

Cabinet	
Wednesday 19 June 2019 at 10.00 am	
Cabinet Suite - Shire Hall, Gloucester	
AGENDA	

Item	Item	Portfolio
4	<p>Questions at Cabinet Meetings (Pages 1 - 14)</p> <p>Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item.</p> <p>Written questions</p> <p>To answer any written questions from a County Councillor, (or any person living or working in the county, or is affected by the work of the County Council), about any matter which relates to any item on the agenda for the meeting.</p> <p>The closing date for the receipt of questions was 4.00 pm on Thursday 13 June 2019</p> <p>To discuss any questions relating to this meeting, please contact jo.moore@gloucestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>A written answer will be provided for each question and presented to the questioner and to Cabinet Members in advance of the meeting. The questions and answers will be taken as read at the meeting. At the discretion of the Leader of Council, each questioner in attendance at the meeting will be allowed to ask one supplementary question in response to the answer to the original question.</p> <p>A copy of the questions and answers circulated at the meeting will be attached to the signed copy of the minutes of the meeting.</p> <p>Urgent questions</p> <p>An urgent written question may be asked by a member of the public about any item on the Cabinet agenda for that meeting which the Chairperson considers could not have been reasonably submitted by the deadline for the receipt of written questions, provided he or she gives notice of the question to the Chief Executive by 12 noon on the day before the meeting.</p>	Leader of the Council

Cabinet

Cllr Mark Hawthorne MBE, Cllr Ray Theodoulou, Cllr Richard Boyles, Cllr Tim Harman, Cllr Nigel Moor, Cllr David Norman MBE, Cllr Vernon Smith, Cllr Lynden Stowe, Cllr Kathy Williams, Cllr Roger Wilson, Cllr Paul Hodgkinson and Cllr Lesley Williams MBE

NOTES

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – Members requiring advice or clarification about whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact the Monitoring Officer (Jane Burns ☎01452 328472 /fax: 425149 e-mail: jane.burns@gloucestershire.gov.uk) prior to the start of the meeting.
2. **INSPECTION OF PAPERS AND GENERAL QUERIES** - If you wish to inspect minutes or reports relating to any item on this agenda or have any other general queries about the meeting, please contact: Jo Moore, Senior Democratic Services Adviser ☎:01452 324196/fax: 425240/e-mail: jo.moore@gloucestershire.gov.uk
3. **DEFINITION OF A KEY DECISION** - A 'Key Decision' is one that is, if implemented, is likely to
 - Result in significant additional expenditure or savings to the value of £500,000 or more, or
 - Be significant in terms of its effect on communities in two or more electoral divisions.
4. **GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS** - Members are required to sign the attendance list.
5. **PHOTOGRAPHY, FILMING AND AUDIO RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS** is permitted subject to the Local Government Access to Information provisions. Please contact Democratic Services (01452 324202) to make the necessary arrangements ahead of the meeting. If you are a member of the public and do not wish to be photographed or filmed please inform the Democratic Services Officer on duty at the meeting.

EVACUATION PROCEDURE - in the event of the fire alarms sounding during the meeting please leave as directed in a calm and orderly manner and go to the assembly point located **outside the main entrance to Shire Hall in Westgate Street**. Please remain there and await further instructions.

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019**

<p>1. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>On two recent occasions the “Safeguarding through Licensing” processes of the County Council and the Police, in respect of Allegations Management, relating to the conduct of licensed drivers, have given members of Cheltenham’s Licensing Committee, which I chair, significant cause for concern about the data-sharing protocols, the timeliness of data sharing, the accuracy of data shared and the support to Licensing Committees by those organisations. These matters have been the subject of private correspondence to the County Council and the Police formally raising these concerns.</p> <p>The absence of any details in the “Working Together – Gloucestershire’s multi-agency arrangements to safeguard children” about how “Safeguarding through Licensing” responsibilities will be delivered, gives me very serious cause for concern that this essential part of the safeguarding process has been overlooked, and that if this omission is not addressed, there will be serious negative public safety and child safeguarding outcomes across our County.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please explain why this important aspect of child safeguarding has been omitted from the report, and give me an assurance that work will urgently be undertaken to address this?</p>	<p>The arrangements to safeguard children and young people in Gloucestershire, set out in the attachment to this report diligently and exhaustively, follow the statutory guidance provided by Working Together 2018 and the associated transitional guidance, both of which are central government documents.</p> <p>There is no omission because they neither interfere with nor alter the arrangements for the licensing of hackney or private hire taxi drivers that remain a matter for the licensing authority, district council licensing teams and employers, including undertaking the necessary medical or DBS checks.</p> <p>District licencing teams are responsible for licencing taxi drivers and are the agency that will undertake a DBS check on taxi drivers if the taxi driver is a sole trader otherwise as with any other sector it’s the employer’s responsibility, but is a requirement to be licenced. The level of the check will be linked to the work a driver may be involved in. Taxi drivers that have contracts to transport children unaccompanied will as expected be vetted at a higher level up to and including Barred list checks. This is done in line with Part V of the Police Act 1997, as updated by the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.</p> <p>Pg56 of WT2018 sets out the relevant organisational responsibilities which fall within their Section 11 duties. Safe recruitment falls under S11 WT2018 and the licencing of Taxi Drivers falls into that category. Again this duty falls to licencing teams or an employer.</p> <p>In the event of an allegation of concern about an applicant or driver, this would be dealt with under our Allegations Management Procedures which are similarly unaltered by WT 2018 but will be included as a further appendix to these arrangements prior to full implementation in July as part of their continuing development. This is part of an incremental approach that will also involve the inclusion of our revised child death arrangements in due course.</p>

