

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 9 September 2020
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

1. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
<p>Can the council inform me of the number of vulnerable people who are on the DO NOT REHOUSE list and are therefore on our streets or sofa surfing.</p> <p>What is the mechanism to appeal such a decision made by council policy to be taken off the list.</p> <p>Do you feel this is good practice at any time of year but during a pandemic extremely dangerous for all concerned.</p>	<p>Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.</p>
2. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
<p>Do you stand by the councils policy to provide food only for those not on benefits living in hotels, during the pandemic and previously homeless.</p>	<p>This has never been the policy. Food was initially provided to all residents, and then to residents on the basis of individual need.</p>
3. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
<p>The Covid 19 Emergency Plan written by Government regarding homeless provision in hotels etc 2nd statement of intent mentions an assessment for all concerned.</p> <p>How many assessments per occupant of all hotels used, have had an assessment in Gloucester</p>	<p>Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.</p>
4. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
<p>Can council reveal the number of vulnerable people currently on the councils own DO NOT REHOUSE LIST and in the current climate of not only a local but global viral pandemic does the council feel this policy has very dangerous consequences for all concerned.</p>	<p>Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.</p>

5. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
Can the council explain the merits of again its own policy of providing minimal food for those not on benefits but no provision of food to all those on benefits regardless of income, state of mind or general wellbeing. Of all those homed in hotels who were previously homeless.	Please see the answer to question 2.
6. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
From the onset of the Covid 19 Emergency Plan, supplied by Government, one strategy was to assess the vulnerable person when accommodated in hotels. Can this council give the total figure of assessments compared to the total figure of actual placements in all hotels provided by this council.	Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.
7. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
What is the total of evictions, how many appeals and how many were overturned.	Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.
8. Questioner's name: Steve Gower	Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams
When will this council stop the funding of homeless in our city	Homelessness and housing is provided by district councils – not the county council. You would have to direct your question to them.
9. Questioner's name: Chloe Turner	Respondent's name: Cllr Dave Norman
In the light of the latest collision between a speeding vehicle and a cow on Minchinhampton Common (28 th August), a particularly upsetting incident that required the euthanizing of the animal by the	This is a really sad outcome – and something that we have worked for a long time with partners to try to avoid. The council has previously

<p>attending police officer, when will the Council take action and commit the funds to implement effective traffic calming measures on the Minchinhampton and Rodborough Commons? I understand that collaborative work between the parish councils, the Commoners and Highways identified potential solutions, inspired by those used in the New Forest, yet the Council has taken no meaningful action, and cows continue to suffer and be killed at the hands of speeding motorists - how many more deaths will it take before something is changed?</p>	<p>taken a number of actions to help the local community and parish address this issue and support road safety including new road markings, vehicle activated signs, trailer mounted variable message signs, additional rumble strips and the deployment of temporary road signs. We will continue to be open to new ideas and meeting with a group arranged by Minchinhampton Parish Council later this month to discuss matters further. However, we are aware that various ideas and requests have been put forward and whilst the council is open to innovations it should also be noted that differing local conditions will mean that not all solutions are suitable in all locations.</p>
<p>10. Questioner's name: Chloe Turner</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>With regard to the Javelin Park incinerator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Can the Council identify all capital payments that have been made to date to UBB or associated parties? b. How much waste (tonnes) has been treated by UBB since the start of the contract up to now, and what total payments have been made/incurred for this treatment? Had this waste been sent to landfill under the Council's recently terminated contract with Cory, what would the cost have been? 	<p>The contract with UBB includes an obligation for the Council to make capital contributions totalling £38 million in the four years before the Gloucestershire Energy from Waste Facility became operational, which will reduce the revenue fee paid over the life of the contract.</p> <p>In addition to this, GCC has paid UBB £24,386,024.19 since the facility started treating waste in June 2019 until the end of July 2020. This figure includes the gate fee for waste treatment and the electricity payment GCC gives UBB. This figure excludes the revenue that GCC has received for electricity generated by the Facility from EDF Energy, which is an income for the project. During this time approximately 137, 600 tonnes of Gloucestershire's residual household waste has been treated by the Facility.</p> <p>The contract with Enovert (previously known as Cory) would have expired in January 2020, therefore after this date, a new contract would have had to have been procured and signed.</p>

