

**COUNTY COUNCIL –13 September 2017  
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<b>1. Questioner's name: Diana Ray</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
Will GCC acknowledge that roadside verges can be managed for road safety and also wildflowers; to be excellent reservoirs for biodiversity across the county –in the face of public concern over decline in butterflies and pollinators?	The County Council full recognizes the importance of well managed verges to biodiversity and this is evidenced in our Transport Asset Management Plan and our Biodiversity Action Plan both of which can be found on the Council's website.
<b>2. Questioner's name: Diana Ray</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
The current contract for the highways contractor Amey ends in March 2019. Will the new highway maintenance and cutting contracts from April 2019 – with whoever is appointed to maintain verges - include performance indicators <u>on supporting biodiversity</u> and a requirement to at least adhere to GCC's own management plans for the county's 105 Conservation Road Verges?	The current highways term maintenance contract requires compliance with the County's policies which support biodiversity including the Transport Asset Management Plan and our Biodiversity Action Plan.
<b>3. Questioner's name: Diana Ray</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
Is GCC aware of the research by Plantlife and inspiring stories of best practice examples from other counties such as Dorset, Oxfordshire, and Bedfordshire; for example, Dorset have increased flowering and seeding on verges and saved money (up to £ 100,000) by adopting better management approaches whilst still maintaining road safety?	Thank you for pointing this out to us. I will ask officers to investigate the best practice examples from these authorities.

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNTY COUNCIL –13 September 2017**  
**Members' Questions**

<p><b>1. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>Does the Leader of the Council believe elected members were adequately informed and kept up to date over the recent IT fiasco where councillors were unable to access emails for more than a week?</p>	<p>No, I don't. I want to take this opportunity to apologise to all members who were affected. I have asked for steps to be taken to reduce the chances of this reoccurring, and to ensure a better response were it to do so.</p>
<p><b>2. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>Please can the Leader tell me why the IT support contract which your administration signed did not include rapid call-out in case of problems and why was no provision made for specialist GCC IT staff to cover for key colleagues who were away?</p>	<p>Reference to Q1 above, this required specialist support from Blackberry and no level of in-house or contract call out staff would have sufficient expertise to deal with the outage on their own.</p> <p>I can confirm that our commissioned contractors were on site on Friday evening and throughout the weekend working on this matter to resolve it. They were actively liaising with Blackberry specialists.</p> <p>This service offered to the council does not currently include a rapid call-out in case of problems however, to date our commissioned contractor has always provided this to us. We have a cover system in place for GCC ICT staff and this works effectively with very few exceptions.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we will soon be in a position to review the terms of the contract and the council will consider re-introducing this as part of the on-going contract.</p>

<p><b>3. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne/ Stewart Edgar</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>What actions have been taken to ensure this doesn't happen again?</p>	<p>We take these events very seriously and undertaken a full and structured debrief.</p> <p>ICT team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has implemented robust management and scrutiny of all system upgrades involving two or more third parties;</li> <li>• has undertaken a comprehensive review and assessment of all key council systems to identify any emerging critical dependencies (such as BlackBerry Work);</li> <li>• are exploring alternative communication methods to keep stakeholders fully updated during incidents (e.g. SMS text messaging updates, alternative email addresses);</li> <li>• has increased the level of support from Blackberry;</li> <li>• now ensure that all future key system changes are extensively tested and peer reviewed at the weekly ICT Change Advisory Board before approval to proceed is granted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Roger Wilson</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Roger Wilson</p> <p>The Budget for 2017/18 included £400K extra support for people with disabilities including tackling disability hate crime, please can the Cabinet Member provide me with a detailed breakdown of how this extra money is being spent and in what ways it is being used to tackle disability hate crime?</p>	<p>Disability Hate Crime is a subject of great importance to us. In many of the consultations we deliver we hear that this is a concern to our communities and we attempt to address this issue in all of the work we do. For example we actively participate in the County Wide Hate Crime Strategy group being led by the Police and Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>I am also very pleased to report that all of the £400,000 designated for Disability Hate crime has been fully committed. The funds have been fully allocated to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providers are supported to carry out Hate Crime awareness sessions with the individuals they support in residential care.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting providers to facilitate people attending Hate Crime awareness sessions at the Learning Disability Drop-Ins (including people whose needs are such that they need a support worker to accompany them to a session).</li> <li>• Supporting individuals to become active members of their communities through attending community-based activities which enable them to develop friendships and networks of support. Evidence shows that this is the best way of preventing Hate Crime.</li> <li>• We are particularly dedicated to ensuring people with a disability have access to third party reporting which means the police will take a complaint from a person whom the person with a disability most trusts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>What dedicated funding has GCC received from the Conservative Government this year to encourage cycling and walking, and what does this equate to in terms of money per head of population?</p>	<p>Government highways funding to councils is not broken down by transport mode. The exception is where we bid for specific grants.</p> <p>However most of our major investment in the network includes improvements for walking, cycling and public transport. It is not possible to disaggregate a meaningful figure.</p> <p>We have submitted a bid for support in developing a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and hope to hear the outcome imminently.</p> <p>We will also receive a Bikeability grant of £159,067 which will help approximately 4600 local children to develop their cycling skills.</p>