<p>2. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>Paragraph 8.16 of the “Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham” by Alexis Jay OBE starts: “One of the common threads running through child sexual exploitation across England has been the prominent role of taxi drivers in being directly linked to children who were abused.” This is a stark reminder of the importance of having “Safeguarding through Licensing” processes.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please explain why the Working Together report does not contain any references to delivering “Safeguarding through Licensing”, or details about working with Licensing Authorities in relation to safeguarding concerns about the behaviour of licensed drivers?</p>	<p>As I explained in the answer to question 1, there is no omission because they neither interfere with nor alter the arrangements for the licensing of hackney or private hire taxi driver which remain a matter of for the licensing Authority including undertaking the necessary medical or DBS checks. PG58 WT2018 sets out the arrangements for the LADO. Licencing is not explicitly mentioned in WT2018 as it clearly falls into S11 duties.</p> <p>The interface between such activity and these arrangements would be in the event of an allegation of concern about an applicant or driver which would be dealt with under existing allegations management arrangements.</p> <p>Allegations against taxi drivers are dealt with through Gloucestershire’s Allegations Management process. There have been a number of allegations managed through this process concerning taxi drivers. In every case the district licencing team were invited to the Allegations Management (AM) meeting. The police and children’s services are always invited to the AM meetings and any allegation is dealt with through that process.</p> <p>Sharing of information is conducted in that meeting and any decision on a specific allegation is a Multi agency one measured against the criteria in WT2018.</p>
<p>3. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member agree that part of Working Together on safeguarding children must include working with the Police and Licensing Authorities to ensure that any information questioning whether a licensed driver is fit-and-proper is promptly and clearly communicated to the Licensing Authority so that the Licensing Authority can fulfil its public safety and child safeguarding duties via the relevant licensing processes?</p>	<p>The decision to licence is not a decision of the Safeguarding Children Executive or other groups created under these arrangements, or the police but of the district licencing authority informed by the necessary vetting and recruitment checks. This is a duty under S11 the efficacy of which will be periodically explored through sampling and audit activity.</p>

<p>4. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member give a commitment that, he, the Director of Children’s Services, and other partners, will work with GLOG (Gloucestershire Licensing Officers Group), to ensure that sufficient data sharing protocols are in place to ensure that any safeguarding concerns in respect of the behaviour of licensed drivers are reported promptly and clearly to the relevant Licensing Authority?</p>	<p>There is a data sharing protocol in place in Gloucestershire between CSC and the district licencing teams. District teams are invited to all allegations meetings with police and children’s social care.</p> <p>If there is a concern these arrangements are not working efficiently and effectively I can assure you the director would be happy to work with the districts and relevant local partners including police to address those concerns.</p>
<p>5. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>As mentioned previously, on two separate occasions in Cheltenham, Allegation Management referrals to the Licensing Authority in respect of child safeguarding concerns were not supported by the presence of an Officer representing the County Council at the Licensing hearing.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member give me, as Chairman of Cheltenham’s Licensing Committee, an assurance that in future, if Allegations Management referrals are made to a Licensing Committee, they will be supported by attendance in person by a County Council Officer with knowledge of the case, if either the Licensing Officer or the Chair of the Licensing Committee requests it?</p>	<p>As I have indicated previously, if there is a concern that licensing arrangements are not working effectively, including the attendance of an officer with knowledge of a case at licensing committee where this is required, I can assure you the director would be happy to work with the districts and local partners including police in order to address those concerns.</p>