11. Questioner's name: Barbara Clark	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>I am a resident of Cheltenham and am concerned about the rumours regarding formation of a unitary council currently being mooted by Gloucester County Council. My concerns are born of a desire to maintain the close, local management of services, especially for those on lower incomes. As a member of the public I understand that I am permitted to ask direct questions of you.</p> <p>Would you please answer these specific questions as soon as you are able:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In July the Minister for Regional Growth and Local Government confirmed the Government would be proceeding with the introduction of unitary councils despite the pandemic. Can the council leader confirm what his preference is for the introduction of unitary councils in Gloucestershire? 	<p>Ms Clark is mistaken. The proposal for unitary councils has come from district colleagues in Cheltenham, Cotswold and Stroud.</p> <p>My preference is for a system that is fit for the future and meets the needs of local people.</p>
12. Questioner's name: Barbara Clark	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>Can the council leader confirm what letters and correspondence he has shared with the Secretary of State for Local Government, other Local Government ministers or special advisors to discuss the dissolution of the County Council and the six District Councils, and what view he has offered?</p>	<p>None.</p>
13. Questioner's name: Barbara Clark	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>Can the council leader confirm what video conferences or conference calls he has been on with the Secretary of State for Local Government, other Local Government ministers or special advisors to discuss the dissolution of the County Council and the six District Councils, and what view he has offered?</p>	<p>I have had no specific discussions about Gloucestershire, although the broader issue of local government reorganisation has, of course been discussed in LGA and similar meetings I have attended, which have been open to all council leaders.</p>

14. Questioner's name: Barbara Clark	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>Can the council leader confirm what instructions, if any, he has given to council officers to develop a business case for a unitary authority that would lead to the dissolution of Gloucestershire County Council and the six district councils?</p>	<p>Following the publication of proposals from Cheltenham Borough, Cotswold and Stroud District councils, I have asked council officers to look at the concerns that they have raised, and how the council might respond.</p>
15. Questioner's name: James Young	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>With Reference to the New Cycle Lane on London Road that has been "Superimposed" onto our Street Parking, taking its place and meaning we no longer have <i>any</i> street parking or even waiting.</p> <p>I would like to ask about the Consultation Process in this astonishing sudden removal of our parking.</p> <p>Did you ask the residents if they need their parking? Did you consult with the residents to find out if there were any circumstances that would make removal of parking untenable? Did you not know that there are regular disabled and elderly visitors to several of the houses in the row? Did you not know that Carers visit at least one of the properties on a daily basis? Did you not realise that most of these houses are large 5 or 6 bedroomed family houses? That the fabric of family life depends on comings and goings...of visitors and doctors of piano tutors and cleaners of children's birthday parties and the worried guests' parents? Did you not realise that these houses haven't been designed for the car and that even though some have a distant rear access that it does not necessarily represent a feasible way of bringing in "stuff"? Have you considered Heritage? You might have done with a Consultation. Large Grade II listed buildings can easily revert to</p>	<p>In response to Covid-19 the government asked councils in England to rapidly implement schemes to increase cycling and walking and to assist social distancing on public transport as lockdown restrictions are eased. It introduced new powers to allow councils to act swiftly and gather feedback from residents and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The London Road scheme is one of the first phase projects, forming a key part of an £11m strategic cycle route connecting Gloucester city centre, station and hospital the university, Longlevens, Churchdown and Cheltenham. It has significant potential to increase cycling and will help students returning to university this month. The B4063 (Cheltenham Road and London Road) is one of the busiest bus corridors in Gloucestershire and public transport capacity is limited by social distancing. Enabling people to cycle for short trips will reduce pressure on bus services, keeping seats free for older and more vulnerable people who have less choice.</p> <p>Cycling facilities are often criticised for being stop-start, too narrow or otherwise unsuitable for younger and older people. That is why we are raising the bar in terms of the quality of cycle infrastructure, giving cyclists space and priority rather than compromising their safety for expediency. This is a much more ambitious agenda that has the full support of the government and is reflected in its new guidance on</p>

being cheap apartment buildings bringing an entirely more disreputable feel to London Road, one of the City Council's "Flagship Neighbourhoods"

I ask about whether you consulted on these and other questions because I believe your research must have been inadequate. Also what you will call the Consultation Period was nothing of the kind. I telephoned Highways twice during the Consultation Period, asked directly for verbal explanations on both occasions and never received any call back.

cycle infrastructure.

