This matter is covered in the letter which was sent to you yesterday, but the council maintains that it has acted legally and properly.</p>

relevant legislation?	
24. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Enforcement of parking restrictions in Cheltenham</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the extensively defective parking signage in Municipal Offices Road in Cheltenham. The gross unenforceable defects that do not comply with traffic signage Regulations past or present has been made known to the Council in full detail, via the Parking Department and otherwise, including bays that bear no resemblance to any form of lawful parking bay and some of which show no parking restriction whatsoever.</p> <p>The only restrictions in this entire road that are lawfully enforceable seem to be the short lengths of double yellow lines at each end of the road. The Parking Department has risibly claimed to the press that Municipal Offices Road signage is compliant with current Regulations.</p> <p>The several different restrictions in this road include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking places along one side of the road with no upright sign plates stating any restriction, many road-marked with no resemblance in appearance or dimensions to any lawful parking bay. 2. Pay and display bays with upright signs having no resemblance to lawful P&D signs. 3. "No Parking" boxes on each side of the road outside the Municipal Offices that have no resemblance to restricted road markings. 4. A so-called "Mayor's Car" bay that is unknown to Regulations past or present. - all prohibited by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 <p>Will the Council please direct me to the separate specific parts of the provisions of Traffic Signs Regulations with which each of the restrictions in Municipal Road, Cheltenham is purported to</p>	<p>This matter has previously been raised by Mr Wise in a meeting with myself and officers and through the council's complaints process and Freedom of Information Requests.</p> <p>The Council is enforcing parking in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order at this location and the Commissioning Director has responded to him to confirm this. There is nothing further to add.</p>

comply?	
25. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Parking enforcement in Municipal Road, Cheltenham</p> <p>I informed the Council of the deficiencies in parking signage in this road early in July 2016. Despite these gross irregularities in the parking signage in this road that are known to the Council which, irrespective of the penalisation of visiting motorists, are in breach of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, penalty charge notices continue to be issued.</p> <p>When will the Council (a) cease and desist from parking enforcement in Municipal Road, Cheltenham pending the implementation of lawful parking signage, and (b) when will all of the existing gross signage defects there be corrected into compliance with the 1984 Act and current Regulations?</p>	<p>As explained in my response to question 24, the council is enforcing parking restrictions in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order.</p>
26. Questioner's name: Nigel Wise	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>The unsatisfactory history of parking restrictions and enforcement in Municipal Road and elsewhere in Cheltenham, together with other irregularities in the Council's enforcement process, demonstrates that there is insufficient understanding of what is required to implement necessary corrections of the present situation. Two advisers with specialist parking regulation knowledge, and having experience in advising other enforcement authorities, both confirm that the current Gloucestershire situation is substantially inadequate in some respects, as also have independent parking adjudicator decisions.</p> <p>The Parking Department has recently claimed to the press that Municipal Offices Road signage is compliant with current Regulations, which it selfevidently is not. The Council's issuing of penalty charge notices that did not comply with the prescribed requirements of a penalty charge</p>	<p>As explained in my answer to the previous question, the Council's Commissioning Director has had significant correspondence with Mr Wise on this matter. There is nothing further to add.</p>

notice, and the impermissible pre-judgement by APCOA of vehicle keepers' formal representations against penalty charge notices, that have both been found to be wrong and unlawful by parking adjudicators but ignored by the Council, were long ago reported by me but dismissed out of hand. However, unannounced, the Council has since corrected both of these major irregularities following my persistent complaints.

When will the Council engage, presumably on an advisory basis, some parking specialist who has the requisite knowledge and experience to advise on the bringing of all aspects of the Council's parking restriction administration and enforcement into full compliance with parking legislation and other related laws so that it is not left, as it is at present, to members of the public to point out the breaches of legislation that have long persisted, including in respect of Municipal Road and elsewhere in Cheltenham?

