

CABINET – 27 January 2021

Public Questions

1. Questioner's name: Chloe Turner	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p data-bbox="107 363 1034 437">Agenda item 7, Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p data-bbox="107 475 1070 584">Thank you for publishing the Budget Consultation Report (Appendix 3) reporting the outcomes of the recent public consultation on the draft Budget.</p> <p data-bbox="107 622 936 695">I note the huge volume of comments on the need for more investment in tackling climate change:</p> <ul data-bbox="206 734 1070 1212" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="206 734 1070 989">• Question 2 (“Would you like to give us any feedback on the priorities in question 1 and on any specific areas you feel we should spend the money on, which aren’t already listed?”): 49 comments, of 183, have been grouped as concerning “More investment in tackling climate change and protecting the environment and habitat, and better recycling”<li data-bbox="206 1027 1070 1212">• Question 4 (“Do you have any further comments you would like to make about our proposed 2021/22 budget?”): 38 comments, of 160, have been grouped as concerning “More investment in tackling climate change, to improve active travel and protect our environment” <p data-bbox="107 1251 1070 1434">It is very clear that your electorate want greater financial investment in tackling climate change than was envisaged in the Budget presented to them for consultation – how and where has the 2021/22 Budget been amended following the consultation (in terms of investment, not the wording of the strategy), to reflect this</p>	<p data-bbox="1102 363 2063 730">As a result of the feedback we have incorporated within the Council Strategy our ambition for Gloucestershire to be carbon-neutral county by 2050, our intention to make sure future growth is delivered in a way that is consistent with that commitment, and our promise to back that commitment up by working with partners to lead a wide-ranging Climate Change Strategy. The draft budget already included investments such as a £1m capital fund to reduce the carbon footprint of new schools development. On top of those commitments, we have since added an additional £6.470m to the capital budget for the B4063 cycle route.</p>

feedback?	
2. Questioner's name: Chris White	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>a) The Local Transport Plan does not appear to include any reference to non-exhaust emissions With the council declaring a 'Climate Emergency' how will the council take into account of 'non-exhaust emissions' from road vehicles when planning any new road schemes and will these emissions be detailed in Business Case, if not why? References - detailed in the recent documents from the OECD and Defra</p> <p>http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=ENV/EPOC/WPIEEP(2020)4/FINAL&docLanguage=En https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat09/1907101151_20190709_Non_Exhaust_Emissions_typeset_Final.pdf</p> <p>b) This links to fact the electric vehicles will have a tendency to be heavier than others based on the battery weight, therefore, even greater amounts of non-exhaust emissions. As the Council 'Local Transport Plan' talks a lot about how pollution will be reduced based on the use of electric vehicles, how will the Council take this into account?</p>	<p>a) LTP policy PD0.2, on Local Environmental Protection, sets out to tackle air pollution which is measured by District Councils in Gloucestershire against national air quality objectives. The LTP vision and objectives align with the environmental assessment carried out under the Integrated Sustainability Assessment Appraisal. Full Business Cases which include an assessment of the environmental impacts of a scheme, in line with Government guidance, are generally produced for large transport schemes. For qualifying schemes we will comply with the government's requirements at the time.</p> <p>b) The Local Transport Plan has a clear emphasis on reducing CO2 emissions and improving air quality. It seeks to achieve this through a combination of moving to ultra low emission vehicles and promoting a shift from the private car to active modes and public transport. GCC will continue to be led by national policy guidance on emissions, including those caused by non-exhaust emissions, and ensure that they are reflected in transport policy and environmental assessments as further guidance becomes available. During the next year we propose to start installing more on street electric vehicle charge points and are funding further work into reducing the impact of transport impact on carbon emissions in the county.</p>