<p><b>6. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>What dedicated funding has GCC itself set aside to encourage cycling and walking in the county, and what does this equate to in terms of money per head of population?</p>	<p>This year we have £500k in the highways capital programme for footway investment and £100k for the two Barriers to Cycling schemes. In addition we will spend £113k for school crossing patrols helping pupils stay safe. A full list is provided in a table shared regularly with Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee and the Cycling Advisory Group.</p> <p>A range of our highway schemes include measures to improve the network for pedestrians and cyclists. However disaggregating spend is difficult to do in a meaningful way. For example Cheltenham Transport Plan being promoted by Cheltenham Borough Council includes a range of improvements for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
<p><b>7. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>The 'Old A40' between Northleach and Compton Abdale has been closed for nearly 2 years. It was well used locally and 500 people signed my petition last year to get it re-opened asap. Despite that, nothing has changed and I – and people living in the mid Cotswolds - have got to the end of their tether waiting for Highways to do something. Do you think it's acceptable for a road to be closed for this long or have you decided by default that you don't have the will or means to keep all roads open in Gloucestershire?</p>	<p>This minor road has been closed, as Cllr Hodgkinson will know, as a result of serious safety concerns. It typically carried less than 450 vehicles per day, and a diversion is in place, which is 700 metres in length. Our geotechnical team are continuing to examine the site and monitor ground movement – which will allow us to design a solution.</p> <p>It is a priority site- but I'm afraid land slips do take a long time to repair and are expensive. To give an example, the Horsley landslip on the B4058 occurred in December 2013, with repairs nearing completion today, having cost the council over £800k. The highways team are also currently working on solutions for the landslips on the A435 at Charlton Hill and the B4632 Lye Lane as well as the scheme on the B4058.</p>

<p><b>8. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>You and I were part of the A429 Task Group in 2016. The group came up with lots of recommendations and last autumn officers were asked to come back within 6-12 months on various actions. I've seen nothing since last autumn. When will concrete and visible actions be taken to address the concerns we all have about the A429?</p>	<p>An update report was provided to Lead Cabinet Member in December 2016 and another it is planned to provide a further update this Autumn. Since then Cllr Hodgkinson will be aware that Oxfordshire County Council have consulted on TRO proposals for Burford and in advance of this Gloucestershire officers have collated traffic and HGV data to support the response to these proposals. The other short term recommendations comprised sharing cyclical maintenance information on the GCC website, carrying out additional traffic surveys to fill data gaps, erection of warning signs at Broadwater Bottom and communication with officers from neighbouring authorities about proposals they might have which would affect A429. All the short term recommendations have been completed.</p>
<p><b>9. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Lynden Stowe</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p> <p>You are on record as saying - as former Cotswold District Council Leader - that you would happily invite Donald Trump to come to the Cotswolds. In your new Cabinet role as economic spokesman, have you done the same by inviting him to Gloucestershire?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p><b>10. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Lynden Stowe</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p> <p>What is your contingency plan for the impact of Brexit on Gloucestershire's economy?</p>	<p>We continue to promote Gloucestershire as a great place for people to live and a great place for companies to do business. This is an approach that will benefit us in any event.</p>