27. Questioner's name: Saadia Hall

Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith

Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review

Park Street is part of the "super-cul-de-sac" created by the placement of bollards in New Street immediately before Burton Street so that the only entry and exit point to and from Park and Market Streets with Great Western is at the beyond capacity end of Gloucester Road. This was achieved under Michael Smith of Cheltenham Borough Council in the late 1990's even though the residents of the area were resolutely against this scheme.

Additionally, the majority of the residents of Park Street have several times stated that they do not wish to be part of the Permit Parking Scheme. Gloucestershire County Council began this most recent cycle of consultation the beginning of June 2015. During the meeting at Salem Church Hall, June 15, 2015, a petition

See response to question 10

was handed in to an officer of the council from the residents of Park Street. The petition stated, "we do not want the introduction of a fee paying residents scheme", and was signed by 46 residents. It was indicated that Park Street's view would be accepted. In the literature dated June 02, 2015, it was stated, "we will use your feedback to decide if a permit scheme or any other changes should be considered in your area". There was no indication in the information provided by the Council that the residents views would have no bearing on the decision forced on the residents.

In 2016, there was another approach from the Council regarding a Parking Permit Scheme for residents with time allotted free parking for vehicles of non-residents. Again the residents of Park Street rejected the proposal.

Burton Street which is the immediate parallel street to Park Street is to have a 2 hour metered paying Parking Scheme for non-residents with Residents Permit Parking. Park Street is to have a 4 hour free Parking Scheme for non-residents with Residents Permit Parking. Many residents of Burton Street and their visitors already use Park Street to park in rather than pay for Residents Parking or Visitors Parking (informally, Waitrose Car Park is also used). Since there are but a few metres that separate Burton Street and our "super-culdesac", both areas are close to town centre. Residents may work regular or irregular, full-time or part-time hours, be retired or be chronically ill. If they return to their street and there is no available place to park because non-residents are more likely to avail themselves to free up to four hour parking than that up to free two hour parking, the resident, because of these and future assigned changes, will have to drive up to one and a half miles to commence to look for a parking spot within the designated parking zone.

If the existing parking on the pavement in Market Street comes into the Scheme, the area for residents Parking will be beyond capacity. I ask that if we must have this imposed upon us that the free visitors Parking be reduce to two hours and if not what other close by (less

that a mile away), accessible parking for fee paying residents will be made?	
28. Questioner's name: R Dragojlovic	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>The petition from Park Street residents was overwhelmingly signed as against the proposed parking permit, which was NOT taken into consideration at any stage of this proposed parking permit and was totally ignored, why?</p> <p>A petition from 2002 for a similar parking scheme was taken into consideration against the proposed scheme and Park Street was excluded from the Parking permit scheme. A petition made in 2016, has even more residents signing against the proposed parking permit scheme and is not even considered but ignored.</p>	See response to question 10
29. Questioner's name: Gorana Amin	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Why are officials involved in proposed parking permit scheme discriminating against individual residents inside one house or flat with more residents owning a car, limiting number of cars per household and discriminating against a second car (charging more) and limiting only to two cars per household and not being able to obtain parking permits for more than number available per household. I do not think this is legal. Is it?</p>	See response to question 10
30. Questioner's name: Sean Jenkins	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Why officials involved in proposed parking permit scheme, are</p>	See response to question 10

<p>presenting to residents incorrect information when replying. Park Street provided numbers supported by signatures. Officials reply with “more residents are for parking permit.....” or “lots of people contacting us asking for parking permit.....” Words like “more” and “lots” etc cannot be accepted as opposed to numbers and signatures (given from Park Street residents) and without back-up and proof from 100% surveys. This has not been done.</p> <p>Without number and proof, that is hiding the truth and bullying residents into submission.</p>	
<p>31. Questioner’s name: D Park</p>	<p>Respondent’s name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Have other streets been offered the chance to “get rid of” the parking permit scheme?</p> <p>Do you (officials) have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of households which did not want to join the scheme which was introduced in their street/area. • Number of households which were asking for proposed scheme compering to number of households in their street/area <p>Please provide details with your reply.</p>	<p>See response to question 10</p>
<p>32. Questioner’s name: A Brown</p>	<p>Respondent’s name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review</p> <p>Please can you provide details as to the destination of monies collected from the parking permit scheme and parking penalties?</p>	<p>By law, the council reinvests the surplus from parking in highways maintenance and transport, as it always has done.</p>