3. Questioner's name: Max Wilkinson	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>Cabinet members will be aware of the Gear Change report. It is a document that sets a positive direction for transport policy. It has been welcomed by active travel campaigners and by advocates for sustainable transport from across the political spectrum. The report includes a foreword by Boris Johnson and we can therefore assume it has backing from the top of government. Please can the cabinet member outline how the principles of the Gear Change report are being applied as part of the LTP?</p>	<p>The LTP states on p. 66 that “The new DfT ‘Gear Change’ document and the DfT LTN1/20 will influence how cycle infrastructure is designed in Gloucestershire going forward.” LTN 1/20 refers to the cycle design guidance that was published alongside the Gear Change document. The Principles of the new Cycle Network & Infrastructure Guidelines (DfT LTN1/20) are depicted in Figure PD2 (E) in the LTP and LTP Policy PD 2.1 – Gloucestershire’s Cycle Network aims to ensure “that all cycle infrastructure will meet approved design standards; for example Manual for Streets (MfS), LCWIP and DfT cycle design guidance LTN1/20 and best practice (...).”</p>
4. Questioner's name: Chris McFarling	Respondent's name: Cllr Patrick Molyneux
<p>Agenda item 7, Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>I note that the Council are recruiting an economic growth officer to help implement the future <i>sustainable(?)</i> economic growth strategy (annex 1.3 pg 119).</p> <p>Cornwall Council have invested in officers to enable the use of Kate Raworth’s doughnut economics wheel in supporting wiser, economically carbon-literate decision-making processes.</p> <p>When will the cabinet consider investing in such an alternative economic model; one that enables us all to thrive without destroying the planet?</p>	<p>The County Council has committed to become carbon neutral by 2030 and are firmly on track to beat this target, as well as supporting the whole county to be carbon neutral by 2045. I strongly disagree with the idea that this has to be at the expense of growing our economy, and of protecting local jobs and businesses – and indeed much of that economic growth can come from delivering the infrastructure and services we will depend upon for carbon neutrality.</p>

5. Questioner's name: Karl Hobley	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>The Connecting Cheltenham report was produced by SYSTRA to inform strategic transport planning in Cheltenham, focusing on sustainable transport in line with the county's stated ambitions for the environment and public health. Please could the cabinet member outline which specific proposals from the Connecting Cheltenham report are included in the LTP?</p>	<p>The Connecting Cheltenham Report has significantly influenced the development of the LTP and is directly referred to in the Central Severn Vale Connecting Places Strategy. The guiding principles of the Connecting Cheltenham report align with LTP policy and expected outcomes, in terms of strategic connection, multi-modal interchange, improving cycling and providing the basis for liveable streets that encourage physical activity and mode shift, especially for new development. LTP policies and initiatives identified are already starting to be delivered, such as walking and cycling improvements on the A40 to help allow for the new Cyber Park, improved rail services to London from Cheltenham and rail station improvements, the securing of significant funds towards the B4063 cycle route between Cheltenham-Gloucester.</p>
6. Questioner's name: Karl Hobley	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor/
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan states that Cheltenham already has an "established cycling network". Can the Cabinet member please supply a list of the elements of the current network that comply with the standards set out in the Conservative Government's Gear Change report?</p>	<p>Alongside the Gear Change report, Government published new cycle design guidance (LTN 1/20) in July 2020. The vast majority of the cycle network in Gloucestershire will therefore have been designed before LTN 1/20 was published. The LTP recognised that the new DfT 'Gear Change' document and the DfT LTN1/2050 will influence how cycle infrastructure is designed in Gloucestershire going forward.</p>
7. Questioner's name: Karl Hobley	Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>School streets trials are taking place in the county and the cabinet member has spoken about these in positive terms. Given the need to reduce traffic at peak times, improve air quality outside schools and promote active lifestyles among children, why does the revised</p>	<p>We are conducting a trial into the effects of school streets –and whilst that's going well it's important to give that time to see the full results. The LTP policy recognises at a strategic level the need to investigate community based vehicle restriction zones, such as the School Streets trial, in order to protect vulnerable highway users</p>