Many concerns that have been raised so far are will be addressed by the time the scheme is complete; road markings, coloured surfacing and barriers will highlight and segregate the cycle facilities and slow down vehicle speeds. Two new zebra crossings will help pedestrians cross safely.

A key benefit of the scheme is the continuity of the cycle lanes, which means that there are no parked vehicles that force cyclists to pull out into a lane used by cars, buses and other traffic. To ensure that cycle lanes are kept clear they are Mandatory, as otherwise vehicles can load, unload or park for up to 3 hours (with a blue badge). Building works and maintenance are still possible with a permit.

In designing the scheme officers recognised that some residents of 100-118 London Road parked on the road in spaces available to all motorists, so there was no guarantee of a space. Some have off road parking to the rear served from a private road. Whilst there is no legal duty on a highway authority to provide on street parking we have relocated all the parking for these households into Denmark Road nearby and have provided them with exclusive residents parking spaces, free permits and visitors vouchers. These spaces can also be used by carers who can apply for a free Carers Permit.

Over 700 letters were delivered to residents along the London Road and in nearby streets prior to the scheme being implemented. These included plans, instructions for how to apply for free parking permits and details of our web site and email address for consultation feedback. Two officers have spoken with and emailed Mr Young, as recently as 27th August.

A Temporary Traffic Regulation Order process has been used to implement the parking changes quickly and deliver the whole scheme

	<p>within the timescale required by the government. Within 18 months the council will carry out a further legal consultation to seek feedback from all stakeholders before taking a decision on whether to make the changes permanent.</p> <p>Serious consideration was given to these parking changes, which affect a small number of residents along the whole route. The changes have not been done lightly, but as a key part of delivering strategic policy to support the Covid-19 recovery by building back greener and ensuring the integrity of the whole cycle route without compromising safety of cyclists. We will give serious consideration to all consultation feedback and are willing to explore ways in which the council could assist residents in the area to address any remaining concerns about disabled access, loading and unloading.</p>
<p>16. Questioner's name: Dr. Michael Gibson</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>As a cyclist myself, I am concerned that the proposed changes will in fact bringing greater risk to both myself as a cyclist, and to pedestrians, as with the (well-intentioned) removal of traffic islands and the speed camera on London Road, speeding will become both more frequent, and more acute, given that London Road is straight and wide, and would be easy to drive along at speeds of up to 50mph.</p> <p><i>- will you consider introducing a 20mph speed limit, and replacing the previous speed camera? (As has been proposed in the letter from Simon and Josephine Sanders of 106, London Road).</i></p>	<p>As explained in my response to Question 15, there are elements of the scheme that are not yet complete. Once these are in place they will significantly affect the look and feel of the road. Wider cycle lanes with no parked vehicles will make the road safer for cyclists and make it feel narrower for motorists.</p> <p>Traffic islands cause vehicles to move towards to kerb – thereby squeezing cyclists</p> <p>Speed monitoring will be carried out and if there is evidence of increased traffic speeds then further measures will be considered, including the use of speed cameras.</p> <p>In setting speed limits councils are required to consider national guidance issued by the Department for Transport - Setting Local Speed Limits. It is unlikely that the top of London Road (near Hillfield</p>

	Gardens) would meet the requirements to qualify for a 20mph limit.
17. Questioner's name: Dr. Michael Gibson	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>I note that in Gloucestershire County Council's <i>Values and Behaviours Framework</i> (available at https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2085350/svrshir160-pcparton-documents-values-and-behaviours-framework.pdf), under the empowerment section, the first value is "You are customer focused and seek to empower yourself, colleagues and our communities to achieve the greatest possible outcomes", and that the counterexample given is "You do not take the time to listen and understand".</p> <p>-How was it possible to propose changes to parking without consultation, while aiming to subscribe to an ethos of taking time to listen and understand?</p>	<p>As I explained in my response to Question 15, the parking has been amended using a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order process and the consultation process is not over.</p> <p>We have written to all residents and given them a contact number and social distancing email address where comments can be submitted so that we can consider these as we monitor the scheme. We are keen to hear the views of all stakeholders in the community and from all road users.</p>
18. Questioner's name: Christabel Young	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor / Colin Chick
<p>With reference to the new cycle lane 100-118 London Road that has removed the residents street parking/waiting/loading.</p> <p>My name is Christabel Young, as a resident of this row I would like to put the following question forward regarding the removal of street parking on this row of houses:</p> <p>Will you reinstate the former street parking on this row? I know that the safety of cyclists is a priority but will you take the needs of residents and associated citizens with disabilities, limited mobility or with young families as a necessary priority</p>	<p>I refer you to my response to Question 15.</p>