33. Questioner's name: Anne Brookes	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
Re: Cheltenham West Parking Review When a scheme such as this goes ahead, regardless of the veracity of the evidence that has underpinned the decision, because the correct 'process' has been followed, what confidence can the public have in the elected members, unless they now request an independent review and amendment of the false conclusion drawn for this super cul-de-sac?.	See response to question 10

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNTY COUNCIL – 15 February 2017
Members' Questions

<p>1. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>How much money did GCC receive from the NHS in 2016 through the Better Care Fund to reduce demand for hospital beds by providing care for residents in their own homes?</p>	<p>The funding within the Better Care Fund to support 'Social Care Demand 14/15 and 15/16' is £9.025m. No additions were made in 16/17 to the level of funding due to the increase in the BCF only being an inflationary increase of £642k.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>A senior NHS boss has suggested that the Better Care Fund is turning out to be "a waste of money". What evidence is there that this funding transfer is delivering as intended i.e. that it has had a significant effect in reducing admissions to hospitals in Gloucestershire in 2016?</p>	<p>In Gloucestershire the investment from the Better Care Fund has made a significant difference. Coupled to this administration's commitment to protecting the most vulnerable, it has led to figures from the hospitals trust showing Gloucestershire has one of the lowest rates of delayed discharge in the country.</p> <p>There has also been a slight fall in the number of emergency admissions.</p> <p>2015 (sept – Nov) = 11,879 2016 (sept – Nov) = 11,431 Difference = decrease of 448 emergency admissions in this 3 month period % fall is 3.8%.</p>
<p>3. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>In February 2015, a sum of £300K over two years was invested to enable a small high quality supported employment service to be set up to find paid employment for a minimum of 120 disabled people:-</p>	<p>This has been a flagship success for this council – with 134 people placed in paid employment to January 2017.</p> <p>10 people have had their jobs saved through the employment service – these jobs were at risk and Job Coaches were assigned to ensure their</p>

<p>Please can the Cabinet Member tell me how many disabled people have actually been placed in paid employment as part of this investment?</p>	<p>employment was maintained.</p> <p>A number of other people were placed in voluntary positions to gain experience as a precursor to paid employment.</p>
<p>4. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>On page 38 of the papers for Cabinet on 4th February 2015, it was noted that such an investment would and I quote "also generate savings by reducing demand on Council run services" -</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member therefore tell me how much the investment of £300K has saved this Council?</p>	<p>At least £314,640 annual saving to the council so far. That builds up – year on year. But beyond the cash savings, we're also making big improvements of the lives of the people who have been helped – supporting their integration into the wider Gloucestershire community.</p>
<p>5. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>What is the exact and total cost in money and officer time (up to the date of the Council meeting 15/2/17) of the Council's attempts via the courts to block details of the incinerator contract becoming public?</p>	<p>As Cllr Hodgkinson ought to be aware, the council has never recorded officer time in the way he suggests, nor would we wish to divert funds and time from delivering services to do so.</p> <p>The Council has not attempted to block the contract being made public. We have released over 95% of the contract already and have simply met our obligation to protect certain confidential information which we believe is in the best interests of the Gloucestershire taxpayer to do so. This has been challenged and is awaiting the outcome of an Information Tribunal – a legal process. Until the judgment is received and the process exhausted I am unable to confirm the exact cost.</p>
<p>6. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>What is the exact and total cost in money and officer time (up to the date of the Council meeting 15/2/17) of the investigation into how the Council released the full version of the incinerator contract online? What is the outcome of that investigation?</p>	<p>The investigation confirmed the timeline of events and the vulnerability in the software used at the time the contract was published on the Council's disclosure log.</p> <p>This has not been separately costed.</p>