<p>LTP not reference any future ambitions for the expansion of school street schemes to more schools?</p>	<p>from a safety and health perspective.</p>
<p>8. Questioner's name: Carol Kambites</p>	<p>Respondent's name: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>We welcome the commitment in the Local Transport Plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 rather than by 2050. Bearing in mind that rail transport must play an important part in achieving this aim, the local and national support for the project and the economic and social benefits it would bring to the Stroud valleys (the third largest urban area in Gloucestershire) why is the re-opening of Stroudwater Station at the Bristol Road site in Stonehouse not a Priority Scheme in the LTP? '</p>	<p>The LTP strongly supports a new station south of Gloucester, and commits to look at all the options to deliver that. I would have expected that supporters of a station at Stonehouse, who are presumably confident that is the best site, would welcome that commitment.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 1: Cllr Phil Awford</p> <p>Agenda Item 10: Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please consider a new bid through the LTP process to solve the frequent flooding of the A417 from Over to Maisemore</p> <p>This is a crucial highway with 12,000 movements a day and it's closure leads to major detours for the travelling Public It impacts on businesses , education a the wider communities</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Whilst the Local Transport Plan is not a bidding nor funding document, it does set out the transport strategy for the county up to 2041. I am well aware of the flooding incidents over several years along the A417 from Over to Maisemore and the associated inconvenience and economic implications that result. I am pleased to say that the scheme in question now features in the Local Transport Plan being presented to Cabinet. The County Council did make a bid to the Department for Transport's Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund in 2015 for such a scheme, but we were unfortunately unsuccessful. We will continue to seek out appropriate funding / bidding opportunities for this scheme in the future.</p>
<p>Question 2: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Council Strategy</p> <p>The Council Strategy repeatedly references the County Council's commitment, "that will see 35 million trees planted by 2030." Included in this figure is Gloucestershire County Council's commitment to plant one million trees, which was established 13 months ago.</p> <p>In order for us to understand if your current budget makes the Strategy deliverable, can the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning confirm how many trees the County Council has planted in the 13 months since making this commitment?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>As Cllr Dobie will be aware, GCC supports Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership in their Gloucestershire Tree Strategy, along with a range of partners, including Forest of Dean Borough, Gloucester City and Cotswold Borough councils, among others.</p> <p>As Cllr Dobie will appreciate, the council's focus has been on Covid for much of that period, but I would expect to see a significant increase in planting in this year's growing season.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 3: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Page 123 Commissioning Intentions 2021/22</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm to date, how many trees have been removed in response to the ash die back programme and what number of these trees have been replanted. Can the Cabinet Member please also confirm that these replanted trees will not count against the one million / 35 million tree planting programme.</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Since June 2021 GCC Highways has removed 2,400 infected Ash Trees which posed a danger to highway users. GCC Highways has consulted parish councils across the county inviting bids for re-planting during February/March 2021. The deadline for applications is 29th January 2021. Following this I will be in a position to announce the scale of re-planting.</p>
<p>Question 4: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>P 124, Community Infrastructure</p> <p>The Cabinet report references the delivery of School Street schemes in 2021/22. The Cabinet Member may be aware that local authorities outside London may be able to make use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) systems to enforce School Street restrictions, starting from this Summer. Will the Cabinet member commit to exploring this option, including the possible ringfencing of income derived from such systems to establish more school street schemes across our county?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Councils outside London don't have the legal powers to do this at present. If that legislation is changed, we will of course, look at this carefully.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 5: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Agenda item 8: Financial Monitoring Report</p> <p>P 267, Highways:</p> <p>The Financial Monitoring Report references the £865,000 provided by the Department of Transport’s Active travel fund, to be allocated for the Highways Capital Programme. This was the total awarded in the tranche 2 active travel fund, despite the County Council having requested more than £10 million.</p> <p>It is critical to understand why we don’t have £10 million to allocate into the Highways Capital Programme, as such can the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning please advise how Gloucestershire County Council’s bid was scored by the Department for Transport against its assessment framework and what feedback it received?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Cllr Dobie ought to acknowledge that officers deliberately submitted a speculative bid with the intention of giving us the best chance of attracting as much funding as possible. We knew it was ambitious – but it was worth trying. DfT feedback was that they didn’t see enough evidence of how the bid met their strategic objectives, or provided enough certainty of delivery. GCC has appealed, showing exactly how we believe that this was clearly demonstrated, and await a response.</p>
<p>Question 6: Cllr Iain Dobie</p> <p>Agenda item 8: Financial Monitoring Report</p> <p>P 267, Highways:</p> <p>Councillors have been advised that Gloucestershire County Council is appealing this decision, which may have a significant effect on the amount of money available to be allocated to the Highways Capital Programme. Can the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning advise on what grounds they are appealing the Department for Transport’s assessment, and how much you are hoping to recoup?</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p> <p>Please see my response to question 5.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 7: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Financial Monitoring Report</p> <p>P283, LTP scheme priorities</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan report identifies eight additional active travel schemes to be included in the final Local Transport Plan. Can the Cabinet member advise on the 16 schemes that weren't successful, and provide additional information on the eight schemes that are progressing to be included in the Local Transport Plan (i.e. indicative plans, lengths of schemes, potential costs etc)?</p>	<p>The LTP public consultation proposed a number of additional schemes, all of which have been through a scheme prioritisation process. Eight additional schemes were successful, the remaining schemes were not, due to a number of factors that include; strategic fit, value for money, high costs and limited wider benefits, lack of evidence to support a scheme, suitable alternatives and deliverability. It is important to note that this assessment was based on the information available at the time and does not preclude individual schemes to be re-considered in the future. The additional schemes listed in the Cabinet Report comply with delivering the expected outcomes and are all listed in the LTP Delivery chapter by indicative cost bands. These schemes remain at scoping stage with funding still required and will be progressed further to design stage as and when funding becomes available.</p>
<p>Question 8: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Financial Monitoring Report</p> <p>P283, LTP scheme priorities</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please confirm that the four unsuccessful schemes in the Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 bid (The Central Severn Vale, Tewkesbury connections, Stroud town centre and "Rural routes") will also feature in the final Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>The LTP discusses provision for cycling in 3 categories, ambition (cycle desire lines), LTP Schemes Priorities (strategic) and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan or LCWIP (local). Therefore, the LTP only includes those cycle schemes that are seen as strategic however, with clear references to the importance of LCWIPs and the schemes included in them. In fact, in recent bidding opportunities for cycling schemes (including ATF/2), Government explicitly asked about inclusion in LCWIPs, rather than in LTPs. For this reason, the Central Severn Vale scheme included in the ATF/2 bid was taken directly out of the CSV LCWIP. LCWIPs for Tewkesbury and Stroud are currently being prepared and the two schemes in the ATF Tranche 2 bid are included in them. Of the rural routes in the ATF Tranche 2 bid, the</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