<p>6. Cllr David Willingham (Cheltenham Borough Council)</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda Item 14: Gloucestershire Child Safeguarding Arrangements: Working Together (2018)</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member be willing to demonstrate the County Council's commitment to ensuring "Safeguarding through Licensing" protocols are present and acceptable, by amending the report to add a further recommendation explicitly requiring the Director of Children's services to work with GLOG to ensure that it is documented how "Safeguarding through Licensing" will be delivered across Gloucestershire?</p>	<p>The Child Safeguarding Arrangements attachments set out how the three children 'Safeguarding Partners' in Gloucestershire will work together. I have given an assurance that the DCS wants to work with districts to ensure they can deliver their responsibilities in this area. However it would not be appropriate to place an explicit requirement to ensure licensing activity safeguards children as that duty rests with the relevant district councils.</p>
<p>7. Tim Davies</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda Item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>a) Was the transfer of £1.534m to the Strategic Waste Reserve anticipated in the most recently approved Council budget?</p> <p>b) What is the nature of the 'Energy From Waste smoothing requirement'?</p> <p>c) The document does not clearly indicate where this money is being transferred from, as it is listed as point 1.5 under a note on a £2.905m underspend, yet that underspend is then allocated in point 2 towards the Transformation Reserve. Please can you clarify the source of the transfer of £1.534m to the Strategic Waste Reserve?</p>	<p>a) This funding was agreed by council as part of the 2018/19 budget – and is being brought forward via reserves</p> <p>b) The Waste Reserve was created to cover the anticipated variations in annual costs and income expected in the early years of the contract. This mechanism allows for Council Tax funding to remain constant when expenditure and income flows are variable in the early years of the EfW facility being operational.</p> <p>c) This isn't new expenditure – it's from last year's residual waste project budget.</p>
<p>8. Tim Davies</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda Item 6: Procurement and Award of Contracts for the Bulking, Haulage and Treatment of Garden Waste</p>	<p>There aren't any suitable HGVs on the market for this at present – nor are any expect imminently.</p>

<p>Given the resolution in Motion 800 at the Council Meeting of 6th December 2017 that GCC “Commits to establishing principles for use in procurement to encourage use of electric or low emission vehicles by Council contractors” can the Cabinet Member confirm whether such principles are in place, and whether they are being applied to this particular procurement for Haulage of Garden Waste?</p>	<p>The next best option available at present is to specify FORS (Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme) accreditation to improve safety, reduce fuel consumption and cut carbon emissions, using vehicles which meet the latest Euro 6 diesel emissions standards.</p> <p>In addition to this, bidders will be asked to provide details of their vehicle and plant standards, fuel consumption and emissions. They will be evaluated against these responses. There will also be questions on vehicle and plant maintenance, driver training and traffic management, which are further factors that can affect emissions.</p>
<p>9. Tim Davies</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda Item 13: Food Waste Collection and Delivery Agreements</p> <p>The report indicates that no modelling has taken place to consider what would happen to residual waste volumes, and to carbon emissions, if the proposed cut of £300k in incentive payments to local authorities for food waste collection, led to cancellation or reduction of these services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Why does the report not consider this possibility? b) If a reduction in incentive payments led to any of the authorities cancelling their food waste collection schemes and therefore increasing residual waste volumes, would this lead to savings or to higher costs carried by Gloucestershire County Council? c) What public representations has the Cabinet member received in relation to this item? 	<p>We believe a fair system, where all Gloucestershire districts get similar help to recycle food waste will help us recycle more across the county, not less. The county council provides over £4.5m pa in support to districts, and there is no reason to suspect that bringing in a fair system should lead to any district discontinuing food waste collections. This is about having a conversation with district councils to find out how we can work together fairly. I have received no public representations to date on this paper. I did receive about six representations in relation to the Individual Cabinet Decision paper on this in February, which was subsequently withdrawn.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