<b>11. Questioner's name: Cllr Bernie Fisher</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>At the recent meeting with GCC councillors from Cheltenham, it was stated by yourself and officers that the Consortium for the urban extension in North West Cheltenham would not be providing the through school by 2020 as originally planned - Could you please tell me the date GCC became aware of this?</p>	<p>The council has not at any point anticipated the Consortium would provide a new all-through school for children from the urban extension by 2020 as the need will be based on the start date of the development. The developers currently hope to start on site during 2019, subject to planning consent, and to complete 50 dwellings in the first year. These houses will yield approximately 8 secondary aged pupils.</p>
<b>12. Questioner's name: Cllr Bernie Fisher</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>Was any indication given as to when it would be completed?</p>	<p>The council is in discussions with the developers and wider stakeholders to determine the appropriate timeline for the phased growth of the new school. This will ensure the supply of school places matches the pupil yield from the development.</p>
<b>13. Questioner's name: Cllr Bernie Fisher</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>Was any reason given as to why it was being delayed?</p>	<p>The timeline for the school and the demand for additional school places is entirely dependant upon the start date of the development.</p>
<b>14. Questioner's name: Cllr Bernie Fisher</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>Who was the spokesperson for the Consortium?</p>	<p>White Peak Planning Agents.</p>



<b>15. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>The schedule indicates that there should have been weed spraying in the Tewkesbury area from 3<sup>rd</sup> July, my understanding is that from communication with the Parish and Amey Churchdown was forgotten and not included in this schedule, please can the Cabinet Member explain the reason why weed spraying in Churchdown has been forgotten this year?</p>	<p>Our annual weed treatment comprises the removal of noxious weeds and not weed spraying; however, this year we have been carrying out an additional programme of weed spraying in selected areas. I can confirm that your Local Highways Manager committed a works ticket on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August for weed spraying in Hucclecote parish, Brockworth, Shurdington and Churchdown. This is due to take place in the next few weeks. Apologies if there has been some mis-communication about when these works were due to take place. I would remind the member that they only need to ask their Local Highways Manager and they will gladly provide this type of information.</p>
<b>16. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member apologise on behalf of the Council for this oversight and will assurances be given that this will not happen again in future years.</p>	<p>See the answer to Q. 15.</p>
<b>17. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>In the response to highways development reference number T/2016/036760 regarding the new medical centre on Parton road in Churchdown it states that there are regular bus stops 200m from the site, but one of these is not connected to a pavement and is sited on a verge, please can the Cabinet Member explain how he deems this to be acceptable access to those using public transport?</p>	<p>There are bus stops and good shelters for people travelling in both directions from the site of the new medical centre. One is sited in the road verge and there is a small section of level grass between the shelter and the adjacent pavement. We are making plans to provide a level hard surfaced footway linking this shelter to the roadside pavement which will also improve disabled access.</p>

<b>18. Questioner's name: Cllr Jack Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
<p>To: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>From a speed survey undertaken in 2016, the average speed along this road is 36mph with some drivers regularly exceeding 40mph, it is extremely dangerous that there is no pedestrian crossing linking the bus stops, will the Cabinet Member meet at the site with myself to see the potential risks to vulnerable users and for us to work together in finding a solution?</p>	<p>I have been informed by the Local Highways Manager that the police recently carried out a number of speed surveys in the Churchdown area and average speeds were well within the 30mph limit. He also confirmed that Tewkesbury police carried out a speed check recently on this road and only one speeding ticket was issued which happened to be a local resident. I am happy to arrange a meeting on site with the Local Highways Manager and an officer from Road Safety to discuss this issue. I would again remind the member, that they can always contact their Local Highways Manager with issues like this.</p>
<b>19. Questioner's name: Cllr Kate Haigh</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Patrick Molyneux</b>
<p>Can the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny update Council on the progress of the review into the County Council's Scrutiny processes that members of the OSMC were keen to have commissioned when they met on 29th June?</p>	<p>Cllr Haigh will recall that OSMC discussed the issue although no decision was made.</p> <p>On 21 July 2017 OSMC received a presentation from the Head of Democratic Services detailing 'Effective Scrutiny'. This presentation is available with the committee papers on the website. Following the presentation, the Committee agreed that no further action was required at this time. I am happy to keep this under review.</p> <p>The draft minutes of the meeting are available at:</p> <p><a href="http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=17504">http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=17504</a></p>
<b>20. Questioner's name: Cllr Joe Harris</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>It has been three months now since the publication of the 'inadequate' Ofsted report of Children's Services in Gloucestershire,</p>	<p>It is important that we all understand that to transform our children's social care service and the practice of social workers is not a quick fix. The Lead Ofsted Inspector visited us on the 5th of September and said that in her view it will take between 18months and 2years to make the</p>