<p>7. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>What was the total cost to the taxpayer of the visit by councillors and officers to China in 2015? What have been the specific and measurable benefits in cash terms to the taxpayer of that visit?</p>	<p>I refer Cllr Hodgkinson to the answers given to the previous Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the 23rd October 2015, which set out the costs, including the support for businesses to attend.</p> <p>Three of the four businesses are still in active discussions with our counterparts in China, with one business, Prospect Training Services, launching its online coaching suite in China next month.</p> <p>Since the visit in 2015, there has been a reciprocal visit from Chengdu, which has directly led to enquiries via the LEP from 2 Chinese companies looking to invest within the County.</p> <p>I appreciate some might like to paint this as some sort of “jolly” in election literature. I am not sure anyone would agree the 13 hour flight I made in economy class was particularly fun, but it is the county council's job to support Gloucestershire businesses and protect Gloucestershire jobs – which was the aim behind the visit.</p>
<p>8. Questioner's name: Cllr Simon Wheeler</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>What is the total annual Revenue budget for Highways Maintenance and related expenditure in Gloucestershire in 2017/8, and how is this allocated across the County's six districts. In the same way what is the total Capital budget for Highways in Gloucestershire in 2017/8, and how is this allocated across the County's six districts?</p>	<p>The Conservative group is, with support from the government, proposing an increase in the highways budget of £6m this year. The budget is for the council to agree or not earlier in this agenda. However, neither revenue nor capital budgets are allocated on the basis of district areas but on the basis of engineering need – and this has always been the case.</p>

<p>9. Questioner's name: Cllr Simon Wheeler</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>What is the total amount of revenue raised by the County Council from Highway related activities in the six districts (actual in 2015/16 and projected in 2016/17 and 17/18) - whether from Parking, S106 money, other charges and levies, Fines, Council tax precepts, and other sources, district by district?</p>	<p>Clearly Cllr Wheeler isn't familiar with the way that the council's finances operate. None of the sources of funding he identifies are hypothecated in the way that he suggests – and this has always been the practice of the council.</p>
<p>10. Questioner's name: Cllr Richard Leppington</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>The Forest of Dean needs a network of buses that are consistently delivering passenger journeys without delays and overly frequent breakdowns. This is essential when infrastructure is key to a thriving rural economy. However, I have received numerous complaints of broken down buses. Currently, they seem to be running (or rather, not running) at 3 a week. This results in hundreds of people inconvenienced and often left waiting in the cold for many hours. In 2016, Stagecoach were given £225,000 for Local Authority subsidised routes .Does this high level of breakdowns give GCC value for money? Can the Cabinet Member responsible please intervene to ensure that my residents are provided with a decent level of service?</p>	<p>I fully recognise the value of the local bus network in providing residents in the Forest with access to work, education, healthcare and essential shopping. The vast majority of Stagecoach bus journeys made in the Forest receive no council subsidy at all and are on a commercial footing.</p> <p>I have met Stagecoach's operations manager to raise exactly these concerns. They have put four newer vehicles onto their Forest routes and have invited a local campaigner to visit their depot.</p> <p>Officers have also contacted the DVSA and they have no concerns about Stagecoach's compliance with vehicle safety regulations.</p> <p>It is clear that Stagecoach are taking this matter very seriously and also that the instances of breakdowns are not as high as being suggested.</p>
<p>11. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for finance confirm the amount of public funds spent on the appeals process of the FOI request and</p>	<p>Please see the answer to question 5.</p>

