

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 10 October 2018**

<p>Question 1: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Replacement and refresh of firefighting Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</p> <p>The report mentions that 50 firefighters were involved in the assessments of the PPE at the fire service college.</p> <p>How many of the testers were female firefighters?</p>	<p>30% of those taking part in the assessments were female.</p>
<p>Question 2: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 8: Replacement and refresh of firefighting Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</p> <p>In the report it suggests the GFRS could maintain existing PPE provision and continue to explore the current market for other supply options.</p> <p>What assessment has GFRS done to consider this suggestion?</p>	<p>We looked at the idea of delaying getting new equipment, but the assessment we conducted showed that this was the best approach. It is right that we are investing in providing the equipment to keep our firefighters safe whilst they carry out their difficult and dangerous role.</p>
<p>Question 3: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 8, Replacement and refresh of firefighting Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</p> <p>The report mentions that 29 fire authorities are using the Kent Fire & Rescue Service collaborative arrangement to purchase PPE.</p> <p>There are 51 fire authorities in the UK. What arrangements are the other fire and rescue authorities making to purchase PPE outside of the Kent collaborative arrangement?</p>	<p>The options available to other Fire and Rescue Services to procure PPE are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Single Service (stand alone) 2. Local collaboration with other Fire and Rescue Services; or as on this occasion, as part of the National Fire Chief's Council (NFCC) supported collaborative framework.

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 10 October 2018**

<p>Question 4: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>The current contractor is APCOA. How have they performed in meeting their current contract obligations?</p>	<p>APCOA have always addressed any minor issues quickly and professionally. Overall performance has been good.</p>
<p>Question 5: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>How many CEOs are employed by APCOA and how many vacancies are there?</p>	<p>The council doesn't employ CEO's (Civil Enforcement Officers) or parking wardens under contract and only pay for the 'patrol hours' we need every month. How many people they employ is a matter for the provider.</p>
<p>Question 6: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10, Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>In the report it mentions that the cost of enforcement is £1.40 for every £1 collected via a PCN.</p> <p>Could you please provide a detailed financial breakdown to prove this point?</p>	<p>The current average income per issued PCN is £30.90. The current cost of parking enforcement, divided by the number of PCN's, is £44.81, giving an approximate ratio of 1:1.47.</p>
<p>Question 7: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>The report says: 'Furthermore, the supplier is able to employ staff outside of the council's pay scales and employee benefits thus further reducing costs.'</p>	<p>We don't set the wages for APCOA staff, although they are all paid at or above the Living Wage, with the potential to earn bonuses for attendance and customer service.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 10 October 2018**

<p>What are the current pay scales and employee benefits that Civil Enforcement Officers get who are employed by APCOA, and how does this compare with terms and conditions that would apply if CEOs were employed directly by Gloucestershire County Council?</p>	
<p>Question 8: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Consultation on the development of a Waste Tipping Away Policy</p> <p>What date will Javelin Park Incinerator become fully operational?</p>	<p>Summer 2019</p>
<p>Question 9: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Consultation on the development of a Waste Tipping Away Policy</p> <p>What date will each of the landfills stop receiving household waste?</p>	<p>The landfills will stop receiving waste from Gloucestershire County Council when the Javelin Park Energy from Waste plant becomes fully operational.</p>
<p>Question 10: Cllr Jeremy Hilton</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Consultation on the development of a Waste Tipping Away Policy</p> <p>What financial impact will the opening of the Javelin Park incinerator have on the six waste collecting authorities across the county, and could you confirm whether they will be required to direct deliver outside of their authority areas to Javelin Park?</p>	<p>Waste delivery arrangements to Javelin Park are currently being finalised in consultation with the Waste Collection Authorities through the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 10 October 2018**

<p>Question 11: Cllr Joe Harris</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>Can you please break down the ratio of £1 income to £1.40 spent on enforcement?</p>	<p>See the answer to question 6 from Cllr Hilton.</p>
<p>Question 12: Cllr Joe Harris</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Dave Norman</p>
<p>Agenda item 10: Proposed Parking Operational Services Contract</p> <p>Is this £1: £1.40 ratio an average just for GCC or across the six districts as well?</p>	<p>Just for GCC.</p>
<p>Question 13: Cllr Lesley Williams</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 6: Cheltenham Cyber Business Park – Transport Mitigation and M5 Junction 10 Business Case Development</p> <p>One of the key risks associated with the Cheltenham Cyber Business Park is public opposition. Has there been any public opposition to the project so far, and if so, how is this being managed?</p>	<p>The concept of Cyber Park has broad support, including Cheltenham Borough Council, GCHQ, the Government, Cyber Security industry and the Gfirst LEP. I am not aware of public opposition at the present time.</p>
<p>Question 14: Cllr Kate Haigh</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Nigel Moor</p>
<p>Agenda item 9: Consultation on the development of a Waste Tipping Away Policy</p> <p>When the cost model for the incinerator was developed, did GCC factor in the cost of a waste tipping away policy? What are the projected additional costs for each district and will any of the burden fall directly on the districts themselves?</p>	<p>With the closure of Hempsted, the County Council was always likely to move to a single waste disposal site for Gloucestershire, irrespective of what technology that site used – even if that was landfill. This is something district councils have been aware of for many years.</p>

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
CABINET MEETING – 10 October 2018**

<p>Question 15: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 6: Cheltenham Cyber Business Park – Transport Mitigation and M5 Junction 10 Business Case Development</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member provide a breakdown of how Amey has arrived at the £1m figure for developing the Outline Business Case, and provide a more detailed breakdown?</p>	<p>Amey has estimated the J10 business case cost based on an analysis of Government/Treasury requirements and experience of completing Outline Business Cases for other major schemes.</p> <p>The costs associated with such a business case include highway design, environmental studies, transport planning and modelling and public consultation.</p>
<p>Question 16: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item 6: Cheltenham Cyber Business Park – Transport Mitigation and M5 Junction 10 Business Case Development</p> <p>The £275k that may be taken from the Missing Link fund – how will that be replenished in a worst case scenario, and if it cannot be replenished what impact does that have for the Missing Link programme?</p>	<p>The county council’s A417 Missing Link reserve will contribute towards Highways England’s scheme development process over a number of years, up until 31 March 2021. I am optimistic any funds removed from the A417 Missing Link reserve, for J10 OBC work in 18/19, will be replaced before 31 March 2021, from alternative funding sources.</p> <p>If that isn’t the case, the council can look to refund the budget in the normal way.</p> <p>In short, there’s nothing A417-related to fund at the minute, so using some of this pot to support vital infrastructure improvements elsewhere, in the knowledge it is likely to be repaid, seems a sensible approach to me.</p>
<p>Question 17: Cllr Iain Dobie</p>	<p>Respondent: Cllr Lynden Stowe</p>
<p>Agenda item: 6, Cheltenham Cyber Business Park – Transport Mitigation and M5 Junction 10 Business Case Development</p> <p>The Outline Business Case has been costed by Amey – has the council looked around for alternative quotes?</p>	<p>Amey are the County Council’s term planning consultants, a role for which there was a competitive tender process.</p>