<p>Question 1: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Roger Wilson</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Commissioning for Residential and Nursing Care Home Provision in Gloucestershire</p> <p>New models of care are proposed at this Cabinet meeting, notably regarding older people’s residential care. Feelings of loneliness amongst such residents are recognised as common and the option of paid/voluntary “companions” in each care Home is mooted.</p> <p>Elsewhere in Europe older people’s residential homes increasingly incorporate younger people who live in and help provide companionship for older residents.</p> <p>Has this exciting new, mutually beneficial, development been considered by GCC for Gloucestershire?</p>	<p>This is not something that is currently offered in Gloucestershire. The council will explore this further with care home providers in Gloucestershire and provide a briefing to cabinet.</p>
<p>Question 2: Cllr Kate Haigh</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Roger Wilson</p>
<p>Agenda item 11: Commissioning for Residential and Nursing Care Home Provision in Gloucestershire</p> <p>a) Does the research undertaken by ‘Evolving Communities’ provide any evidence that the initiatives cited at 3.2 of the report have any impact on people’s loneliness.</p> <p>b) Is there any evidence that the Cabinet member can provide to justify such claims?</p>	<p>The report from Evolving Communities reflected the views of older people. Evolving Communities have not undertaken any direct research for Adult Care on the causes of loneliness.</p> <p>People ‘feeling lonely’ is very subjective and it is difficult to evidence a particular activity resolves a person’s feeling of being lonely. By signposting people to activities that are of interest to people this should provide an environment that would encourage people to attend the activity and meet people who want to participate in similar activities.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

<p>Question 3: Cllr Kate Haigh</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 13: Food Waste Collection and Delivery Agreements</p> <p>The report shows that the County currently spends £918k on diverting food waste from the residual waste scheme.</p> <p>a) What are the savings that are anticipated from the proposed scheme?</p> <p>b) What investment is the County making in reducing food waste and eliminating it from the waste stream?</p>	<p>The savings will only be known following discussions with the district councils on the make up of the new agreements that are to be put in place. A further cabinet decision will then be taken on whether to adopt them. Discussions are underway with district officers and will continue over the next few months.</p> <p>GCC continues to work with district councils through the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee on communications work to reduce food waste. The partnership promotes the national Love Food Hate Waste campaign. Last year for example, some seasonal campaigns were run that included reducing the amount of pumpkins wasted at Halloween and the amount of left-over food wasted by families at Christmas.</p>
<p>Question 4: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>In the Revenue and Capital Expenditure item, only £1.28 million of the £3.3m 'savings' in Public Health, Mental Health and Children's Services have been achieved.</p> <p>You state that the longer term plan is to 'address the shortfall with a review of services for 0-19 year olds across Children's Services and Public Health'.</p> <p>What does that actually mean?</p>	<p>The review of children's services involves considering whether aligning services such as Public Health Nursing, Early Help, targeted youth support and Children's Centres could provide a more joined up service for children and families. This also considers whether there could be efficiency savings by combining the services</p> <p>This review will be carried out over the next year, to deliver a 5 year long term 0-19yrs plan, to reconfigure / commission a 0-19yrs service mode. Taking into account all current commissioning arrangements. In the short term some interim arrangements will be required to align commissioned services.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

Question 5: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles
<p data-bbox="107 300 909 331">Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p data-bbox="107 368 1016 432">In the budget outturn for 2018/19 the Children’s Services budget has once again been overspent – this year by 8.3% (just under £9 million).</p> <p data-bbox="107 469 1043 533">Since this has happened again what cuts will you be making to this area to ensure the budget is not overspent again in the coming year?</p>	<p data-bbox="1088 300 2087 395">This is a demand led budget and, if demand is greater than expected, I make no apologies for the fact we step up and invest to protect Gloucestershire’s children. I am sure Cllr Hodgkinson supports this approach.</p> <p data-bbox="1088 432 2069 600">As noted in the Revenue report the activity in children’s social care and the number of children in care has caused significant pressures against the external placement, safeguarding staff and young people’s support budgets causing the overspend. This is in keeping with the national picture where pressures on children’s services budgets have been well documented.</p> <p data-bbox="1088 636 2033 700">To address this financial position in 2019/20 a number of measures have been put in place</p> <ul data-bbox="1137 705 2087 1152" style="list-style-type: none">• Additional funding of £12.7 million for vulnerable children agreed in the MTFs for 2019/20.• The continuing review of all high cost placements to ensure decisions around placements are executed in a timely child centred manner to reduce costs where appropriate.• Improved processes for advertising and recruiting social workers and the continuation of allowances to attract and retain staff.• Resource panels to gate-keep and ensure consistency in significant support packages for children.• Efficiency Plans in place with regular monitoring to target areas of significant spend to reduce costs where appropriate.• Establishing a brokerage service and more effective procurement frameworks. <p data-bbox="1088 1189 2056 1284">These measures will seek to keep expenditure within budget but the continuing level of activity within social care services and the improvement journey will make this task very challenging.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