<p>how satisfied is the Cabinet Member that progress is being made to implement those recommendations as outlined in the report?</p>	<p>necessary changes to our services.</p> <p>Having said that we have not been complacent in taking immediate steps to improve the infrastructure that will support and sustain improvement, alongside having a focus on our most vulnerable children. We recognise that we need support in achieving change and we have appointed Essex County Council as our improvement partner to help us on our journey to good. Essex have a track record in achieving change and providing support through high quality, competent practitioners. Our Ofsted Improvement Plan clearly outlines the steps that we need to take to improve, challenging targets and timescales have been set and I am confident that we have put in place the resources and expertise to deliver this plan for our children in Gloucestershire.</p>
<p><b>21. Questioner's name: Cllr Joe Harris</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Richard Boyles</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide me with specific examples of what improvements have been made to this Council's Children's Services since the Ofsted report was published in June?</p>	<p>Through our improvement work we are seeking to ensure that the changes that we make will be sustainable into the long term, there are no quick fixes to the issues that we face. We have seen progress in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 78.2% of single assessments were completed within 45 days in quarter 1; this is consistent with the previous quarter at 78.1.</li> <li>• The timeliness of initial child protection conferences and reviews exceeds target (ICPCs up to 83.6% and reviews 92.2% at the end of June. Performance continued to improve in July and remains high in August.</li> <li>• There has been a reduction in the number of children on Child Protection Plans for more than 2 years, which has gone down from 17 to 8 and the majority of those remaining are in court proceedings.</li> <li>• Stability for children in care related to length of placement remains above target at 73.1%</li> <li>• The number of children in need who had not been seen in the last</li> </ul>

	<p>4 weeks decreased from 760 in July to 707 in August. The number of children who have not had a visit for more than 6 months has reduced from 20 to 11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of Children in Need on a plan for more than 2 years reduced to 7 in August.</li> <li>• Despite the continued increase in the number of children in care, only 2 children admitted to care in August had been in care previously, which reduced the Rolling Year readmissions figure to 16.8%. This is the lowest that it has been since March 2017.</li> </ul>
<p><b>22. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>On 31st of August 2017 you stated on BBC Radio Gloucestershire that the total savings on waste disposal to be made by the county council because of the incinerator (over a 25 year period) would be £100m.</p> <p>Two years earlier you said on BBC Radio Gloucestershire that the savings over a 25 year period would be £150m.</p> <p>Please explain the £50m difference?</p>	<p>I am happy to stand by these figures. The £100m figure is the saving that Gloucestershire will benefit from over the 25 year operation of the Javelin Park facility. This is essentially a comparison against landfill based alternatives which, over time, would involve exporting out of county.</p> <p>The larger figure of £150m includes both the above saving and, at the time the question was asked, the cost of terminating the Javelin Park contract. This figure has always depended upon where we were in the procurement and construction cycle, and would be a considerably larger sum if calculated today.</p>
<p><b>23. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</b></p>	<p><b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b></p>
<p>To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p> <p>What is the annual estimated tonnage of waste that will be recycled over the next 25 years compared to the estimate made in 2015 when you stated the incinerator would save us £150m?</p>	<p>The forecast remains the same as it was in 2015 per the business case and assumes achieving 60% by 2020.</p>

<b>24. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b>
To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne  Where will this council find the additional £2m a year from within its budget over the next 25 years following your statement on the Mark Cummings show on BBC Radio Gloucestershire?	This is not the case; see the answer to Q 22.
<b>25. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</b>
To: Cllr Mark Hawthorne  What will be the annual estimated residual household waste that will be processed by the incinerator over the next 25 years and how does this compare to the estimate made two years ago when you stated the incinerator would save us £150m?	The forecast remains the same. The county's recycling rate has risen to 52% this year, and we anticipate that it will continue to increase up to 60% as assumed in the Energy from Waste model.
<b>26. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b>
Javelin Park – In the Planning Application to build an incinerator 2 routes were identified to connect an electricity cable to a grid connection. Why are neither of these routes being used and when was it decided not to use them.	That is a question you would have to direct to Western Power Distribution, who are responsible for grid connections.
<b>27. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b>
In the meeting papers for the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 <sup>st</sup> March 2015 on page 17, 2.53 it says 'the application for the grid connection works would be made by the local Distribution Network Operator in due course'. Please could you tell me when this application was made and provide me with a copy of the application and any other associated relevant papers.	Consents for the grid connection for the Energy from Waste facility are a matter for the developer, UBB, and the distribution network operator, WPD. UBB applied to WPD who have advised on the most economical route.  UBB will satisfy themselves as to whether the grid connection works

are permitted development.