19. Questioner's name: Rhiannon Gibson	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor / Colin Chick
<p>Whilst supportive of cycle routes in general, I am particularly concerned about the safety, sustainability and practicality of the alternative parking on offer.</p> <p>Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will you install cameras and improve lighting on Denmark Rd?</i> • this is especially important for younger residents and more vulnerable adults returning late at night - it is a significant walk along poorly lit streets back to London Rd • <i>If you are expecting us to regularly park using Royal Lane, will you also install cameras and improve lighting there?</i> • Royal Lane is not a safe place to regularly be getting out of a car to open a gate, it is a known hot spot for crime. <p>Practicality and availability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will you make the 'permit only' parking be restricted to 'residents only' for the whole 24 hour period?</i> • <i>Will you guarantee the number of spaces available?</i> • if there is free parking overnight, as is currently the case, parking spaces will fill up and make it likely that residents will not even be able to park on Denmark Rd - and of course once again of special concern for younger residents, disabled visitors and more vulnerable adults 	<p>I refer to my response to Question 15.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>I will ask officers to review the street lighting in Denmark Road and Royal Lane.</p> <p>The new residents parking bays in Denmark Road apply on every day from 8am – 7pm. This is consistent with other residential areas, is practical to enforce and, in our experience, only needs to be extended if there is a specific local activity such as a cinema or restaurant. During these hours the bays are solely for the use of residents of 100 – 118 London Road and their visitors. Gloucestershire County Council, like other highway authorities, does not guarantee parking however the provision of residents' bays reduces the number of other motorists who can also park there, making it more likely that residents will be able to find a parking space.</p> <p>The decision to offer a free permit applies to the duration of the trial. At the end of the trial we will consult on whether to make the changes permanent and a decision will be taken on whether or not to retain or modify the arrangements.</p> <p>A resident permit costs £61.80 per year for the first permit (£1.19 per week). This can be paid by monthly direct debit.</p>

returning late at night

Sustainability and cost:

- *will you ensure no future fee for valid applicants?*
- there are already significant implications on the value of our houses with no parking/loading for 24 hours outside - adding a fee for parking permits is simply another reason why families would not choose to live on this terrace.

20. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders

Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor

Please clarify the signage, prohibitions, restrictions and suspensions that you intend to enforce outside of the row of terrace houses from 100 to 118 London Road, as the information provided has been ambiguous and contradictory?

A temporary parking restriction is in place comprising double yellow lines and a loading ban between 7am – 10am & 4pm – 7pm.

The cycle lane is mandatory so it is an offence for anyone to drive a motor vehicle into the cycle lane or to traverse the white line between the cycle lane and the traffic lane.

Using the temporary traffic regulation orders, no waiting at anytime restrictions have been introduced to reinforce the mandatory cycle lane and the council is looking to introduce loading restrictions to align with this.

21. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders

Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor

Please explain from when you intend to enforce, and what consultations will be afforded to those residents impacted to enable changes to be made where reasonable and appropriate?

I refer to my response to question 15.

In line with normal practice enforcement will initially comprise a short period of issuing warning notices once the scheme is completed, to enable people to familiarise themselves with the new arrangements. After this period Penalty Charge Notices will be issued to vehicles parked in contravention of the restrictions. The council operates a