judgement over the UBB Incinerator project?	
12. Questioner's name: Cllr Steve Lydon	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>If the administration had consistently increased the budget by at least 1.99% since 2013 to 2018 (inclusive of the 2% social care levy imposed last year) what the total budget for the Council be this year?</p>	<p>This is difficult to answer with clarity. In the first place, as SDC did, the County Council received a council tax freeze grant from the government, which would have been lost. Moreover, putting more costs onto hard-pressed Gloucestershire families, whilst many were struggling with the effects of Labour's recession, could well have increased the burden on county services, and impacted on district collection rates.</p>
13. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>How much has been raised since the introduction of the concessionary disabled charge for park and ride sites – can you list your answer by site?</p>	<p>Last year we took the decision to introduce a part fare for concessionary travel on park and ride following a public consultation which supported this. For a journey that costs other adults £2.50 or £3.00, a pass holder will pay £1.</p> <p>This year we expect the cost of concessionary fares to reduce by £77,000 at Waterwells and the Racecourse and by £67,000 at Arle Court.</p>
14. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>How would the cabinet member for Fire, Planning and Infrastructure rate his professional relationship with the PCC?</p>	<p>We have a robust working relationship.</p>

15. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
How would the Leader rate his professional relationship with the PCC?	As Cllr Moor says above, I would say we have a robust relationship.
16. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
Has the Council recently paid for the issuance of a report looking at what a potential merger of the Fire Service and the PCC office may look like? If so, how much has this cost? Who is undertaking the work? Was this money give by government grant or loan?	<p>The council has engaged with independent consultants to better understand how effective and efficient collaboration is within Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service.</p> <p>This piece of due diligence was commissioned in anticipation of the duty placed upon emergency services to collaborate under the Policing and Crime Act 2017 (received Royal Assent on 31 January 2017).</p> <p>It is important, once a duty is placed upon a public sector body such as the fire and rescue service, that I have a full understanding of the current position in relation to collaboration.</p> <p>The piece of work also looks to give an overview of the benefits of a county council based fire and rescue service. This, I am sure you agree, is in the best interest of the people of Gloucestershire.</p> <p>We expect the final cost to be c. £25K, funded by the county council.</p> <p>Ameo Consulting are undertaking the work and using Alendi Consulting Ltd. for sector experience.</p>
17. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Does the Cabinet member agree with me that VAS is a good way to reduce the risks of accidents on our roads?</p>	In a suitable location, yes.

<p>18. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>Geoffrey Clifton-Brown says that schools will be worse off under the funding formula, Neil Carmichael has also criticised the government for a botched job over the funding formula. What has the Leader of the Council done to improve the situation?</p>	<p>Overall, Gloucestershire schools will be £2m better off under the proposals. Although they do not go far enough, and there are legitimate concerns from specific schools, we should not forget that the previous Labour government imposed a very unfair funding settlement on Gloucestershire – and that it will take some time to unwind that nationally.</p> <p>I hold regular meetings with Gloucestershire MPs, LGA, the CCN and others. More generally, I asked Cabinet member for Children and Young People to work with Glos MPs, schools forum and f40 campaign group on this issue. A number of meetings have been held following the initial announcement before Christmas. Last week 9th Schools Forum met to finalise its response to the current consultation and I received detailed briefing from Cabinet member.</p> <p>GCC is preparing our own submission. F40 just submitted its response and we have been very active in the preparations of that. I have also ensured a seminar was held so that all members could be briefed on the proposals.</p> <p>We are actively encouraging GASH, GAPH and GASSH to submit their own responses as well as individual schools as we are mindful that overall Gloucestershire receives increase and many Glos. schools gain from the proposals.</p>
<p>19. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Paul McLain</p>
<p>To: Cllr Paul McLain</p> <p>How many GCC funded Children Centres were there in 2010, and how many will there be in 2018?</p>	<p>In Gloucestershire in 2010 there were 39 GCC funded Children's Centres, some of which used several sites.</p> <p>From 2018 there will be 16 Children and Family 'Super-Centres' set across 16 buildings and 30 children's centre sites, including those co-located within schools.</p>