	<p>Lydney to Parkend route is included in the LTP because of its strategic nature, linking two settlements. The Moreton scheme proposals in the ATF/2 bid are of a smaller nature and are therefore not explicitly stated in the LTP, but would fall under two more general LTP scheme packages for active travel improvements in Moreton, namely “An expanded local and strategic cycle network, linking (...) into Moreton and Cirencester in the Cotswolds (...)” and “Resolve pedestrian access arrangements in Moreton-in-Marsh”.</p>
<p>Question 9: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Financial Monitoring Report</p> <p>P283, LTP scheme priorities</p> <p>In 2017/18 I used my delegated “Highways Local” fund to pay for a professional engineering/financial feasibility study into creating what is now called the “Bournside Green Corridor”. This Amey study established that it is indeed feasible to convert a 600 metre stretch of GCC-owned former railway line running along the perimeter of the Bournside campus into a cycle/footpath extending existing off-road pathways (to Leckhampton in one direction and The Park in the other). This would clearly encourage walking and cycling to the county’s largest schools campus (comprising 1800 pupils at Bournside, plus pupils at Belmont and Bettridge schools). The case for this safely segregated, shovel-ready scheme has subsequently been strengthened by major new housing developments in Leckhampton - children from these homes are already attending Bournside and many more will likely follow.</p>	<p>It’s important that everything in the LTP is based on a fair and transparent professional assessment. I am told that officers looked at this scheme, but, given the cost of installing street lighting behind existing housing and the availability of other routes, it didn’t demonstrate sufficient value. I’m happy to arrange a meeting for Cllr Dobie to discuss this with officers in more detail.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Does the Cabinet Member agree that this scheme fits well with the government’s “Gear Change” vision for supporting sustainable travel, and thus that it is well overdue serious consideration for commissioning?</p>	
<p>Question 10: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Tim Harman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Containment Outbreak Management Fund</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member commit to use some of the “outbreak management fund”, or an alternative pot of money, to hold a public inquiry into the County Council’s handling of the Covid-19 pandemic, which has so far led to the tragic loss of 815 lives in Gloucestershire, including 345 in Gloucestershire’s care homes?</p>	<p>Public inquiries are initiated and funded by Government. Locally we have already completed a “lookback” into events in the first wave within our care homes. The details of this will be made available shortly, but the informal learning has already been shared and COMF money will be used to support the implementation of recommendations from the report (e.g. providing additional Infection Prevention support to the sector).</p>
<p>Question 11: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Tim Harman</p>
<p>Agenda Item 9: Containment Outbreak Management Fund</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member also commit to using some of the “outbreak management fund”, or an alternative pot of money, to run exercises to test our resilience to future outbreaks, and will you commit to sharing these results in full with the public, in order to be transparent on areas where this council needs to improve?</p>	<p>The Local Outbreak Management Plan was first exercised in June 2020. It underwent a light touch review at the end of 2020 which resulted in the publication of further sub-plans (which are operationally updated regularly). The plan will be further reviewed shortly to incorporate the additional national policy announcements in recent months (including community testing and vaccination). The Covid-19 Health Protection Board will then consider an appropriate mechanism to ensure the plan is fit for purpose; this may include exercises. In addition multi-agency exercises are also planned and run by the Gloucestershire Resilience Forum as Gloucestershire County Council continues to play a full and active roll in these exercises.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 12: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Carole Allaway Martin</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Adults budget, P146</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cut to the Adults budget, totalling £3,193,000, including a narrative explaining these figures. Please can the Cabinet Member also note that the breakdown, shared by the Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Public Health on 15 January, was insufficiently informative, and requires a great deal more explanation in order to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>The narrative can be found on page 30 and 31 of the MTFS document (within Annex 1.1 - Adults Commissioning Intentions), and in recognition that not all pressures can be addressed within the resources available and in the context of our intentions to improve outcomes, there are a number of areas set out which we will pursue as we seek to achieve financial balance in adult services. Page 31 also sets out the framework for managing that change and the governance structure provided by the Adult Single Programme.</p>
<p>Question 13: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Children and Families – Vulnerable Children budget, P147</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown of the anticipated income from the Children and Families – Vulnerable Children budget, totalling £4,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>The £4,000 represents a 2% increase in fees and charges relating to a number of areas but mostly relating to the safeguarding training traded service.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Question 14: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Richard Boyles</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Children and Families – Other Services budget, P148</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cuts to the Children and Families – Other Services budget, as well as the anticipated income, totalling £112,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>As P148 details this relates to two areas:</p> <p>Education Pensions: £100k - reduce the budget based on an assessment of the reduction in no. of pensioners and spouses based on age and trends – the current budget totals £3.6m and reductions in payments have been between £100k and £150k over the last few years.</p> <p>Income target - £12k - this represents a 2% increase in fees and charges relating to a number of areas including Education Psychology and Music service traded services.</p>
<p>Question 15: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 7 Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Economy, Environment and Infrastructure budget, P149</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cuts to the Economy, Environment and Infrastructure budget, as well as the anticipated income, totalling £447,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>The EE&I Reduction in the 2021-22 MTFS budget is made up of:</p> <p>£72,000 Reduced Food Waste Agreements payments to waste collection authorities.</p> <p>£375,000 represents increasing charges and fees in line with inflation.</p>
<p>Question 16: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p>	<p>This relates to an inflationary increase in fees and charges.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021**

