

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

	Member/ Public Question?	Supplementary question requiring response	Responsibility	Response
1	Public Question	Question 16 – Officers, on behalf of Cllr Gray, to arrange a meeting with the Minchinhampton and Rodborough Commons Advisory Committee where possible for January, to discuss progressing road narrowing in the commons area.	Colin Chick	The cabinet member was contacted by Philippa Schwarz on 9 th December and a meeting with stakeholders is in the process of being arranged.
2	Public Question	Question 20 – To pass on concerns raised by Lorna Parker relating to services not in use in the Stroud area to Stagecoach.	Colin Chick	The law states that local bus services must be registered in order to pick up passengers. Because buses returning from Cirencester College are not registered they do not appear on any timetable and ‘not in service’ is displayed on the vehicle. There are likely to be operational and/or financial reasons for Stagecoach’s decision not to register these journeys so the ITU Manager has contacted them to see whether there is more they can do.
3	Member Question	Question 6 – Cllr Vernon Smith to make a further request for a response from National Highways regarding the poorly lit subways passing under Elmbridge Court Roundabout.	Colin Chick	Officers made a further request from National Highways – Cllrs Smith and Willingham updated on the detail which confirms that the subways and underpasses have been inspected, lighting levels checked and confirming they are correct. Contact details for National Highways

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

				provided for future reference.
4	Member Question	Question 11 – Cllr David Gray to look into correspondence reported by Cllr Paul Hodgkinson that suggests that charging points will not be considered in rural communities.	Colin Chick	<p>In July Cllr Hodgkinson contacted officers regarding a request for an EV charger at the village hall in Chedworth. Officers correctly advised that the government's OZEV grant criteria favour locations which will be used by residents who lack access to off road parking and charging. This does not exclude rural communities as it can include sites such as village hall and parish council car parks where they are used for long stays by local residents. However to qualify for an OZEV grant (worth up to 75% of the installation cost), and to justify the significant investment the county council is also making, we must be able to demonstrate that there is sufficient demand.</p> <p>In addition we are encouraging the sharing of private charge points and the installation of commercially viable charge points in new developments, at supermarkets, petrol stations and in district council car parks.</p>
5	Member Question	Question 22 – Cllr Lynden Stowe to discuss the supplementary question from Cllr Cate Cody outside of the meeting.	Steve Mawson	Gloucestershire does not have a tram system and does not have regular transport services in all areas of the county therefore some members may have no alternative but to use their car to commute to Council

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

			<p>meetings. This proposal would not be suitable to GCC it is designed to encourage the use of the public transport systems which are not available in the county due to Gloucestershire's geographical layout. We could look at encouraging car sharing for those members that have to use their car to travel to Council meetings.</p> <p>Workplace parking</p> <p>A Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) is a charge on employers who provide workplace parking, a type of congestion charging scheme that has been introduced in Nottingham.</p> <p>Nottingham City Council has introduced a WPL to tackle problems associated with traffic congestion, by both providing fundings for major transport infrastructure initiatives and by acting as an incentive for employers to manage their workplace parking provision.</p> <p>Money raised from the WPL has helped to fund <u>NET Phase Two</u> (the extensions to the existing tram system), which now carries more than 17m passengers a year, as well as the redevelopment of Nottingham Station. It also supports the popular <u>Link</u></p>
--	--	--	--

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

				<p><u>bus network.</u></p> <p>Employers, rather than employees, are responsible for paying any WPL charge, although employers can choose to reclaim part or all of the cost of the WPL from their employees.</p> <p>Workplace Parking Levy Charge: RPI figures announced December 2020</p> <p>Charge for next WPL licensing period confirmed as £428.</p> <p>The central government has released the RPI (Retail Price Index) figure used to calculate the Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) charge from 1st April each year.</p> <p>The figure is 0.9% (as per November index), which means that the cost per workplace parking place per year for the licensing period 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022 will be £428 for employers who provide 11 or more liable places.</p> <p>The VAT is not payable by employers to Nottingham City Council on the WPL charge. Any parking charges an employer introduces for its employees are, however, subject to VAT.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

6	Member Question	Question 23 – Cllr Stephen Davies to provide the numbers to Cllr Cate Cody relating to how many children had left care, where are they were located and how their safety was monitored.	Chris Spencer	<p>As of 14 December 2021 there were 457 Care Leavers. Of these, 374 have a primary address that has a Gloucestershire post code. There are 83 Care Leavers whose primary address has a post code which is not within Gloucestershire. There is an out of county list of all primary addresses and a Power BI map which shows that the destination of all care experienced young people living furthest away from Gloucestershire including, but not limited to, Sheffield, Bournemouth and Gateshead, for example.</p> <p>Care Leavers up to the age of 21 years of age should be visited face to face at least once every 2 months and good practice would be to keep in touch far more frequently. Keeping in touch can be achieved via 'phone calls, text messages, email, WhatsApp messages and the frequency and nature of this is planned to suit the individual Care Leaver's needs. Care leavers aged 21 – 25 do not have face to face or in touch visiting practices</p>

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

				<p>stipulated in guidance however the principles of good practice still apply and we would expect Personal Advisors to maintain regular contact.</p> <p>Agreement about what constitutes regular contact is reached in consultation with older Care Leavers to determine the frequency and methods of contact that are most suitable for them. Frequency and the type of contact with Care Leavers are monitored as part of the service's performance monitoring and are reviewed at regular performance surgeries. Care Leaver's safety and wellbeing is monitored via supervision with social workers and professional advisors. High Risk Planning Meetings, which is a multi-agency forum chaired by an off-line social work manager who does not hold day to day responsibility. The HRPM considers risk and safety planning for care experience young people and may include the young people themselves. The HRPM process has recently been positively reviewed by the National Working Group.</p>
7	Member Question	Question 26 – Cllr David Gray to look into and share data sets on traffic speeds on London Road Gloucester with Cllr Jeremy Hilton.	Colin Chick	In October 2019 the average daily (24hr) two way flow on London Road was 11921 vehicles. Average speeds (over 24hrs) were 23.8mph. On average 6 vehicles exceeded

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

				<p>45mph late at night, between 10pm and 6am.</p> <p>In October 2020, during Covid, the average daily two way flow was 9084 vehicles, average speeds were 24.4mph and, on average, 8 vehicles exceeded 45mph overnight between 10pm and 6am.</p> <p>Whilst traffic volumes in October 2020 were noticeably lower than in 2019 (-24%) the marginal change in average speeds (+0.6mph) and in the number of vehicles exceeding 45mph overnight (+2) are not significant road safety concerns.</p> <p>We will carry out further monitoring in 2022 and will seek support from the Police should we have any concerns.</p>
8	Member Question	Question 38 – Cllr David Gray to ask officers to consider whether there is anything further that can be done to ensure safe access for pupils attending the High School Leckhampton in September 2022.	Colin Chick	<p>As far as the County Planning Authority is concerned, the planning application for the new school was determined on its merits as applied for. This included detailed transport and highway assessments. Since the application has now been approved, it is being implemented on the terms of the submissions made. The County Council as Highway Authority considered the</p>

Member and Public Supplementary Council Question Written Responses – 8 December 2021

				<p>application in detail and did not raise any objections. The proposals were deemed to be safe and adequate and should be implemented in accordance with the planning permission and associated conditions.</p>
--	--	--	--	--