	<p>All will continue to provide services to children and families. This will include nursery education funded via the DSG, and bespoke outreach work including health visiting, parent and peer support groups and individual sessions funded via the new targeted family support contracts.</p> <p>A number of the centres are sited within GCC library facilities which also receive ongoing funding.</p>
20. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Will the cabinet member for infrastructure and planning agree with me that the proposed cable through Stonehouse High street could have a detrimental effect on the high street and commuters?</p>	<p>I certainly recognise the concerns that Cllr Williams and local traders have raised and we're working to find a suitable solution.</p>
21. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>We have been told that adult social care is in crisis, what does the cabinet member think?</p>	<p>It makes me proud that, in Gloucestershire, we have always focused on protecting the most vulnerable. That has taken difficult savings in other areas, savings which opposition councillors criticised at the time, but which have allowed us to protect key social care services. I appreciate that other councils elsewhere have not made the tough decisions that Gloucestershire did and are facing significantly more difficulty as a result.</p>
22. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>What has the cabinet member done to look at the issue of loneliness and isolation of older people in our County who receive help from the council for their care</p>	<p>The Council is actively working with partners on ensuring that opportunities for greater engagement within communities are well known; consistent with the Council's agreed policy on this issue.</p> <p>Needs arising from loneliness and isolation would be taken into</p>

	account within any social care assessment and an appropriate response incorporated within any support plan; increasingly this will be built on the same active communities agenda and the opportunities to enable people to make better connections to their local community.
23. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns
To: Cllr Dorcas Binns What role does the cabinet member for older people feel that private companies have in the running of NHS services?	I know the last Labour government was keen to increase the delivery of NHS services by private companies – more than doubling the amount of commissioning I believe. The most damaging example of this would be Labour's PFI contracts in hospitals, which allowed for nice election headlines at the time – but for which the significant long-term costs are a significant factor for many hospitals today. Of course, some parts of the NHS have always been private – GPs, for example, have been private businesses since the creation of the NHS.
24. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard	Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns
To: Cllr Dorcas Binns During the cabinet member's monitoring of home care contracts, what attention is given to checking whether home care workers have had up-to-date training?	All home care providers are subject to a quality review visit prior to joining the framework. As part of this visit Commissioning Officers review the policies and processes in operation in the organisation and check the implementation of these policies through reviewing service user and staff files. For staff training the following aspects are reviewed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an induction programme for Staff? • Does the induction include the 15 standards of the Care Certificate? • Are safeguarding policies an integral part of the staff induction and training program? • Does the Provider have a performance management system? • Does the Provider have a staff skills and training policy?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence of regular staff training and review of competency? • Is there evidence that staff are trained and qualified to deliver the service expressed in the statement of purpose? • Does the Provider have a whistle blowing policy which is understood by all staff? • Does the Provider have a lone working policy?
<p>25. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>What training needs does the cabinet member responsible feel that care workers are most in need of in our County?</p>	<p>The minimum requirement for service providers induction and training would include the 15 standards of the CQC Care Certificate and to have the policies and training in place which gives all staff training in the areas listed.</p> <p>This Care Certificate states that everybody has the right to expect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person-centred care • Dignity and respect • Consent • Safety • Safeguarding from abuse • Food & drink • Premises & equipment • Complaints • Good governance • Staffing • Fit & proper staff • Duty of candour • Display of ratings <p>Feedback from Healthwatch and GCC internal mechanisms would suggest improved language skills and awareness of community assets are also areas requiring training.</p>