	parking appeals process and will consider each case on its own merits.
22. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
When will you remove the mandatory cycle lane introduced outside the row of terrace houses from 100 to 118 London Road, where the road width is greater, and replace with an advisory cycle lane (broken white line) and allow loading/unloading and waiting as per the previous restrictions?	I refer to my response to Question 15.
23. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>If you will not remove these restrictions, and we can only assume at this time that there will be no loading/unloading, or waiting, 24 hours per day, 7 days per week and 52 weeks per year; then please explain how you will ameliorate the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No safe location outside of the property for children to be dropped off and collected from our property? • No safe location outside of the property for visitors with mobility difficulties to visit our property when driving or being driven? • No safe location outside of the property for deliveries of goods (food, etc) which have increased in both frequency and necessity post COVID- 19? • No safe location outside of the property for essential service providers ("non-emergency" such as plumber, electrician, removals, etc)? 	I refer to my response to Question 15.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a member of our family or future resident was a Blue Badge holder, and needed to apply for an accessible parking bay at the front of the property, this may no longer be possible? • Restrictions that prohibit the safe, practicable and attractive use of the homes on 100 to 118 London Road (terrace of grade II listed Georgian town houses) as family dwellings, will risk the future investments that are key to the conservation, management and regeneration of these properties. Family occupancy, whilst supporting diversity, also provides benefit of investment to maintain and restore these buildings and gardens, including original features, within this conservation area and so supporting the Gloucester Heritage Strategy. How will you avoid these properties from falling into disrepair or neglect if families can no longer live in them? 	
24. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>If you will not remove the restrictions, and will only accommodate permit parking arrangements in Denmark Road, then please explain how you will address the below concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location is poorly lit and at greater risk of vandalism and theft – will you introduce improve lighting and install cameras? • Permit only parking is restricted from 8am-7pm and therefore may be occupied overnight with non-permit holders thus not able to use – will you make it a restricted 24 hours permit only parking zone? • No guaranteed parking and permits may be over allocated 	<p>I refer to my response to Question 15.</p>

<p>during restricted times considering visitors, etc – will you allocate specific numbered spaces to a property?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will you guarantee no future charges for this alternative arrangement? 	
<p>25. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>We are concerned that some of the changes made will create a greater risk to cyclists and pedestrians, due to the increased speed of motorists and removal of the safe haven crossing points. In our personal experience as both pedestrians and cyclists, we have the following concerns which we feel could be ameliorated with the introduction of a 20-mph zone, and instead of a mandatory cycle lane, in key locations that are low risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the speed camera has already resulted in a number of cars driving at a speed in excess of 30mph • Removal of the traffic island restrictions, which reduced speed as well as enabling a safe haven for crossing pedestrians • Increased risk to pedestrians due to removal of safe haven crossing points. Although replaced with a zebra crossing we have found the existing crossing outside of the England's Glory Pub on many occasions does not slow and stop traffic when trying to cross. <p>Please explain on what basis these concerns were considered during the development of the proposed changes, and why it was chosen not to introduce a 20-mph zone on London Road and on</p>	<p>I refer to my responses to Questions 15 and 16.</p>

what specific grounds the mandatory 24-hour cycle lane only, was preferred and subsequently adopted?	
26. Questioner's name: Josephine Sanders	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
Will you monitor or survey during the trial any "data" to demonstrate safety improvements (or not) and consider again, introduction of a 20-mph zone during this trial?	I refer to my response to Question 16.
27. Questioner's name: Allan Barker	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
The creation of a mandatory cycle lane in London Road will deny any parking whatsoever outside our home, even for loading. This will prevent access by vehicles such as delivery drivers, postal services, visits from wheelchair visitors and professionals such as social workers, and non-emergency medical staff. Can the council suggest a solution or changes to the mandatory cycle lane that will permit us access to these services and needs?	I refer to my response to Question 15.
28. Questioner's name: Joanna Barker	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
My question is in relation to the London Road cycle lane scheme , where a Mandatory Cycle Lane has replaced parking bays in front of a terrace of Grade II listed Georgian houses (100-118 London Road). This denies the residents legal vehicular access to their homes, meaning that they are unable to deliver people (able bodied or otherwise), goods such as building/maintenance/gardening materials, or even the family's grocery shopping, to the door (closest parking provision will be a 5 minute walk away for the able-bodied) According to the <u>Gloucester heritage strategy 2019-2029</u> on the subject of the difficulty of maintaining Listed Buildings:	I refer to my response to Question 15.

“Harmful alterations can cause incremental harm over time and can create the impression of a degraded environment, which in turn can be a barrier to investment.”

Does the Council recognise that this erosion of the householders’ rights to access to their homes causes not just incremental harm, but a seriously damaging blow to the future viability of these historic homes, which is likely to be a major barrier to investment, and contribute the degrading of these historic family homes?