**28. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams**

**Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor**

Javelin Park Grid Connection Gloucestershire County Council has recently announced that GCC/UBB intend to route the Grid Connection for the Javelin Park EfW facility underground along the B4008 and A419 from Javelin Park to an electricity substation at Ryeford, a route that has not previously been mentioned during the Planning process.

Would you please explain to me the process you intend to follow in order to discharge Condition 21 of the Inspectors decision?  
(Decision letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015, Schedule of Conditions Annex B 21)

The Grid Connection was discussed in the original Scoping Report for the Environmental Impact Assessment, prepared by UBB and dated October 2011, two routes are described at 3.9, page 11 and the same routes are examined at some length at Chapter 18, page 425 in the Environmental Statement prepared by UBB and dated January 2012. Neither route is the one now proposed.

The Environmental Statement was a material consideration in determining the application. In these circumstances GCC acting as the Waste Planning Authority, cannot discharge condition 21 without first fulfilling the requirements of the Scoping Report, producing a relevant Environmental Impact Assessment, amending the Environmental Statement and incorporating this into the planning permission in some way.

Would you please tell me how you intend to proceed to fulfil your various obligations in this matter.

Condition 21 requires the Developer to submit details of facilities to enable connection to the electricity network and supply of generated electricity. 'Facilities' in this context does not relate to the electrical line but to the requirements within the application site boundary. The connection route falls outside the scope of the permission.

<b>29. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</b>
When will the Environmental Impact Assessment of the route for the cable between Javelin Park and Ryeford grid connection be carried out and please can you specify the extent of the public consultation which will take place?	This is entirely a matter for Western Power Distribution.
<b>30. Questioner's name: Cllr Lesley Williams</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles</b>
GCC Children and Families and Gloucestershire Police both had 'less than complimentary 'inspection' reports about the services which are failing young people in the County. How are both GCC and the Police working together to resolve these issues and ensure the protection and safety of young people in Gloucestershire.	Senior Officers from the Police, council and the Gloucestershire Children's Safeguarding Board have met to agree how we work together to improve our services for children. The GSCB have agreed to take a lead role in facilitating this activity.
<b>31. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</b>
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou  What are the up-to-date gate fees and fee bands? The 2013 contract has been published, including the gate fees, which are essential to a public understanding and scrutiny of the potential impact of the project on public finances and recycling rates, but the 2015 revisions have not been published, and continue to be redacted.	We have reviewed what financial information can now be released. These figures remain commercially sensitive and confidential.
<b>32. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</b>
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou  How can the quoted £100m saving that is repeatedly given in newspaper articles be maintained in spite of the substantial cost	The detail was clearly outlined in the budget monitoring cabinet report and attached annex in November 2015.

rises alluded to in the Ernst & Young Report?	
<b>33. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</b>
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou  What is the predicted range of savings for the project to be obtained over the 25 year lifetime of the project in a low waste scenario in which we achieve 70% recycling rates?	We published this information on our website on the 21 <sup>st</sup> March. Cllr Smith can download it directly from the FOI disclosure log, or I can ask officers to send a copy.
<b>34. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</b>
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou  What percentage of the saving is made up of anticipated revenue from the electricity generation?	See the answer to Q. 32.
<b>35. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Ray Theodoulou</b>
To: Cllr Ray Theodoulou  What contracts or deals have been secured in relation to electricity revenue from the Javelin Park Incinerator between GCC and third parties? Where none have yet been secured what is the timeline for deals to be concluded? And what has been the cost to the council of the negotiation of these deals?	Negotiations are scheduled to take place nearer to the completion date therefore no costs have so far been incurred.
<b>36. Questioner's name: Cllr Rachel Smith</b>	<b>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</b>
To: Cllr Vernon Smith  What is Highways policy on grass-cutting and weed-spraying? What	Gloucestershire's policies for grass cutting and weed spraying are set out in the Transport Asset Management Plan which is available on our website. Most weed treatment comprises the removal of noxious



chemicals are used? And what safety measures are in place to protect contractors?

weeds, however where weed spraying is carried out it is in accordance with The Control of Pesticides Regulations 1986. Only approved pesticides are used, these are chemicals listed in the "Blue Book", Pesticides Approved Under the Control of Pesticides 1986. Weed spraying is carried out by our term maintenance contractor who provide specialist training to their workforce or use specialist sub-contractors to carry out this activity.

This page is intentionally left blank