<p>Question 6: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>The report recommends transferring £1.534 million to the Strategic Waste Reserve to fund the EFW (Energy from Waste) smoothing requirement. This I believe will take the Strategic Waste Reserve to a value of £40.584 million.</p> <p>Do you envisage adding further sums of taxpayers money to the Strategic Waste Reserve over the next two years of this council?</p>	<p>We have no plans to transfer further amounts into the Waste Reserve from outside of the Waste budget.</p>
<p>Question 7: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>The report recommends approval of a revenue contribution of £0.120 million to the Trevone House capital refurbishment. When will plans of the new internal and external alterations of Trevone House be made available for my consideration as the local councillor and for local residents to view?</p>	<p>As part of the engagement with the local community a further event on 20th August 2019 has been advertised. At this event the full plans for the site will be available.</p>
<p>Question 8: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>The report proposes to transfer £0.438 million to the C&I Reserve for the carry forward of one off funding for the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Improvement Project.</p> <p>How many electric vehicle charges points will be installed in Gloucestershire with this financial investment and where will the charging</p>	<p>We are in discussions with potential suppliers on procuring 50-100 charging points. Our priority is locations in and near Air Quality Management Areas where electric vehicles can help to bring air pollution back down to within legal levels.</p> <p>Most electric vehicle charging takes place overnight at home. However, one third of UK households does not have private parking and is unlikely to switch to electric vehicles without access to public charging points. Therefore we will</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

<p>points be located?</p>	<p>prioritise on street chargers in these areas, using government grants to make our investment go further.</p> <p>We are also exploring a range of other measures including working with parishes to help provide community charging points in rural areas and with districts on helping taxi drivers switch to electric vehicles.</p>
<p>Question 9: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>Is the portfolio holder happy with the slippage of £8.152 million in the £93.235 million capital budget position for 2018/19?</p>	<p>The 2018/18 budget included a significant and ambitious capital investment programme – due to the complex nature of these investments it is sometimes necessary to delay plans to ensure an optimum outcome for residents. All schemes included in the programme have commenced and are forecast to be delivered within budget.</p>
<p>Question 10: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Roger Wilson</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>The Adults Single Programme made savings of £11,561 million in 2018/19.</p> <p>How was this achieved and did it have a negative impact of the quality of support provided to service users?</p>	<p>The programme is structured to deliver a new model of social care, reflecting both the Prevent, Reduce, Delay philosophy of the Care Act 2014 and the approach to demand management as developed in partnership with IMPOWER. The savings partly reflect improved commissioning arrangements developed as part of the programme but mostly reflect the changes in practice resulting from this model. In consequence we have not only reduced spend by making significantly fewer placements into long term care but we have worked hard, with partners, to help people achieve the personal outcomes that have enabled them to live independently.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

<p>Question 11: Cllr Klara Sudbury</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Revenue and Capital Expenditure 2018-19</p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that the transfer of a further £150,000 to the C&I reserve to cover the future costs of the Cheltenham Transport Plan suggest that the administration failed to properly budget for the changes agreed at the TRO committee and supported by Cheltenham Borough Council?</p>	<p>Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) requested the extension of the corner trial at Boots Corner (phase 4 of Cheltenham Transport Plan) by a further 6 months and to implement a number of additional mitigation measures on the local highway network. This extension could not have been foreseen by GCC therefore no additional budget was planned and no contribution has been made from CBC.</p> <p>Therefore, we were able to utilise the £150k to cover the additional mitigation costs following CBC request.</p> <p>Please note the total revenue income does not cover the cost of the scheme.</p>
<p>Question 12: Cllr Klara Sudbury</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 13: Food Waste Collection and Delivery Agreements</p> <p>It is stated that the termination and review of the food waste collection and delivery agreements would “enable new incentive payment models to be negotiated...which will reflect and reward the Gloucestershire WCAs based upon performance levels, whilst contributing savings to GCC’s waste management budget.”</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member spell it out more plainly and say the recommendation is to spend less GCC money on recycling while asking district councils to continue to do more for less?</p>	<p>This is about bringing in a fair system, which doesn’t see councils like Cheltenham Borough paid 60% less per tonne of food waste than other councils in Gloucestershire. I have heard what district councils have said on this – and I agree that we can’t continue to pay less to councils with the biggest challenges in collecting food waste.</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS

CABINET MEETING – 19 June 2019

Question 13: Cllr Klara Sudbury	Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor
Agenda item 13: Food Waste Collection and Delivery Agreements If the recommendations are agreed later – how much is it anticipated that each district will lose in the projected 33 per cent cut by GCC?	That would depend on the outcomes of any discussions with the districts. It is entirely possible that a fair system could see some district gain more money.

This page is intentionally left blank