What action will the council take to prevent the degrading of Gloucester’s Heritage in this particular instance?

Please confirm receipt of my question for council, and I look forward to receiving considered responses during the meeting on 9 September.

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNTY COUNCIL – 9 September 2020
Members' Questions

<p>1. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Tim Harman</p>
<p>Staff in elderly persons care homes are now being tested for COVID-19 anti-bodies. Can you please provided data to include how many tests have been done so far and how many tests proved positive or negative?</p>	<p>As of 2nd September 2020 1,801 staff working in care homes in Gloucestershire have had anti-body testing (of approximately 5,800 staff; 31%). Of these 323 were positive (17.9%).</p> <p>It is important to note that there is still insufficient evidence to show that a positive antibody test means immunity to further COVID-19 infections. In addition, the numbers of people testing positive should be treated with caution as we do not have comprehensive data to compare the data to at the current time, and we do not know where people who test positive caught the virus from.</p>
<p>2. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>On the 7th of April a press release was issued by the county council in which you were quoted. The press release reported that the county council was helping the NHS Hospital Trust transfer patients from hospital into elderly persons care homes within three hours.</p> <p>Considering that it was known at the time that some elderly people were not being tested for Covid-19 infection and that some subsequently died, why didn't you say no to such untested transfers?</p>	<p>The county council followed all applicable guidance from Public Health England in working to support Gloucestershire's NHS.</p>
<p>3. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>How many residents in the county elderly persons care homes have died from Covid-19 since the beginning of the pandemic?</p>	<p>ONS data shows that sadly between 1st March and 21st August there</p>

	<p>were 274 deaths in care homes (of all types – both older people and younger) in Gloucestershire where COVID19 was mentioned on the death certificate. We do not know how many of these people will have died from Covid, as opposed to other causes.</p> <p>There are 113 care homes delivering care to those in the frail elderly category, as defined by CQC.</p>
4. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles
<p>Can you please state what the agreed budget for services vulnerable children was for the following years and what the financial outcome (final spend) was when the accounts were closed?</p> <p>2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20</p>	<p>15/16 Budget £60.1m; Outturn £62.2m; Variance £2.1m</p> <p>16/17 Budget £61.1m; Outturn £65.8m; Variance £4.7m</p> <p>17/18 Budget £64.3m; Outturn £71.4m; Variance £7.1m</p> <p>18/19 Budget £80.7m; Outturn £90.1m; Variance £9.4m</p> <p>19/20 Budget £88.7m; Outturn £101.9m; Variance £13.2m</p>
5. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles
How many young people are in the council's care?	777 as of the last performance report in July.
6. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles
How many of those young people in your answer to the previous question are placed out of county and what is the cost to this council?	The July 2020 performance report shows that 599 children were placed in county and 177 (23%) were placed out of county. Whilst the volume of children being looked after by the council has continued to increase year on year, we are accommodating more children in county than in previous years.

	The costs as shown on the external placements tracker for children placed OOC during July 2020 was £1,798,656.
7. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Richard Boyles
Under your leadership will you ever turn around the failing children's services? You only have until May 2021 to do so.	Children's Services continues to make progress in improving services to children and young people. This progress of course cannot be formally recognised until GCC Children's Services are next inspected. The timing of re-inspection is still uncertain due to Ofsted inspections having been suspended due to Covid-19. What I can tell you is that a number of LAs nationally (40) who were rated inadequate at their last inspection or who have not been inspected for a while will receive a "Focussed Visit" during the autumn. Given that we are an inadequate rated LA and we have not been inspected since February 2017, we are likely to be one of those 40 LAs nationally who will receive a visit. The focussed visits will beginning the week commencing 28 th September so we could get a visit as early as the first week in October. However, even a focussed visit will not lead to a change in rating as this will only be possible following a full ILACS re-inspection. The latest information coming out of Ofsted is that the full re-inspection of children's services will not recommence until the new year and possible not until April 2021. Significant improvements have been made to our services for children and young people which we are informed about during reports to the Improvement Board, CFOSC and other forum but however significant those improvements they will not be formally recognised until a full re-inspection. I would also like to reassure members that although progress is being made we recognise that there is still some way to go to become a "good" service and we are certainly not complacent in our approach to Improvement.
8. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith
How many gullies in the city of Gloucester were cleaned during the Covid-19 lockdown period?	Since 1 st April 8836 gullies have been cleaned in the Gloucester.