<p>26. Questioner's name: Cllr Tracy Millard</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p>
<p>To: Cllr Dorcas Binns</p> <p>How much is spent by providers on updating training of care workers commissioned by the Council? What was it in 2010 and will it be for 2018?</p>	<p>This figure was not collected prior to the introduction of the 2016 contract. The new contracts introduced in April 2016 for rural areas and in October 2016 for urban areas ask all providers to include this in their pricing structure so we will be able to in future.</p>
<p>27. Questioner's name: Cllr Brian Oosthuysen</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Andrew Gravells</p>
<p>To: Cllr Andrew Gravells</p> <p>What is the cabinet member for Public Health doing to promote awareness of HIV testing in the County Council?</p>	<p>The Council commissions the Eddystone Trust to provide HIV testing with a particular focus on communities who are most at risk of HIV. National guidance and data tells us that the two communities most at risk of HIV are Men who have sex with Men and Black African Communities. It is therefore these two groups who are the main focus of the work of The Eddystone Trust. That said, where possible the service provides support and the promotion of HIV testing awareness broadly throughout the county. This includes within the Council.</p> <p>The Eddystone Trust has supported a number of interventions within the County Council to promote awareness of HIV testing. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of information, posters and support to promote HIV testing week and World Aids Day. This was used by PRISM for internal awareness on staff net. This included links to The Eddystone Trust website where contact numbers are available to arrange testing. • Delivery of an information talk about The Eddystone Trust, HIV testing and prevention to GCC staff as part of PRISM's celebration of LGBT History Month. Awareness of the talk was via staff net and e-mail. <p>Details of HIV testing availability are currently on the GCC website via</p>

	the Council funded Respect Yourself site.
28. Questioner's name: Cllr Tim Harman	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>The Residents of Kensington Avenue in my division are disadvantaged by the proposals contained in the Cheltenham Parking Review . They are quite different to the adjoining areas in that they have had a successful residents parking scheme for some years and they have consistently sought no change. The changed hours and the loss of protection on a Saturday morning will adversely impact them particularly due to their close proximity to Cheltenham Railway Station. Officers had previously indicated that solutions could be tailored to individual roads rather than a blanket approach.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member consider revoking this part of the scheme which is detrimental and wholly unnecessary</p>	<p>I know both Cllr Harman and Alex Chalk have raised concerns with me about this issue. I am very happy to meet with them to see how we can take this forward and address local concerns.</p>
29. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>What is this council's criteria when it comes to fixing pavements across the county?</p>	<p>The criteria for intervention levels and response times for footway defects is set out in our Safety Inspection Policy.</p>
30. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member tell me how much will be spent on</p>	<p>We've never hypothecated budgets in this area.</p>

fixing broken pavements in my division of Churchdown in 2017/18?	
31. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>What are the differences in defects that can be repaired following safety inspections between pavements and roads?</p>	<p>The criteria for intervention levels and response times for footway and carriageway defects are set out in our Safety Inspection Policy. In general the difference is that intervention occurs at 20mm defect on footways and 40mm defect on carriageways – in other words we treat problems with footways more seriously.</p>
32. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member tell me how much time has been spent by traffic wardens enforcing on street restrictions this year in Churchdown?</p>	<p>75 hours 23 minutes to date, for financial year 2016/17</p>
33. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>What is the criteria for Bus routes to get salted?</p>	<p>Our Adverse Weather Plan set out our strategy for the network we treat, extract below:</p> <p>Strategy</p> <p>Our core winter period is from the October to April and when icy road conditions are forecast during this period precautionary salting will be carried out on the strategic road network which comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class A and B roads • Roads leading to main hospitals, ambulance stations, police stations and fire stations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some strategic public transport routes • Roads serving main shopping centres • The majority of Secondary schools <p>The strategic road network covers approximately 29% of Gloucestershire's total road network. We also refer to Strategic road network as our Primary or Key routes.</p> <p>During prolonged severe winter weather conditions, when time allows and resources are available, salting may also be carried out on the secondary road network. The extent of the secondary road network to be treated will be determined at the discretion of the local Area Highways Manager and Amey Gloucestershire's Principal Operations Manager on the basis of prevailing weather conditions and resource availability and may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major bus routes (operated every two hours or more frequently) not covered by the strategic road network • Routes adjacent to major educational establishments (in term time) provided treatments can be completed by 0800 hrs using available spreading equipment • Other locations where high traffic volume or local conditions dictate as well as access in to rural communities.
34. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
Why, given the 66 is a "Gold" bus route, was it not salted?	We have been in discussions with Stagecoach concerning this route and some of it is not currently on our treated network as not all of Kingsway has been adopted but this will be reviewed at the end of this season with Stagecoach for future years.

35. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
How long has the Road Safety partnership been considering the speed reduction on the A38 in Quedgeley?	The Leader of the council raised this issue with Highways over a year ago. Highways are responsible for setting speed limits taking into account all of the elements identified in the Department for Transport guidance "Setting Local Speed Limits". The Road Safety Partnership (RSP) is a contributor to this process. In regard to the A38 in Quedgeley, a report was provided to RSP Governance Board in July 2015 and it was agreed to explore the safety benefits of lowering the current speed limit.
36. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
What other actions does the road safety partnership consider appropriate for the A38 in Quedgeley?	<p>Following concerns from Cllr Hawthorne and others, a number of other actions have already been implemented including safety barriers on Waterwells roundabout and an uninterrupted power supply for traffic signals at the junction with Cole Avenue.</p> <p>Following a video survey at the Kingsway junction the Partnership would also recommend considering a ban on southbound U turns at the Kingsway signals and improving the pedestrian crossing facilities to create greater separation between waiting pedestrians and passing traffic.</p>
37. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>How many businesses have seen a boost in export sales to China since the Leader visited in 2015?</p>	Please see the answer to question 7.

38. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>To : Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>How many SMEs have benefited from increased interaction with China since the Leader visited in 2015?</p>	<p>Please see the answer to question 7.</p>
39. Questioner's name: Cllr Barry Kirby	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>To : Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>What actions have taken place to ensure that documents published on GCC web are as secure as they are intended to be?</p>	<p>The Director: Strategy and Challenge has carried out an urgent review of the security of the documents she is responsible for. She assures me that suitable measures have been taken to protect all sensitive data on the disclosure log. I would be happy to arrange a meeting with her and Cllr Kirby to discuss this in more detail, if that is helpful.</p>
40. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Could you please tell me whether the county council or Gloucester City Council are responsible for the electricity supply and maintenance of the street lights in Orchard Close, Gloucester?</p>	<p>The street lights in Orchard Close, Gloucester are not the responsibility of Gloucestershire County Council. It is understood that this street is in private ownership and that there is a management company in charge of maintenance.</p>
41. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>Construction work has started on building of the waste incinerator at Javelin Park. When will construction be finished and the plant become operational?</p>	<p>The plant is on target to be operational in Summer 2019. Construction is going very well and the piling is now almost complete and the roads have been built.</p>

<p>42. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p>
<p>To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</p> <p>How much GCC waste will be incinerated at Javelin Park per year and how much third party waste does the incinerator have the capacity to cope with?</p>	<p>The plant has a capacity of 190,000 tonnes. The current amount of Local Authority Collected residual waste is around 135,000 tonnes and the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) forecasts this will rise to 143,000 by 2027/28. The balance will be third party waste which will be at UBB's risk to find though again the WCS forecasts substantially more waste than this arising in the County.</p>
<p>43. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>What do you see as the threats and opportunities for Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service now that the Police and Crime Act 2017 has received Royal Assent?</p>	<p>The Policing and Crime Act (received Royal Assent on 31 January 2017) places a duty on emergency services to collaborate and I am content to report that in Gloucestershire our fire and rescue service and police force have well developed and successful examples of collaboration e.g. responding to emergencies, shared Control Room space, shared vehicle workshops, shared HQ campus, shared police/fire station in Lydney, PCSOs who are also retained firefighters and the list goes on.</p> <p>The Policing and Crime Act also places a duty on police, fire and ambulance services to work together and enable police and crime commissioners to take on responsibility for fire and rescue services (the role of the fire authority) where a local case is made.</p> <p>The question is very relevant and this is why I have commissioned a piece of work to be undertaken to better understand current collaboration, the benefits of the fire and rescue service being integrated within the county council and the impact of the legislation (see question 16).</p>

44. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
To: Cllr Kathy Williams How many homeless people were recorded as sleeping rough in Gloucester on the 19 th October 2016 when a multi agency count took place?	23.