<p>Community Safety budget, P150</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown of the anticipated income from the Community Safety budget, totalling £13,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	
<p>Question 17: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Kathy Williams</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Prevention & Wellbeing budget, P151-2</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cuts to the Prevention and Wellbeing budget, totalling £171,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>The budget papers on p152 provide a detailed breakdown of the savings to be made and through the realigning of some budget areas this provides the opportunity to invest in priority areas.</p>
<p>Question 18: Cllr Nigel Robbins</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p>Corporate Resources budget, P153</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cuts to the Corporate Resources budget, as well as the anticipated income, totalling £961,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p>These savings are generated from a combination of service efficiencies and additional income.</p> <p>This includes savings in AMPS - £150k, ICT Wide Area Network upgrade - £175k, Income from inflationary increases - £102k, Income / savings by using for Quayside house - £110k, Savings from use of external support £103k, smaller efficiencies across corporate resources - £321k</p>

MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 27 Jan 2021

Question 19: Cllr Nigel Robbins	Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe
<p data-bbox="98 268 1077 344">Agenda item 7: Council Strategy and Medium Term Financial Strategy</p> <p data-bbox="98 379 1077 419">Technical and Countywide budget, P154</p> <p data-bbox="98 454 1077 598">Can the Cabinet Member please provide a detailed breakdown of the proposed cuts to the Technical and Countywide budget, totalling £1,860,000, including a narrative explaining these figures which is sufficiently detailed to enable proper scrutiny.</p>	<p data-bbox="1077 268 2051 308">Please refer to the report. Page 154</p> <p data-bbox="1077 343 2051 454">The majority of the saving is a £1.7 million reduction in Local Government Pension Scheme employee contribution rate following the actuary's tri-annual evaluation.</p> <p data-bbox="1077 489 2051 566">The remaining £160k is a reduction in the MTC savings contingency to reflect reduced savings target in 2021/22.</p>