<p>9. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>What plans other than on London Road, do you have to improve the cycling infrastructure in the city of Gloucester</p>	<p>The priority for improving cycling infrastructure in Gloucestershire is the delivery of the B4063 Gloucester to Cheltenham cycle route. Strategically this is the heart of the county's cycling network; a clear and definite 'spine' from which other routes can be connected. We have applied for funding for this scheme under the Tranche 2 bids of the Emergency Active Travel Fund from DfT, as well as from the LEP and Highways England.</p> <p>Further to this, we have also applied to the same funding pot for two areas, which are part of the Central Severn Vale LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan) in Gloucester. The focus here is on linking the canal towpath to the city centre and London Road, with widened cycle lanes and footpaths on Southgate Street and other measures to remove barriers to cycling on Llanthony Road. The LCWIP itself has further cycling improvements through Gloucester.</p> <p>Local Transport Plan (Review) identifies a number of cycle scheme priorities for Gloucester, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gloucester – Cheltenham: cycle access improvements for A40 Corridor between Cheltenham and Gloucester • A38 Outer Ring Road, Gloucester: cycle access improvements <p>Gloucester – Tewkesbury: cycle access improvements to the Gloucester – Tewkesbury corridor.</p>
<p>10. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>As a city resident, would you support the abolition of Gloucester City Council in favour of a single unitary council serving the whole of Gloucestershire, ending the current two tier system?</p>	<p>As a city resident, and as leader of the county council, I would favour whichever system is fit for the future. Certainly I will look closely at the points made by his colleague Cllr Harris, along with the leaders of Cheltenham and Stroud councils.</p>

11. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Lynden Stowe
What is the expected additional cost, in this financial year, to this council for its response to the Covid-19 pandemic?	The financial impact of COVID 19 on the council (which includes, additional costs, reduced income and unachievable savings) is £47.2m.
12. Questioner's name: Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Respondent's name: Cllr Lynden Stowe
Could you please list all additional Covid-19 grant funding this council has received from the government or has been promised?	<p>Covid Emergency Grant £31.425m Test and Trace Grant £2.222m Infection Control Grant £7.752 Emergency Assistance Grant £0.558m Covid Bus subsidy Grant £0.461m Home to School Transport Grant £0.550m Reimbursement of Lost Income £4.1m (estimate)</p> <p>So £47.1m in total.</p>
13. Questioner's name: Cllr Joe Harris	Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne
<p>Two weeks ago the GCC Comms team released an internal email to all County Council staff and councillors criticising three District Council Leaders for exploring options for unitary government in Gloucestershire. This notice was signed by the Conservative Group Leader, Mark Hawthorne, and the County Council Chief Executive.</p> <p>Does the Conservative Group Leader agree that this was clearly a political statement and therefore inappropriate for the Comms team to be instructed to write this release and that it was extremely inappropriate for the Chief Executive to be dragged into a political situation?"</p>	It is very telling Cllr Harris sees the issue of local government reorganisation in Gloucestershire as a party political matter. I make no apology for working with the Chief Executive to keep staff updated on the latest proposals, and will continue to do so.

<p>14. Questioner's name: Cllr Paul Hodgkinson</p> <p>In a recent High Court ruling, HH Judge Russen QC stated that there is now “sufficiently clear and apparent factual indication of a breach of public procurement rules” in relation to GCC’s Javelin Park contract.</p> <p>Does Councillor Nigel Moor agree with HHJ Russen’s assessment that procurement rules appear to have been broken and what are the potential implications for the recovery of taxpayer’s money from UBB?</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>The full sentence, of which this is a strangely selected fragment, makes it clear Judge Russen has stated nothing of the sort. The purpose of the preliminary hearing was to establish if CR4C could bring its case against the Council and the Judge ruled that it could not. The Court did not consider whether there had been a breach of the Procurement Regulations by the Council.</p>
<p>15. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Department for transport figures recently released show that the number of cyclists killed or seriously injured on British roads has increased by 11% over the past decade to more than 4,000. The number of fatalities last year was just under 100.</p> <p>For each of the past 10 years (to 2019), please supply the equivalent statistics</p> <p>a) for Gloucestershire b) for Cheltenham c) for Gloucester.</p> <p>If available, please also provide annual figures on the % of journeys made by bicycle for a) b) and c) - or at least an indication over time of the relevant trend.</p> <p>Has local cycling become more or less dangerous in the county - in particular in its two main urban areas?</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Vernon Smith</p> <p>The following table shows the statistics of cycling injuries provided to GCC from Police records.</p> <p>Comparison of individual years shows considerable annual variation. Whilst this could suggest a small increase in cycling KSI casualties in recent years, these figures have also been influenced by changes made by the DfT at the end of 2015 to its method of reporting road accidents, since when increases of about 20% in the number of serious casualties have been reported.</p> <p>Cheltenham: 2010 – 7 2011 – 9 2012 – 11 2013 – 2 2014 – 4 2015 – 9 2016 – 8 2017 – 9 2018 – 11 2019 – 10</p> <p>Gloucester: 2010 – 4</p>

2011 – 10
2012 – 11
2013 – 2
2014 – 13
2015 – 10
2016 – 7
2017 – 11
2018 – 10
2019 – 16

County:

2010 – 25
2011 – 35
2012 – 44
2013 – 15
2014 – 25
2015 – 35
2016 – 31
2017 – 42
2018 – 40
2019 – 46

Gloucestershire County Council has a network of 15 cycle counter sites that monitor local use. The total average daily count from ten* of these sites is shown below.

2009 – 1524
2010 – 1413
2011 – 1483
2012 – 1484
2013 – 1541
2014 – 1686
2015 – 1667
2016 – 1694
2017 – 1744
2018 – 1690
2019 - 1795

* counters at some sites have recently been upgraded and are more sensitive. To

	<p>make a valid year on year comparison only data from 10 sites has been used.</p> <p>These sites do not cover the whole county and tend to be located where there is greater potential for cycling. In these locations there has been an 18% growth in cycle use between 2009 and 2019.</p> <p>Further data analysis and time is therefore required to reliably ascertain whether cycling has become more or less safe in the urban areas.</p>
<p>16. Questioner's name: Cllr Eva Ward</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>Could the Cabinet Member please provide a brief update on any progress with the disposal of the former care homes, Southfields and Wyatt House in Stroud.</p>	<p>Both properties are being reviewed at the current time for the re purposing / consideration for re use by other GCC services priory to any disposal.</p>
<p>17. Questioner's name: Cllr Eva Ward</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Mark Hawthorne</p>
<p>Whilst I am aware that GCC has good policies concerning staff support for and recruitment of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff, will these policies now be reviewed in the light of the recent Black Lives Matter protests?</p>	<p>We are in the process of reviewing our policies regarding the recruitment and support of all those with a protected characteristics including Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff. We are in conversation with the Black Workers Network as well as other employee networks so that they are involved with these reviews and can help us proactively encourage the recruitment of Black, Asian and Minority staff where they are underrepresented in our teams.</p> <p>For context – our workforce data shows that we do represent the County's BAME population across the majority of grades except senior officers where BAME staff are underrepresented. Therefore we are looking at targeted activity to support development into these roles including mentoring, leadership programmes and targeted recruitment. Any selection would remain fair and transparent but we aim to encourage applications from underrepresented group and the development programmes give BAME colleagues proactive support to reach their potential.</p>

18. Questioner's name: Cllr Iain Dobie	Respondent's name: Cllr Patrick Molyneux
<p>Urgent Question</p> <p>What is the advice which GCC has received from its own or the government's lawyers about a single individual's letter requesting a Judicial Review to stop construction of the new Leckhampton High School - will this vexatious spanner-in-the-works be quickly thrown out in order that worried parents can apply with confidence for their children to attend their local community secondary school?</p>	<p>As I've said publicly, the council is strongly opposed to this judicial review, and will robustly defend its position. The new school in Leckhampton is a £30m investment into the future of Cheltenham children, as well as being the lowest carbon school we have ever built. I stand with local parents and will fight this tooth and claw.</p> <p>Publishing the council's legal advice before this issue is resolved risks undermining the councils legal position. Whilst I appreciate that is not Cllr Dobie's intention – I hope he understands why I cannot do as he asks.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank