CITY OF GLOUCESTER

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting: Monday, 22nd January 2007 at 18:30
Council Chamber, North Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester

Membership:  Cllrs. D. Wilson (Chair), Smith (Vice-Chair), Jones, Durrant, S. Lewis (Spokesperson), Noakes, Crawford, Power and Gardiner

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION TIME</th>
<th>(Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. APOLOGIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members and Officers are reminded that at the start of the meeting they should declare any known interest in any matter to be considered, and also during the meeting if it becomes apparent that they have an interest in the matters being discussed.

| 3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 6) |           |

Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meetings held on 7 December 2006 and the Special Scrutiny Budget Consultation meeting held on 4 January 2007.

| 4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME |           |

| 5. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS |     |

Pre-scrutiny of Key Decisions

| 6. FAMILY INTERVENTION PROJECT (Pages 7 - 28) |           |

Report by the Cabinet Member for Streetcare herewith.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy and Budgetary Framework Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT-RENT AND CHARGES INCREASES 2007/2008 (Pages 29 - 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> LLANTHONY SECUNDA PRIORY-OPTIONS APPRAISAL (Pages 45 - 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report by the Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure herewith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> STREETCARE DEPOT IMPROVEMENTS (Pages 89 - 102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report by the Cabinet Member for Streetcare herewith.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> SCHEDULE OF CABINET DECISIONS (Pages 103 - 106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following lists the titles of decisions taken by Cabinet at its meeting on 13 December 2006. Details of the decisions are set out in the attached schedule for information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMMES AND CABINET FORWARD PLAN (Pages 107 - 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report by the Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Personnel Services).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To consider the following Resolution :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the following item of business on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
if members of the press and public are present during consideration of this item or these items there will be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item 10</th>
<th>Description of Exempt Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paragraph 3-Schedule 12A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12. SCHEDULE OF INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE DECISIONS (Pages 119 - 120)**

Schedule of Individual Executive Decisions that have been taken since the last meeting of OSM.

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To consider the following Resolution:

“That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the following item of business on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public are present during consideration of this item or these items there will be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item 13</th>
<th>Description of Exempt Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Paragraph 3-Schedule 12A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. DRAFT HEADS OF TERMS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF NEW INDOOR MARKET AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADJACENT LAND (Pages 121 - 124)

Report by the Acting Deputy Chief Executive

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 5 March 2007 at 18.30 hours.

Please note:

The discussion times are only estimates, some items could take slightly longer to discuss.
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MEETING : Thursday, 7th December 2006

PRESENT : Cllrs. D. Wilson (Chair), Smith (Vice-Chair), Noakes, Power and Gardiner

Other Members Present
Cllrs. Hawthorne, A. Lewis, Morgan, White and Emerton

Officers in Attendance
David Clegg, Acting Chief Executive
Keith Birtles, Acting Deputy Chief Executive

Others in Attendance
(none)

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Jones and Durrant

68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Smith and Gardiner declared personal interests in Agenda Item 9 (Minute No. 75 Gloucester Bandstand CS 200611) as members of Planning Committee.

69. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 November were taken as read and signed by the Chair.

70. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (15 MINUTES)

There were no questions from the public.

71. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS (10 MINUTES)

There were no petitions or deputations.

72. IMPLICATIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER

The Acting Chief Executive gave a presentation to Members on the implications of the local government white paper for Gloucester City. He advised that the white paper had been split into three main headings with a number of sub-headings. These were:

Community, Leadership and Engagement.

- Community Involvement
- Community Leadership
Community Cohesion

Local Democracy and Accountability

- Executive Powers and Elections
- Local Government Reorganisation
- Members

Performance

- Best Value
- Performance Framework
- Efficiency

Under Local Democracy, Members noted that there would be a need to consider three options during a consultation (May 2008). Directly elected Mayor, indirectly elected Leader (by Council), directly elected Cabinet.

Members also discussed the elections. They were asked to consider whole Council elections and single member wards. Members noted that four-yearly whole Council elections would save the Council £120,000 over a four year period.

The option of directly elected Mayor was also discussed as was the local government reorganisation. There were four issues under this heading:-

- Unitary Bid
- Pathfinder Two Tier
- Advanced Two Tier
- Creation of Parishes

Of the first three, it was reported that in Gloucestershire the advanced two tier system was the only option that remained. The Cabinet noted that all Councils would need to find savings equivalent to what they would have saved by becoming a unitary authority.

Members were briefed on the performance issues arising out of the white paper. This area was split into three main headings and a number of sub-headings.

Best Value Reform

- More citizen involvement
- More competition
- No more best value reviews

Performance Framework

- Fewer performance indicators
- Comprehensive area assessments based on risk, direction of travel and use of resources
Efficiency

Gershon and CSR 07

Shared Services and Procurement

Business Improvement Techniques

Members went on to discuss the report and noted that £15-20 million savings would be needed across the County. Training of members would also be a big issue. A Member felt that Councillors would need to know how they could represent their wards and have knowledge of their responsibilities.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

73. SCHEDULE OF INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Noted.

74. GL1 COMBINE HEAT AND POWER INSTALLATION

The report by the Leader of the Council will be asking Cabinet to consider tenders for the installation of combined heat and power equipment (CHP) at Gloucester Leisure Centre (GL1).

Members were reminded that in April 2006 expressions of interest were invited from six firms from the CHP Associations list. Two firms Congenco and Ener-G expressed a wish to tender. At its next meeting Council would be asked to waive contract standing orders to give approval for the head of Building Design Services to accept the higher tender in the sum of £175,846 from Congenco for the capital purchase cost of combined heat and power plant at GL1.

RESOLVED

That the recommendations to Cabinet and Council as set out in the report be noted.

75. GLOUCESTER PARK BANDSTAND (CS200611)

The report by the Cabinet member for Regeneration and Culture presented the results of the consultation on the future of the bandstand. At its meeting on 13 December Cabinet would be asked to agree a preferred option.

The Cabinet member for Regeneration and Culture advised Members that there had been a wide-ranging consultation which had produced a clear favourite. Members noted that if Cabinet accepted the result of the consultation an application for the bandstand would need to be submitted to Planning Committee.

RESOLVED
That the recommendations to Cabinet as set out in the report be noted.

76. **SCHEDULE OF CABINET DECISIONS**

The Scrutiny Committee received a list of Cabinet decisions taken by Cabinet on 15 November 2006.

**RESOLVED**

That the decisions be noted.

77. **SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMMES & CABINET FORWARD PLAN**

The Assistant Director (Legal Democratic and Personnel Services) advised that this list would be updated following the meeting of Council – 29\(^{th}\) November 2006. Two items were to be added:

- St. Michael’s Tower
- Byelaw on prohibition of skateboarding.

The Assistant Director (Legal Democratic and Personnel Services) also reported that Members of the constitution task and finish group would be contacted shortly for their availability for a meeting. A constitution review needed to be completed by March.

78. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Monday 22 January 2007 – Noted.

**Time of commencement: 18:30 hours**
**Time of conclusion: 19:40 hours**

Chair
SPECIAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – BUDGET CONSULTATION

MEETING : Thursday, 4th January 2007

PRESENT : Cllrs. Durrant, Francis, Hobbs, Noakes, Rentell, Crawford, Hanman and Power

Other Members Present
Cllrs. Hawthorne, Gravells, James, A. Lewis, Morgan and White

Officers in Attendance
David Clegg, Acting Chief Executive
Keith Birtles, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Phil Lane, Assistant Director (Housing and Health)

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Witts, Smith, Heath, Jones, S. Wilson and Suddards-Moss

79. CHAIR

In the absence of a Chair and Vice-Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Councillor Mark Hobbs was elected Chair of the meeting.

80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Noakes, Hanman, Power and Durrant declared a personal interest as Board Members of Gloucester City Homes. Councillor White declared a personal interest as a Board Member of Gloucestershire Airport. Councillors Hanman and Gravells declared a personal interest as members of Gloucestershire County Council.

81. DRAFT BUDGET 2007/08

The Acting Deputy Chief Executive stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider representations from the Scrutiny Committees on the proposed draft budget. He informed the meeting that Cabinet would meet on 24 January to examine the outcome of the budget consultation and to decide on the draft budget to Council.

The Acting Deputy Chief Executive explained that the City Council was still concerned about the level of grant settlement it would receive for 2007/08. Representations already made by the Council to the Government had not been listened.

Cabinet was proposing to take the following actions:

Savings of £315,000 would be made and £135,000 would be taken from the LABGI in order to support the revenue budget for repairs expenditure. The Council was
anticipating a £1m LABGI grant for the financial year as there had been a substantial increase in business rates in the city. There would be an increase in income of £230,000 including car parking charges and £50,000 worth of savings would be made through a recruitment drag. A separate report had been made available on the Housing Budget.

The Leader of the Council stated that Cabinet had been working on the 2007/08 budget over the last year as the Council had been informed of the Government grant settlement last year. He reported that Gloucester City Council would not receive as much as other districts in the County and would maintain its pressure on the Government.

The 2007/08 budget covered the extra investments needed for Streetcare which included investment in public conveniences and the extension to the Green Waste Scheme. He also reported the decision which had been taken on concessionary bus fares and it was noted that for 2007/2008 the new scheme would offer free travel on all registered services starting in the County. This meant an increase in expenditure from £930,000 to £1.1m, leading to a shortfall of £450,000 Government grant provided for concessionary fares. In summing up he stated that Cabinet was keeping its promise to maintain a 3% Council Tax.

A question was raised on the approval of the proposals for the LABGI funds and it was clarified by the Leader of the Council that this would be approved at the Budget Meeting in February.

A question was asked with regards to the Appendix on Assets being considered for sale. The Member was concerned about Tredworth allotments and it was agreed that caveats should be put in the report so that Council Members are involved in the decision to sell the land.

The issue of car parking charges was raised and it was reported that a Cabinet Working Party had been set up to look at these in more detail including bringing in Best Practice from other Authorities. It was agreed that further work was needed for a more sophisticated approach to car parking charges.

Time of commencement: 18:30 hours
Time of conclusion: 18:50 hours

Chair
CABINET DECISION TRACKER AND MONITORING FORM
(To accompany all Cabinet decisions [key and non-key] except reports for information and noting)
(*F11 to form fields)

1. SUBJECT
   (a) Title: Family Intervention Project
   (b) Ward: All

2. *KEY DECISION/*DECISION TO BE CONSIDERED (As per recommendations of report)  (Delete as appropriate)

That Cabinet note the successful Home Office bid to fund a Family Intervention Project in Gloucester, and agree that the Council, as accountable body for the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, acts as Accountable Body for this new project. This is on the understanding that the Council will not pick up any of the funding for this project once the Government funding ends, but we will work with partners to encourage them to mainstream the project.

3. SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE
   (a) Background

   Gloucester CDRP, which is managed by the Council’s Community Safety Team, has been receiving funding from the Home Office Respect Unit for the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit. Because the ASBU has been so successful, we were asked by the Respect Unit to bid for further funding to set up a Family Intervention Project. Our bid was considered an exemplar bid, and we have been granted £195,500 pro rata for 2006/2007 (three months remaining) and £195,500 for 2007/8.

   (b) Financial Implications (Bring in from report)

   As the bid is grant funded, there are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in paragraph 2, other than officer time.

   (c) Legal Implications (Bring in from report)

   8.1 If the City Council is to be Accountable Authority for the project, it is important that the City Council ensures that it complies with any conditions attached to the funding.

   8.2 It is also important that as Accountable Authority the City Council makes sure that
the right agencies are involved and that they meet their obligations to deliver services. All agencies need to sign up and be committed to meeting the same ends before they can move on to other issues.

(d) Risk Management Implications

(e) Predictive Impact Assessments (Equalities)

(f) Other Corporate Implications

4. REPORTING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CMT:</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cabinet Briefing:</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th} January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Executive Scrutiny: \textit{(Pre-Scrutiny - key decisions only)}</td>
<td>[   ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cabinet:</td>
<td>24\textsuperscript{th} January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Executive Scrutiny: \textit{(Post-Scrutiny : all decisions)}</td>
<td>[   ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. RESPONSIBILITY

Portfolio : Cabinet Member for Streetcare

Lead Officer : Sue Oppenheimer and Sue Tilley
6. **CONSULTATION**  
*(To be carried out or carried out (including method and dates, required for Key decisions only - information must link with information on consultation contained in the Forward Plan).)*

6.1 **Stakeholders** *(including Ward Councillors where appropriate)*

A wide range of CDRP Partners have been involved in both writing and agreeing the bid. An initial consultation meeting was attended by representatives from over 10 key organisations. All major Housing Associations have been involved. Key partners included the County’s Children and Young people’s Directorate, Gloucester City Homes, Gloucestershire Housing Association, Gloucestershire PCT.

6.2 **Outcome** *(Brief summary and ref. for minutes, other related documents)*

The Bid has received enthusiastic support from all partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>OPTIONS</strong> (to be considered/considered - brief summary and reference to reports where appropriate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 8. **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - PRE-SCRUTINY COMMENTS**  
*(Key decisions only)* |
| --- |

| 9. **ADDITIONAL OPTIONS CONSIDERED**  
*(other than those specified in the report)* |
| --- |

| 10. **CABINET DECISION TAKEN**  
*(If in line with 2 above, say, ‘In accordance with 2 above’ - Expand if the decision is otherwise e.g. where views/suggestions of Executive Scrutiny Committee have been taken into account)* |
|   | CONSULTATION/ADVICE  
|---|-----------------------------------
| 11. | (Delete as appropriate)  
| 11.1 | Have the consultation comments been taken into account?  
| | YES / NO  
| (Key Decisions only)  
| 11.2 | Was the decision taken in accordance with officer advice?  
| | YES / NO  
|   | REASONS FOR THE DECISION:  
|   | INTERESTS  
| (Details of any interests declared by a Member or Officer in the subject matter of the decision either (a) personal or (b) personal and prejudicial):  
|   | DISPENSATION  
| (Details of any dispensation granted by Standards Committee):  

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform Cabinet of our successful Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership bid for funding for a Family Intervention Project for which we are expected to be Accountable Body.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That Cabinet note the successful Home Office bid to fund a Family Intervention Project in Gloucester, and agree that the Council, as accountable body for the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, acts as Accountable Body for this new project. This is on the understanding that the Council will not pick up any of the funding for this project once the Government funding ends, but we will work with partners to encourage them to mainstream the project.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 Gloucester CDRP, which is managed by the Council’s Community Safety Team, has been receiving funding from the Home Office Respect Unit for the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit. Because the ASBU has been so successful, we were asked by the Respect Unit to bid for further funding to set up a Family Intervention Project. Our bid was considered an exemplar bid, and we have been granted £195,500 pro rata for 2006/2007 (three months remaining) and £195,500 for 2007/8.
4.0 PROGRESS

4.1 The bid document is enclosed as Appendix 1 and explains what the project will deliver. Basically, it involves employing 3 link workers who will work with around 3 families each at any one time. The aim of the project is to provide intensive support to the most chaotic families in Gloucester who are causing considerable distress to their communities through their anti-social behaviour. Support is provided for a maximum of 2 years, with less intense intervention needed as the family’s behaviour improves. It is anticipated that the project will deal with around 12-15 families up to March 2008.

4.2 Each family will be each assigned a link worker, and in the worst cases, may be moved to a ‘dispersal unit’ – a property owned by a social landlord and allocated to them through the Council’s allocations process. This will not reduce the amount of property available to other families as their existing home then becomes available for letting. It is anticipated that very few families will actually need to be moved in order to deliver the outcomes of the project. The Link worker not only provides intensive support, they also co-ordinate a package of support and interventions from a range of agencies, including schools, mental health teams, Drugs and Alcohol services, parenting programmes etc.

4.3 Similar projects around the country have shown around an 85% success rate. Families are supported to gain control of their lives and reintegrate into their communities. Savings, for instance in terms of keeping children out of care, can run into hundreds of thousands, and the close involvement of the County Children and Young people’s Directorate in the project is with the intention that they will pick up the project once the funding ends (it can cost as much as £170k a year to keep one child in care). These savings, and therefore mainstreaming, have happened in other areas of the country where Family Intervention Projects have been piloted.

5.0 FUTURE WORK

5.1 The challenge is to implement the proposals in the enclosed Bid. Recruitment of staff will begin in January.

5.2 A further successful bid to the Home Office for £50,000, made by our Community Safety Team, will allow for the appointment of a Senior Practitioner within the Children and Young People’s Directorate at the County Council. Their task will be to gain further partner commitment to the project and mainstream the FIP over the next 15 months.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 This is a very exciting initiative, and the success of the bid is a real credit to our Community Safety staff. We know that a few families often create major problems to communities, and this programme allows us to address the causes, and not just the symptoms of this behaviour.
7.0 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 As the bid is grant funded, there are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in paragraph 2, other than officer time.

7.2 *Name of the Officer:* Janet Parrot

8.0 **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 If the City Council is to be Accountable Authority for the project, it is important that the City Council ensures that it complies with any conditions attached to the funding.

8.2 It is also important that as Accountable Authority the City Council makes sure that the right agencies are involved and that they meet their obligations to deliver services. All agencies need to sign up and be committed to meeting the same ends before they can move on to other issues.

8.2 *Name of the Officer:* Steve Isaac

9.0 **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS** *(Authors to complete)* Identify all key risks (scoring 8 and above) for the recommendation including the impact and likelihood of the risk occurring and what measures will be taken to mitigate the risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners do not commit to project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Partners have been closely involved in preparing the bid, and indeed the Home Office have commented on the exceptionally high buy-in secured. Partners will actively oversee the project. The Senior Practioner post mentioned in 5.2 above will work to ensure partner commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners do not pick up funding at end of project. (The Project would therefore fail – this is not a financial risk to the Council)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>There will be stringent monitoring of the project to demonstrate value and outcomes. The steering group will be tasked with developing an exit strategy at an early stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersal units will not be available</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The project will make every effort to support people in their own homes in the first instance. We will continue to work with all Registered Social Landlords, and the Council’s allocations team, to address this issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.0 PREDICTIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (EQUALITIES) (Authors to complete) Identify all risks for customers and staff, in the areas of gender, disability, age, race, religion, sexual orientation etc.

The project users will be identified through their behaviour and their failure to comply with their tenancy agreement. There is therefore no issue of people having ‘equal access to service’. It will be targeted at around 12-15 families in greatest need, a substantial number of whom will be facing disadvantage because of mental health issues, substance abuse, criminal records, literacy problems, family breakdown, single-parent households etc. We will monitor all families in relation to equalities issues, and regularly assess whether we are delivering a fair service.

11.0 OTHER CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

1. Community Safety (Author to complete)

The purpose of the project is to improve community safety and perceptions of safety within local communities by addressing the causes of ASB.

2. Environmental (Author to complete)

By reducing Anti-Social behaviour, we will reduce its effects on the environment (e.g. criminal damage)

3. Staffing (Personnel to complete)

4. Trade Union (TU to complete)

Background Papers : 

Published Papers : 

Person to Contact : Sue Oppenheimer
Tel: 396166
E-mail: sueo@gloucester.gov.uk

Sue Tilley
Tel: 396588
E-mail: sue.tilley@gloucester.gov.uk
Appendix 1

FAMILY INTERVENTION PROJECT
Gloucester Community Safety Partnership
Project Proposal Bid

To be completed to set out proposals for Family Intervention Projects. The shaded area below gives examples of the type of detail we would hope to see and should be looking for in assessing proposal quality

1. Target group

Clear plans for the target group for the project and anticipated level of demand

The target for this project is to ‘address the behaviour of the most challenging problematic families who persistently behave anti-socially and are at risk of losing their home and becoming both socially and educationally excluded’. By establishing Parenting Interventions including Parenting programmes, outreach support will be provided to help families’ address behavioural and other problems in order to maintain their existing accommodation. In addition, support will be coordinated in dispersed tenancies managed by the project.

Gloucester has a population of over 112,000. The neighbourhoods are effectively policed through four geographic Inspector Neighbourhood Areas known as INA’s - Hucclecote, Gloucester South, Barton and City Central. There are five super output areas in Gloucester, which are in the ten percent most deprived areas nationally. These are; Westgate, Podsmead, Kingsholm and Matson. To actively support this, the Local Area Agreement agenda addresses the needs in these areas across the identified blocks.

Our Aim will be:

To establish safer and stronger cohesive communities by challenging the most problematic families and address their anti social behaviour to give respite to the community.

In Gloucester, there are a number of social and private housing providers that deal with a significant amount of problematic families who persistently make life a misery for the people within the community. The severity of many of the complaints received made about the families have focused on aggressive and intimidating behaviour, arson, constant noisy gatherings day and night, where residents were subject to abuse, threats, theft and vandalism to their property, and made to live in fear. The root causes of Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) often remain unaddressed or compounded through lack of resources and skills, or effective joint working by relevant statutory agencies leading to a sense of public frustration.

Residents living within the community hold a common misconception that agencies, particularly landlords and police are not tackling these problems quickly enough, causing a lack of confidence in these services. The reality however, is quite the opposite. For instance, the two of the largest social housing landlords, Gloucester City Homes with over 4.100 homes and Gloucester Housing Association with over 1.000 homes are working together through the Respect Agenda. Their aim is to challenge the families’ behaviour and step up their action to develop long term multi agency solutions to improve the quality of life for both the family and the community before they lose their home; their children or both. Above all, it is widely accepted that eviction alone is not the answer and the challenge is to seek a common multi agency approach to finding local solutions. There is a good record of multi-agency working in Gloucester, with a jointly-funded and jointly
managed Anti-Social Behaviour and Family Support Unit (hereafter known as The Unit) already established and undertaking action to deal with high level cases of ASB.

Gloucester City Homes and Gloucester Housing Association anticipate nine referrals in year one who are currently residing in their rented accommodation and causing persistent ASB, disorder and criminal problems. Other social landlords identified a further three problematic families for immediate referrals and who will require medium to high level support. By December 2006, there will be twelve families already identified to sign up to the work of The Family Intervention Project (hereafter known as The Project) that will be coordinated and lead through three designated key workers within The Unit. All families have a history of blighting people’s lives and degrading the spirit of communities through harassment, intimidation, criminal and significant acts of ASB.

A typical family consists of several children, ranging from eighteen months to seventeen years, and three adults (parents and lodger for example). Some of the children will already be in receipt of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC’s) and most will be known to the partnership agencies. Some or all of the siblings will not be receiving education or attending schools. The tenancy will be at risk and one or more of the adults will have some kind of dependency and / or mental health issues. The behaviour of the whole family has a significant impact on the community.

A good example would be to examine the effects of a persistent problematic ASB family who, over a period of three months caused serious criminal damage to schools, the library, local shops and disorder to the local community. The costs over this period exceeded over £170,000. These costs include; retail loss, staff time (multi agency), vandalism to cars, shops, dwellings and personal properties but more importantly the cost to peoples’ health. This excludes, costs of the courts, statement taking and solicitor’s time. Consequently, this does not reflect the full costs of increasing fear of crime and stripping the pride and confidence from the local community and the devastation inflicted on victims and witnesses.

The Unit, through the police or housing provider, have already received reports of incidents and several agencies have been involved with the family without full success.

2. Referrals and acceptance process

Service should be publicised and the purpose and process widely known amongst all relevant agencies. Service will be receiving referrals from all relevant agencies at a predefined and agreed threshold (e.g. threat of possession action, failure to comply with the terms of tenancy, one or more family members at risk of ASB action etc). Project workers visit the family to explain about the project, get message across that no other realistic options to maximise chances of take up.

To fully support the services, it will be essential to publicise and promote The Project with the use of wide spread media and marketing methods through all key agencies. The Project will also be promoted through the multi agency Problem Solving Groups within each Police INA. These groups were initially formed over a year ago in line with the four INA’s, to discuss local issues of ASB within the communities and seek solutions together.

To demonstrate our commitment and showcase best practice by proactively communicating the difference we are making, we will work with Government News Network (GNN) by signing up to the ‘Changing Lives Making Communities Safe’ campaign by
The Unit Family Support Coordinator will receive referrals from relevant agencies that will be entered onto The Unit database. A report will then be prepared and passed on to The Project Panel using a twin track approach to identify the appropriate needs of both the family and needs of community.

The Community Safety Manager, will have the final decision whether to accept the family on to the project and confirm the level of support to be allocated. On acceptance, a key worker will carry out a comprehensive assessment of the underlying problems of the family’s behaviour and will have the overall responsibility for ensuring delivery of the agreed multi-agency Project Plan.

Referrals will be received from the Police, all Housing Providers, NHS Trust, Children and Young People’s Services and other relevant agencies.

The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) has strong links with all key stakeholders and within this structure, The Unit already receive referrals. Since May 2006, The Unit has received and worked with fifteen families to provide ongoing support including working with the Children and Young people’s Directorate (County Council), Youth Offending Service, Fire Services, Housing, Health, Child and Mental Health Services, Police, Colleges etc. From this, eight ABC’s and three parenting contracts have been successfully implemented. Key agencies including social landlords, already report incidents of ASB to The Unit. This process will be extended to the private housing sector.

Key relevant stakeholders will refer families who meet the agreed criteria directly to The Project through The Unit. All referrals will be directed to a The Panel (The Project Panel) to be assessed using the Common Assessment Framework developed by Gloucestershire County Council, which provides a means by which all assessments undertaken are translated into four key concepts; need, threshold (i.e. severity of need), outcomes and services. The Common Assessment Framework uses the National Assessment Framework to translate information via National Assessment analysis tool into these four concepts. Gloucestershire County Council has developed multi agency district level groups who ensure that services are delivered to Children and Young People, who are in receipt of a Common Assessment Framework to prevent duplication. In addition, to ensure a continuum of services prior to and following intervention. All Key relevant stakeholders will be offered the opportunity to join The Panel.

Current members include; Family Support Coordinator, Community Safety Manager, Children and Young Persons, Police, Housing, Probation, Youth Service and The Unit.

Consideration will also be given to a Restorative Justice programme (RJ) as a means of reducing re-offending and identifying the cause of the problematic behaviour. In September 2006, Gloucester INA’s received RJ training. Other relevant agencies such as Housing, Children and Young People and Youth Services etc, will be trained by the end of March 2007. Overall, the main aim will be for the four INA’s to implement the main RJ principles across Gloucester communities. This innovative approach demonstrates Gloucester’s commitment in ‘gripping’ the underlying multi faceted problems and changing behaviour. The CDRP and INA’s will work together with the offender(s) and the victim(s) to stop re-offending and establish confidence and strong community values with the community.
In addition, work will take place to seek to influence all housing providers in Gloucester to adopt and implement the ‘Respect Housing Standard’, and ensure a consistent service for all housing tenants and owners.

The Unit will:

- **Work with Housing Providers to support the ‘Respect Housing Standard’ agenda,**
- **Sustain strong leadership and governance to ensure accountability and commitment by all Housing Providers,**
- **Ensure Housing Providers establish a Family Intervention lead officer with clear defined roles and responsibilities.**

For referrals from housing providers, the key worker will ensure strong links with the housing officer’s so that close working arrangements are established and that the housing officer is able to manage a consistent approach within the tenancy agreement and The Project action plan. This is intended to stop families playing agencies off against each other and to keep the housing officer involved with The Project action plan.

For all referrals, the Common Assessment Framework and ONSET frameworks will be used to adopt a threshold with all relevant agencies to evaluate the deeper problems of the family behaviour using the following criteria:

- **Tenancy at risk**
- **Family engaging in persistent anti-social behaviour and / or offending**
- **Family willing to engage by self referral**
- **At the early stage of enforcement such as Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)**
- **Injunctions etc.**

Once The Panel has approved a referral, information will be verified and the allocated key worker will visit the family. The benefits of becoming involved and the consequences of not becoming involved with the project will be explained. The family will sign a contract to indicate their willingness to become part of the project and for information to be shared. This contract will be a binding agreement between the family and the project, which sets out explicit acceptable standards and rules. This intervention contract is compulsory and sets out any sanctions that may be invoked should the ASB continue. The consequences of not becoming involved will ultimately lead to eviction or enforcement / criminal action against at least one member of the family.

### 3. Strategic responsibility

**Good arrangements for joining up at strategic level locally. This should include naming a senior level lead officer within the local authority at the start of the project e.g. the Director of Housing or Community Safety**

Throughout the length of The Project, the Family Support Coordinator will provide a progress report to the Community Safety Manager, currently Sue Tilley, who will in turn report to The Panel. The Chair of The Panel, who will be identified by December 2006, will report to the Chair of the CDRP, currently Derek Cross and copied to the Respect Action Task Force. All key relevant stakeholders will identify and provide named lead officers to
act as representatives for The Project and The Panel. The named lead officer for Gloucester City Council will be Acting Chief Executive David Clegg. For Gloucester City Homes the named officer is Chief Executive Ashley Green and for Gloucester Housing Association is Housing Manager Christopher Benjamin.

The Head of Service (Chris Sands) from the County Council’s Children and Young People’s Directorate will be working closely with this project and accessing County Council services to support the success of this work. Strong support will enhance the intervention project making reference to the Children and Young People’s Plan using the following sections;

- Stay Safe: enhance personal safety
- Make a positive contribution
- Reduce offending
- Achieve economic wellbeing;
- Engaging those young people within the families to engage in education, training and employment if 16+

Arguably, this project will contribute to all five outcomes of ‘Every Child Matters’

The five aims of the Every Child Matters consultation at the heart of the Children Act 2004 means that it is a law that everyone must make these aims top priorities for all children and young people.

Dr Pat Diskett from the Primary Care Trust (PCT) has (in principle) signed their commitment of support and will aspire to working towards The Project over the following year. This includes confirmation from operations (Care Services) Directorate who is happy to endorse this proposal. Other key Directorates are also in agreement.

Reference will be made to Gloucestershire’s Countywide Anti Social Behaviour Officers group to ensure positive links within this section of work and identify areas to develop within the Respect Action Plan.

4. Project details, staffing and interventions

Process for how the project will operate, be established, types of interventions available, who will deliver the project, accountability, line management, clear timescales for set up with milestones

To establish strong and clear multi agency intervention projects across Gloucester, it is fundamental that the Family Support Co-ordinator, who is already in post manages and delivers the work of this project to reduce duplication and establish effective joined up working so that all relevant agencies are signed up and delivering to the same ends. Our primary objectives will be to identify the root causes of ASB and then implement a robust multi agency family intervention action plan. In doing so, the Family Support Coordinator, will manage the day to day running of The Project and this will incorporate three key workers by the end of March 2007. The Unit Administration Officer provides administration support.

Family Support Coordinator Admin Officer

| Key Worker | Key Worker | Key Worker |
Anticipated Full Staff & FIP Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Worker x 1</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Worker @ 30,000 x 3</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator x 1</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support set up costs such as ICT, desks, chairs, printers etc</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training staff and agencies</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking venues for FIP/Consultation meetings etc</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses (essential users x 4)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning Parenting services</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone cost such as P.D.A's/mobile/pager to cover 24/7 support</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, photocopying, media, postage and office supplies, campaign costs etc.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPECTED TIMESCALES – if funding received early December 2006

- Identify suitable community locations: December 2006
- Publicity of Project/Recruitment Campaign: Early January 2007
- The Project Panel set up: Feb 2007
- Robust Family Intervention Referral system: Feb/March 2007
- Monitoring Systems established: February – April 2007
- Training of Housing Officers: April/May 2007
- Office/Project Equipment purchased: Jan 2007
- Recruitment of 3 key workers: March 2007
- Training of key workers to commence: April-July 2007
- Referrals accepted: April 2007 onwards
- Intensive family work with 5 families: June/July 2007
- Intensive family work with approx 12 families: End December 2007

To implement this approach, it is anticipated that the support will need to be in place for a minimum of six to twelve months, with stringent evaluation and performance measures in place. For example; the key worker will have ongoing review mechanisms to evaluate the family progress every two to four weeks and to evaluate The Project progress and outcomes.

In the first year, a maximum of four families will be designated to each key worker, subject to the composition of the family, the depth of the multi problems, individual needs, risks factors etc.

By December 2006, we will have already reached agreement with housing providers to identify an accommodation allocation system for dispersal units. In this agreement, we will focus on a transitional two-year accommodation programme to secure a move-on long-term tenancy to establish sustainable family/community roots.

- a) **Low & medium** – Outreach work to support a maximum of four families per key worker to existing tenancies;

- b) **Medium to high** – Outreach work to support a maximum three families per key worker by utilising existing dispersal accommodation within the
community.

The Key Workers will be accountable for their roles and responsibilities to stop persistent problematic families being anti social and causing severe unrest within the family and the community. Should the behaviour continue, robust systems will be in place to use the full range of powers and tools tackling both causes and symptoms of ASB. This will be managed and lead by The Unit and crucial links will be developed with National Children’s Homes (NCH), Children and Young Peoples Directorate and Children and Adult Mental Health Service, where agency workers will attend one or two days a week.

There is already a commitment from Gloucester City Council for five Dispersed units within the area of Gloucester. The aim is to have two units available by September 2007, with further units available by March 2008. Other Housing Providers within Gloucester have been approached; who will be considering the provisions of further dispersed units within their Business Plan 2007/2008.

As the Family Support Coordinator is already in post, it is anticipated that the Project will be in operation with immediate effect on the success of this bid and in receipt of immediate funds; albeit, this will be dependant upon successful recruitment of three key workers.

For types of interventions this will include:

- Welfare Benefit Advice and Assistance
- Health
- Police
- Fire Services
- ASBFSU
- Children and Young People’s Directorate
- Adult Services
- Schools and colleges
- Housing
- National Children’s Homes
- Job Centre
- Domestic Violence
- Mediation
- Drugs and Alcohol education/interventions
- Respect Housing Standards
- Neighbourhood Charters
- Volunteer services
- Gloucester Domestic Violence Intervention Programmes
- Educational welfare
- Hate Crime interventions such as anti bullying/harassment programmes

Each family will have a two-year maximum support intervention programme. This programme will start with high-level support for a maximum of six months; reducing as behaviour patterns improves. At the end of The Project support, the responsibility for lower support will be passed to appropriate agencies, according to assessed need.

If the families do not address their offending behaviour within six months of intensive intervention, the support will be withdrawn and enforcement action will be taken. The Panel will decide the appropriate level of intervention.
During the first year of the project and by March 2008, the need for a core unit for families with severe ASB problems will be assessed.

5. Assessment

Robust family assessment framework (building on CAF, ASSET etc) which clearly identifies the causes of the ASB and the service needs of the whole family to help them stop perpetrating ASB. Should allow input both from the family and from agencies. Assessment to include mapping of all existing service provision to hold and assessment of effectiveness. Decision about the most effective service package taken at IFSP Case panel attended by all critical partners (e.g. Health, Education, Social services, YOT etc).

An assessment using the Common Assessment Framework will be completed following acceptance for intervention decided by The Panel. Ongoing assessment will be applied through critical agencies reviewing the family progress every two to four weeks. This will ensure that the needs of both the family and communities are met with clear inputs and outcomes. Assessment measures will also be in place to evaluate the service provision.

This will identify the positives to be built upon further and highlight areas that need strengthening.

Where a Common Assessment Framework has already taken place prior to referral and remains pertinent to the referral to The Project, the relevant key agencies to support the assessment will be identified.

The local multi agency group will establish an exit strategy for long term sustainability, where applicable.

6. Contract setting and review process

Drawing up a contract clearly setting out the changes in behaviour that are expected and the support that will be provided and the sanctions that will be used should behaviour fail to change. Family’s progress to be assessed through regular reviews which include partner agencies (e.g. IFSP Case Panel meetings).

A family contract will be established clearly setting out an agreed formula to include; agreed tasks, agreement to sharing information between agencies for the purposes of supporting the family, methods to be used, what will be done and by whom, when and where it will take place, desirable changes, timescale and where necessary enforcement sanctions. Should the family’s behaviour fail to change the full range of enforcement powers in tackling both the causes and symptoms of ASB will be used. These will include:

- ASBO’s
- Injunctions
- Demoted Tenancies
- Closure Orders
- Criminal Prosecutions
- Post Convictions ASBO
- Noise abatement notice
- Possession of accommodation

Family accommodation settlement timescale will be established to secure long-term tenancy and sustainable family/community roots with the key housing agencies.
7. Key worker Role

Nominated key worker for every family who co-ordinates delivery of agreed service package and ensures gaps in provision are filled. Projects need to demonstrate (in project proposals, literature and practice) a commitment to assertive and persistent working styles to ensure families meet the terms of their contract. Proposals need to set out plans for level of contact with key worker and whether this will take place in the families home or dispersed or other project accommodation.

As stated in item 2, every family referred will be nominated a keyworker to deliver a support package that has been agreed. Each keyworker will ensure that all provisions are being met 24/7 and are achievable. In the case of evening call outs, the police will accompany the key worker in line with the lone worker policy, The Keyworker will work on a one-to-one support package and will be responsible for ensuring that all assessments and reports are to a high standard. Contact sheets of every session will be entered on The Project database and evaluations will be undertaken every two to four weeks. These reports will include clear and defined guidelines and sanctions agreed by the panel, which will ensure that all agencies interventions are being met.

All contact whether by visit, letter, email or telephone will be noted on the database. All families that have been accepted on The Project will have regular, often daily, contact with their Keyworker and these sessions will take place in the family home, in the dispersed unit or within the community.

This will involve:-

- Assessment
- Providing direct support
- Responsible for drawing up and overseeing/monitoring/ensuring delivery of multi-agency support package
- Monitoring outcomes
- Organising regular reviews
- Negotiating with agencies – e.g. helping to secure move-on accommodation

The project will work with the Children and Young People Directorate to examine the benefits of The Unit being the Budget Holder for the ‘Lead Professional Pilot’ scheme.

8. Service Provision

Clear rationale and plans for any provision that the project will provide directly (e.g. one to one parenting support). Projects to demonstrate commitment to leveraging in relevant mainstream provision (e.g. youth activities, debt counselling, mental health services, child and adolescent psychiatry, specialist help for drug & alcohol problems etc). Projects to have links to provision delivered by all critical partners. ‘Unfillable’ gaps in services to be identified and info fed back to RTF and strategic partners in the Local Authority.

Where substance misuse is a contributory factor, the assistance of the outreach workers at Gloucestershire Drug and Alcohol Service (GDAS) will be enlisted. GDAS have a Supporting People Team who already works closely with housing officers to assist families to retain their tenancies where adults have a drug or alcohol problem. For family members who are under the age of 18, the GINI team from the Young People’s Substance Misuse
Service will assist. GINI provide one to one support for young people under the age of 18 with substance misuse problems.

Over the next twelve months we will network with other CDRP’s such as Bristol Anti Social Behaviour Unit, to examine the benefits of having a Clinical Psychologist working with children at an earlier age.

The project will link directly with:-

- Respect Housing Standards
- Community Engagement
- Every Child Matters Five Outcomes
- Government Agendas
- CDRP
- Local Area Agreements
- Respect Action Plan
- Local and National strategies and targets across the multi agency partnership

The Project will provide directly the following mainstream activities:

- Individual support
- Tenancy workshops
- Budgeting and welfare benefit advice
- Social skills / life skills
- Anger management
- Self esteem workshops
- Parenting skills / Support

The Project will work with other agencies to provide:

- Connexions services
- Restorative Justice
- Education Welfare
- Drug and Alcohol misuse (GDAS and GINI)
- Probation Service
- YOS
- Mediation
- Domestic Violence advice
- Mental Health services
- Social work services

The CDRP will take full responsibility of supporting any ‘unfillable’ gaps identified by The Project Panel, to determine multi agency partnership solutions and recommendations.
9. Parenting Provision

Details of the type of parenting provision that it is envisaged the projects will need to access. Including the types of programmes that would might need to be in place locally.

In addition to item 8, The Project will provide:

- Children and Young People’s Directorate services/projects
- Family Support Service
- Positive parenting skills
- Communications skills
- Basic Life skills and awareness
- Social and environment integration skills

The Project will link with the current review of parenting support and family support review that is currently being undertaken by Children and Young People directorate.

The Family Support Coordinator already uses parenting provisions through Parentline Plus. This will be the starting point for The Project team to link up with all other parenting provision within Gloucester City to have an all round service and meet the needs of the families.

The project will commission where necessary the services of Parenting Puzzle. This is a highly successful local parenting resource with a range of individual and group work interventions develop to meet the needs of hard to reach families, who sometime struggle to assess more mainstream resources.

Parenting Puzzle works from a sound evidence base and has mechanisms in place for effective monitoring of their work. The service is a deferrable to meet local needs and staff are trained in the use of theoretical models e.g. Webbers Stratton.

The Educational Psychology Service has a good ‘Big Picture’ training event, which could support the process of assessment and understanding of the various influences on families and young people. This intervention will be explored over the next twelve months to further develop and support The Project.

The Children and Young People’s Directorate also has a Family Support Service within the Gloucester area and it is planned that support may be available also from this service to enhance the project’s interventions.

10. Information sharing

Explicit arrangements in place to ensure appropriate information sharing between agencies. This will allow projects to establish agency involvement with the family and ensure the family receives a comprehensive service. Ongoing information sharing will enable family members to check the adherence of the families’ contract (e.g. attendance at school, appointments, cessation of ASB etc).

The CDRP, The Unit and Countywide ASBO group already have an information sharing protocol between all agencies that will form the basis of The Project. Each agency will be expected to provide a lead officer, who will ensure all the appropriate information is shared between agencies. In this process, the Keyworker will be the facilitator for the family. The
families’ agreement to sharing information will be requested as referred to within section 6.

11. Funding

**Clear plans for moving to mainstream funding streams (e.g. NRF, Supporting People) with timescales. Projects should also provide details of any interim funding that might be needed before these other funds are available.**

Consideration for incorporating elements of this project into the business plans of individual agencies within the partnership will be negotiated at Chief Officer level. This will include showing how the programme meets both national and local targets and strategies for example; the five outcomes of *Every Child Matters*. A strong focus will be seeking long-term business planning for The Project to continue after 2008, and we will gather evidence (e.g. number of children prevented from going into care, number of families prevented from becoming homeless), which will make the financial case for supporting the programme.

Our aim is to achieve the redirection of resources from mainstream budgets. In addition, the CDRP will examine sources of funds and opportunities throughout the first year of 2007; including through the Local Area Agreement process. This project will make reference to the Children and Young People’s Strategic Partnership for inclusion within their business planning cycles.

Funding will be required for one-off provisions for each family, such as holiday camps, after school clubs, training, white goods (washing machine etc). To enable the project to be *fit for purpose*, it will be necessary to identify additional support and funding streams. The Project will work closely with other projects such as the Youth Inclusion and Support Team (YIST), and will refer clients to the YIST who will provide unmet needs to support the family.

The main bulk of funding stream requirement will be the provision of dispersal accommodation and a core block unit. Housing partners and Gloucester City Council have already agreed in principle that allocation of required accommodation as a match fund contribution towards The Project fund.

12. Outcome monitoring

**Robust monitoring systems which allow projects to meet their commitments to providing quarterly monitoring data to RTF. Systems should also monitor outcomes when a family is engaged with project and following the end of the intervention to measure long term behavioural change.**

The Panel will have in place a robust monitoring system to evaluate the expected referrals and provide quarterly monitoring data as required. This will be reported to the CDRP on a quarterly basis with an annual report, summarising the project performance and outcomes with a copy to the Respect Action Task Force.
The Project will ensure there is a specific monitoring system in place that is designed to determine the progress of this project. Such monitoring will include:

- Number of ASB reported incidents to Gloucester City Council Customer Services
- Numbers of Police call outs
- Regular surveys from victims of ASB
- Community engagement surveys/meetings
- Number of offences
- School attendance
- Attendance Parenting Support Session
- Compliances with Parenting Orders
- Any related referrals to the Children and Young People’s Directorate
- Level of contact by Keyworker
- Number of related referrals to the Housing Departments
- Monitoring of ethnicity
- Hate Crime Incidents
- Arson related incidents

To ensure lessons learned are evidence based and actively measured to change the behaviour of problematic families and that we are tackling the roots causes we will effectively ‘Face The People’ of the community. We want to make a tangible difference to communities and their quality of life. To do this the aim of The Project will be…

‘To build respect in local communities and to reduce Anti-Social Behaviour and fear of crime through community engagement as well as to improve the quality of life for the residents’.

The Project will:

- Adopt and implement Gloucester Community Engagement Strategy and Neighbourhood Charters to embrace Citizen Focus within our key functions and services,

- Give the opportunity for local residents to voice their comments and challenge local agencies through tenant/resident meetings and surveys of ASB victims to measure outcomes and performance,

- To ensure service providers are more responsive and aware of neighbourhood needs and improve their delivery using the Respect Action plan to determine outcome and performance.
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CABINET DECISION TRACKER AND MONITORING FORM
(To accompany all Cabinet decisions [key and non-key] except reports for information and noting)
(*F11 to form fields)

1. **SUBJECT**
   
   (a) Title: Housing Revenue Account Rent and Charges Increase 2007/08  
   (b) Ward: All

2. **KEY DECISION/DECISION TO BE CONSIDERED (As per recommendations of report)**  
   *(Delete as appropriate)*
   
   Key Decision

3. **SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE**
   
   (a) Background
   
   The report sets out the factors affecting the Housing Revenue Account budget for 2007/08 financial year and the principles underlying the recommended rent increase and other charges for this year.
   
   (b) Financial Implications *(Bring in from report)*
   
   In the body of the report.
   
   (c) Legal Implications *(Bring in from report)*
   
   The Housing Act 1985 provides that a local authority may make such charges as they may determine for the tenancy or occupation of their houses. Also, the Act provides the authority shall from time to time review rents and make such changes either of rents generally or of particular rents as circumstances may require. The tenancy agreement specifically provides for rent changes but notice has to be given to tenants.
   
   (d) Risk Management Implications
   
   GCH have not completed this element of the report as yet. GCH are currently focusing on completing their self-assessment for the March inspection. The self-assessment needs to be completed by 29.1
   
   GCH will be submit risk management implications prior to Cabinet briefing.
   
   The consultation on the 49 week rent year is due to be completed in mid-February. Consideration must be given to the outcome of the consultation and it is possible that tenants will not support the additional weeks payment. The impact of retaining a 48 week payment schedule will have a more significant impact on the budget if GCH do not achieve the two star rating in March.
(e) Predictive Impact Assessments (Equalities)

GCH have not completed this element of the report as yet. GCH are currently focusing on completing their self-assessment for the March inspection. The self-assessment needs to be completed by 29.1
GCH will be submit the predictive impact assessment prior to Cabinet briefing.

Those most affected by the additional weeks payment will be tenants who, though not in receipt of benefits, have low incomes. This may therefore affect certain groups within the population more the population as a whole. However, it is not clear at present whether there are any adverse implications in relation to equalities issues.

(f) Other Corporate Implications
4. REPORTING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) CMT:</td>
<td>6.2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cabinet Briefing:</td>
<td>21.2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) OSM: <em>(Pre-Scrutiny - key decisions only)</em></td>
<td>22.1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Cabinet:</td>
<td>21.2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. RESPONSIBILITY

Portfolio: Housing and Health

Lead Officer: Philip Lane

6. CONSULTATION

*(To be carried out or carried out (including method and dates, required for Key decisions only - information must link with information on consultation contained in the Forward Plan).*

6.1 Stakeholders *(including Ward Councillors where appropriate)*

See paragraphs 1.0, 2.0 and 5.5
Tenants Forum consulted on January 15th 2007

6.2 Outcome *(Brief summary and ref. for minutes, other related documents)*

Tenants Forum recommended approval subject to outcome of consultation with all tenants, for changes in practice (no. of rent free weeks and timing of rent free weeks)

7. OPTIONS *(to be considered/considered - brief summary and reference to reports where appropriate)*

Need to consider proposals to increase rent and service charge levels.

Also need to consider proposal to amend normal practice of charging for a 48 week year and for the changing in timing from having rent free weeks in the five week months to the dates suggested.

Outcome of consultation re: rent free weeks must be considered before decision made to comply with terms of the tenancy agreement and legislative requirements.

8. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - PRE-SCRUTINY COMMENTS

*(Key decisions only)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. | **ADDITIONAL OPTIONS CONSIDERED**  
(other than those specified in the report) |
| 10. | **CABINET DECISION TAKEN**  
(If in line with 3 above, say, ‘In accordance with 3 above’ - Expand if the decision is otherwise e.g. where views/suggestions of Executive Scrutiny Committee have been taken into account) |
| 11. | **CONSULTATION/ADVICE**  
(Delete as appropriate) |
| 11.1 | Have the consultation comments been taken into account?  
YES / NO  
(Key Decisions only) |
| 11.2 | Was the decision taken in accordance with officer advice?  
YES / NO |
| 12. | **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:** |
| 13. | **INTERESTS** *(Details of any interests declared by a Member or Officer in the subject matter of the decision either (a) personal or (b) personal and prejudicial):* |
| 14. | **DISPENSATION** *(Details of any dispensation granted by Standards Committee):* |
1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To seek approval for the rent, service charges, supporting people charges and other charge increases to be applied in 2007/2008

1.2 To seek approval for the rent - free weeks for 2007/2008 subject to consultation with all City Council tenants.

1.3 To seek approval for the 2 draft HRA budgets for 2007/08 as attached

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That Forum / Cabinet notes the factors affecting the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) in 2007/2008

2.2 That Forum / Cabinet agrees a rent increase to be applied in 2007/2008 of 4.10% in line with the level of increase set out for Gloucester City Council in the ‘Guideline Rent and Limit Rent for Rent Rebate Subsidy Limitation 2007/2008 determination’. 4.10% represents an Inflation (RPI) of 3.60% plus a real inflation increase of 0.5%.
2.3 That Forum / Cabinet agrees the proposals for determining charges made for Supporting People services in 2007/2008 under delegated authority as outlined in paragraph 4.7

2.4 That Forum / Cabinet agrees the charges recommended for Communal Services in 2007/2008 as outlined in paragraph 4.6

2.5 That Forum / Cabinet agrees an increase of 4.1% on charges for Garages and Parking Spaces as outlined in paragraph 4.6.9 and also that no increase will be made to charges for the Life-link service.

2.6 That Forum / Cabinet notes that the ‘Rent Restructuring’ convergence plan continues as agreed in January 2002.

2.6 That Forum / Cabinet agrees the rent - free weeks for 2007/2008 as outlined in paragraph 5. Subject to the outcome of consultation with all tenants.

2.7 That Forum agrees the 2 draft HRA budgets attached, and notes the operational budget for 2007/08 will be dependant upon the result of the Audit Commission inspection of Gloucester City Homes in March 2007.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 Each January, Tenants’ Forum makes a recommendation to cabinet on the rent charge and other charges to be made in the following financial year. This determination is shaped by external factors set by Central Government and internal factors decided by forum and members. At the same time, the Council has a legal obligation to ensure that the HRA does not run into deficit.

3.2 This report sets out the factors affecting the HRA revenue budget for the 2007/2008 financial year and the principles underlying the recommended rent increase and other charges for this year.

3.3 Although it will not influence the level of rent increase, the outcome of the Audit Commission inspection of Gloucester City Homes in March 2007, will influence the HRA Budget for 2007/08. For this reason, 2 budgets are presented for approval and the relevant one will become the operational budget for the year when the result of the Inspection is known.

4.0 INFORMATION

4.1 REVENUE BUDGET 2007/2008

4.1.1 In determining the rent increase to be applied for the financial year 2007/2008, Forum / Cabinet must first consider the HRA revenue budget estimates for the coming year. (Appendices 1 & 2)
4.1.2 Officers have taken the following factors into account when preparing budget estimates:

- Subsidy and the financial position of the HRA.
- Outcome of the Audit Commission Inspection of GCH
- Reviewing current policies.
- Meeting decent homes targets
- Rent restructuring.
- Fair and equitable charges for communal facilities.
- Maximising the income collected.
- Pay and price inflation

4.2 HRA SUBSIDY FOR 2007/2008

4.2.1 The position on the HRA and the need to set a particular rent increase are both linked to central government’s processes for determining subsidy and rent restructuring. Housing subsidy is determined by reference to a “Notional” Housing Revenue Account consisting of allowances for Supervision and Management, Capital Charges, Rents and Interest.

4.2.2 The 2007/2008 allowances for Management and Maintenance are shown below with the corresponding figures for 2006/2007. There has been an increase in both allowances, above the rate of inflation. This is in line with indications given by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, during the consultation process for the implementation of rent restructuring.

Forum / Cabinet will recall that under the ‘New Financial Framework for Housing’ introduced in April 2001, the authority is allocated a 'Major Repairs Allowance (MRA), a cash sum allowance towards repairs and maintenance of council housing stock. The actual amount to be received by Gloucester City in 2007/2008 is £2.838 million, which is shown in Appendices 1 and 2 as depreciation because the MRA is a cash grant to balance the effect of depreciation on the stock.

**Allowance for Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£490.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£512.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowance for Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£930.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£964.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 In calculating subsidy, the government assumes that an authority will receive an amount of rental income based on the Annual Guideline Rent multiplied by the number of Council houses (less an allowance for voids). The guideline rent for 2007/08 is £54.70 per week, an increase of £3.56 over 2006/07.

4.2.4 Since 1st April 2004, Rent Rebates are no longer accounted for in the HRA. For a transitional period any costs arising as a result of discretionary awards continued to be accounted for in the HRA. From 2006/07, this transitional period ceases and the costs fall on the General Fund.

4.2.5 The net impact on the estimated subsidy for 2007/08 is to worsen Gloucester’s position by £485,000. This net position is arrived at after taking account of increased management and maintenance allowances and MRA of £249,000, coupled with increased assumed rental income of £720,000.

4.3 BALANCES

4.3.1 Appendix 1 shows the estimated HRA position for 2007/08 should GCH not be successful in achieving a 2* rating from the Audit Commission at their inspection in March 2007. The account is shown with the proposed rent increase and service charges increases included. This budget, together with the Cabinet approved use of Right to Buy receipts of £600,000, enables a sum of £8.0 million to be made available towards meeting the response repairs, voids, cyclical maintenance and capital investment / decent homes standard. This is an increase of c£0.5m over the amount made available in 2006/07.

4.3.2 These options would leave an estimated working balance at the end of 2007/08 of £1,036,000. This balance is considered to be adequate.

4.3.3 Appendix 2 shows the estimated HRA position for 2007/08 should GCH be successful in achieving a 2* rating from the Audit Commission at their inspection in March 2007. The account is shown with the proposed rent increase and service charges increases included. This budget, together with the Cabinet approved use of Right to Buy receipts of £600,000 and the Decent Homes funding from the Government enables a sum of £19.1 million to be made available towards meeting the response repairs, voids, cyclical maintenance and capital investment / decent homes standard. The critical difference here is that GCH will charge a fee for managing the Capital works element of this £19.1m that will reduce the management & supervision fee chargeable to the HRA.

4.3.4 These options would leave an estimated working balance at the end of 2007/08 of £1,887,000. This balance is considered to be adequate.
4.4 OPERATIONAL COSTS

4.4.1 Gloucester City Council now delivers its Housing Management service through Gloucester City Homes (GCH), an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO) operational from 12th December 2005. The Management Fee paid to GCH is identified separately in Appendices 1 & 2. In addition to this fee, there are retained client costs within the HRA that form part of the overall Supervision & Management fee. Again, these are identified separately in Appendices 1 & 2.

4.4.2 The Supervision & Management fee payable to GCH in Appendix 1 represents the minimum amount of fee for which GCH can deliver the current level of service (including the recent doubling of the Estate Services Worker team). The fee identified in Appendix 2 takes account of the fee income GCH will charge for delivering the Decent Homes Programme, and allows for some increases in Neighbourhood Working within the City.

4.4.3 Approximately £4.124 million is needed to maintain all current revenue repairs obligations.

4.5 RENT RESTRUCTURING

4.5.1 Gloucester City Council implemented the first year of rent restructuring during 2002/2003.

4.5.2 It was decided that the full 10 years allowed for rents convergence to target be used – 2007/08 will be the 6th year of implementation and so the difference between target and nominal rents is adjusted by 1/5th of the difference.

4.5.3 The ODPM completed a review of the rent restructuring process and made several changes to the calculation formula for 2006/07. There are no changes to the rent restructuring calculation formula in 2007/08.

4.5.4 The ODPM also amended the instruction that no rent change, positive or negative, should be outside an inflation check of RPI + 0.5% + - £2.00. This now only applies to rents that are increasing to target. This check no longer applies where rents are reducing to target.

4.5.5 The rent restructuring formula has been applied to the calculation for 2007/8 and each property will have an amended rent from April 2007. Appropriate rent increase notices will be sent to tenants within statutory timeframes giving notice of the increase which will take effect from Monday 2nd April 2007.

4.6 SERVICE & OTHER CHARGES

4.6.1 In 2003, Tenants’ Forum requested a full analysis of the cost of providing communal services and then a review of the charges made for those services. The results of that analysis were presented to Forum in January 2004 and agreed as a service charge policy by Cabinet with effect from April 2004.

4.6.2 For 2007/08, the costs of providing communal services have been reviewed and updated accordingly.
4.6.3 Since 4th December 2006, a new cleaning contract has been in operation. The new contract allows that each block has a specific charge for cleaning and so individual tenancy charges have been reviewed and amended.

4.6.4 In addition, the Estate Services team has been enhanced and now comprises 8 Estate Service workers. These officers are based across the entire city and all tenants benefit from this service. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the cost of this enhanced service is recovered by a service charge. The cost to all tenants for this service will be 86p per week. Tenants in blocks in Kingsholm will not incur the charge for this enhanced service, since they have a dedicated Estate Service worker, funded directly from the existing service charge for Kingsholm.

4.6.5 Officers are able to accurately identify the cost of providing the service to an individual property and can raise an appropriate charge. Properties receiving different levels of service are charged only for the elements they receive.

4.6.6 A summary of some typical calculated charges for 2007/08 and the types of property to which they apply is shown below

4.6.7 The wider range of services and the costs of providing these has broadened the range of charges considerably, from 86p to £ 12.64, depending on the services received in each block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPICAL ADDRESS</th>
<th>Internal Lights</th>
<th>Door Entry</th>
<th>Telewest Doors</th>
<th>General Elec / Fire</th>
<th>TV Aerials</th>
<th>Estate Services</th>
<th>Cleaning / Estate Services</th>
<th>New Weekly Charge 2007/8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Houses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacon Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Gardens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s Square</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penhill Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowleaze</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbury Avenue</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Close</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Avenue</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Court</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dukeries</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.8 On the basis of the updated financial analysis, Forum / Cabinet is recommended to approve the revised level of service charges with effect from 2007/08
4.6.9 Current Council Policy is to increase the rents for Garages and Parking Spaces by the same percentage as dwelling rents and so these too will increase by 4.10%. Current Council policy is to apply no increase to Life-link charges for 2007/08.

4.7 SUPPORTING PEOPLE CHARGES

4.7.1 The Supporting People process began in April 2003, where services such as warden support are funded directly from Supporting People grants and subsidies rather than from housing benefit.

4.7.2 At the moment, officers have no indication of the grant allocation that will be made for 2007/08 and this is not expected until February 2007.

4.7.3 Forum / Cabinet is recommended to agree that Supporting People charges be determined once the full financial position is known. Officers will report to the Chair of Forum and to the Cabinet member for Housing & Health for a delegated decision.

The final recommendations will abide by the principles outlined in 4.1.2 above;

- Fair and equitable charges for communal facilities.
- Maximising the income collected

5.0 RENT FREE WEEKS 2007/08

5.1 Forum / Cabinet will be aware of the system of rent - free weeks each year.

5.2 There are 53 accounting periods in the financial year 2007/8, and so officers recommend a 49 week charge year. The service charges above have been calculated on that basis.

5.3 To relieve the financial burden on families at expensive times of the year, officers recommend that the rent free weeks be:

- Weeks commencing: Monday 30th July 2007
- Monday 24th December 2007
- Monday 31st December 2007
- Monday 31st March 2008

5.4 As the change will have an impact upon all tenants Gloucester City Homes will in line with Section 105 of the Housing Act 19885 and Gloucester City Council’s Tenancy Agreement consult with all tenants on this change of policy and practice. The consultation letter is to be found in Appendix 3.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Appendix 1 contains an estimate for the HRA in 2007/08. An increase of 4.10% would leave a balance at £1,094,000. The council is under a statutory obligation not to budget for a deficit. It is financially prudent to maintain the HRA working balance at around £1,000,000. A rent increase of 4.10% would raise an additional £480,000 in revenue.
6.2 The Retail Price Index is currently around 3.6%

6.3 Forum / Cabinet is advised to maintain good balances in line with the recommendations of the Choices debate in September 2001.

6.4 Forum / Cabinet is asked to:
   a) Approve the Housing Revenue Account
   b) Recommend the level of increase to be applied to Council dwelling rents in 2007/08 be 4.10%

6.5 Further to previous narrative, officers recommend the following other charge increases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Recommended Increase 2007/2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifelink – council tenants</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelink – private</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden Charges</td>
<td>To be determined upon confirmation of Supporting People grant allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charges</td>
<td>See schedule above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage / Parking space Charges</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Charges</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 It is recommended that the rent - free weeks listed in paragraph 5 above be adopted for 2007/08

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 These are adequately covered in the main body of the report.

8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Housing Act 1985 provides, amongst other things, that a local authority may make such charges as they may determine for the tenancy or occupation of their houses. Also, the Act provides the authority shall from time to time review rents and make such changes either of rents generally or of particular rents, as circumstances may require. The tenancy agreement specifically provides for rent changes but notice has to be given to the tenants.

9.0 HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 None

10.0 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

   (a) Staffing Implications

None at present.
(b) Trade Union Comments

None at present

11.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None.

Background Papers :

Published Papers :

Person to Contact :

Ashley Green, Chief Executive - GCH
Telephone 01452 396471
Lynne Phillips – Resources Manager - GCH
Telephone 01452 396551
Rob Wharton – Finance Manager - GCH
Telephone 01452 396408

I am writing to you in connection with the recommended rent increase report, which went to your Tenants Forum on Monday, 15th January 2007.

In consultation with Gloucester City Council, we are continuing to support the 4 rent-free weeks in 2007 –2008 financial year. Gloucester City Homes is mindful that the rent free weeks should be at more convenient times in order to relieve the burden on our customers at expensive times of the year and so the recommendation of your forum is that for 2007/2008 rent free weeks should reflect the holiday periods more closely as follows:

Monday, 30th July 2007 (Start of Summer Holidays)
Monday, 24th December 2007 (Start of Christmas Holidays)
Monday, 31st December 2007 (Start of New Year Holidays)
Monday, 31st March 2008 (Start of Easter Holidays)

Paying by Direct Debit is the most convenient and secure way to pay your rent charge. You can spread the cost of your annual rent charge over 12 monthly payments or weekly if you so wish. Please contact our customer services and we will arrange for you to be set up. Please call our Freephone 0800 408 2000.

Your tenant forum has also agreed the annual rent increase for next year at 4.1%. This will take into account a 53-week rent period, which will enable Gloucester City Homes to:

- Meet the Decent Homes Programme and provide better services, an increase £461,000 in the Housing Investment Programme is necessary.
- Maintain and improve services for 2007-2008 following a reduction in housing subsidy of £485,000 compared to the 2006-2007 financial year.

The alternative is to cut services to you in next years Improvement Programme to many homes in the City. Clearly, this is a matter for Tenants to decide and we value your views and if you wish to give us any feedback on this letter, please complete the following questions: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the proposed rent-free weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the annual rent increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the 4 rent-free week and 49 Week rent period to sustain the Improvement Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

If you have any questions, please contact Customer Services, Freephone 0800 -408 -2000.
1. **SUBJECT**

   (a) **Title:** Llanthony Secunda Priory Options Appraisal
   
   (b) **Ward:** All Wards

2. **KEY DECISION/DEcision TO BE CONSIDERED (As per recommendations of report)  (Delete as appropriate)**

   Members are recommended to:

   - Sell to the Management Trust within the current financial year (2006-2007) to take advantage of English Heritage funding (£20,000).
   
   - Keep the current budget for Llanthony Secunda Priory (£10,000) for the first three years (2007 –2010) and to use it to sustain the Management Trust in its early stages; this funding would enable the Council to retain its influence and would be subject to a Service Level Agreement (SLA). The SLA will include access rights for the Council to stage Living History, theatrical and film events at the Priory.
   
   - Covenant the site so that, should the Management Trust fail, ownership of the monument and its grounds would revert to the Council.

   Private individual to be offered a seat on the Management Trust Board.

3. **SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE**

   (a) **Background**

   3.1 This report follows the previous ones made to Cabinet Briefing on December 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2004 (Ref: PT02124D), to Cabinet on June 7\textsuperscript{th} 2006 (Ref: 0002/6), and to CMT on November 14\textsuperscript{th} 2006 (Ref: 0009/6).

   3.2 Llanthony Secunda Priory is a Scheduled Ancient Monument of national importance. It is situated at the heart of the Gloucester Quays Development and has been in the City Council’s ownership since 1974. Despite its historic significance, the site has suffered from years of neglect and under-investment.

   3.3 Two Grade I listed buildings on the site are currently identified by English Heritage as being in the highest risk category, that is ‘at immediate risk’, due to their poor condition and disuse. There are potential public safety issues if the works are not carried out as
a matter of priority.

3.4 Given its current state of dilapidation and its national importance as a Scheduled Ancient Monument immediate action is required. It is imperative to bring the site and its component parts back into beneficial use and to create a sustainable future for the Monument.

3.5 At the Cabinet Meeting of June 7th 2006, the Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure sought advice from Cabinet in respect of a way forward for Llanthony Secunda Priory.

3.6 The Managing Director advised that he had been exploring opportunities with management trust partners which would both distance the Council from the risk and increase funding opportunities.

3.7 As a result, Cabinet resolved the following:

1) That a Management Trust be created, as outlined in the Fielden Clegg report (September 2004) which would take responsibility for the site and maximise the eligibility of the site for grant.

2) That Cabinet agreed in principle the sale of Llanthony Secunda Priory to English Heritage and that delegated authority be given to the Managing Director (now Chief Executive) in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure to complete the sale of Llanthony Secunda Priory to English Heritage.

3) That officers report to Cabinet in six months.

3.8 Within weeks of the Council’s decision to sell the Priory to English Heritage, exploratory talks between English Heritage and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) revealed the difficulties involved in such a sale.

3.9 DCMS declared that it would take at least nine months to decide whether English Heritage should acquire the Priory. Since members had asked for the sale to take place within six months, it was agreed at the Steering Group that acquisition by English Heritage could not be achieved within the time-period allowed by the Council.

3.10 Further discussion in the Council and at Llanthony Priory Steering Group lead to the decision that the Council should sell the Priory directly to the Trust and that the best time for the transfer to take place was January 1st 2007.

3.11 In the following months, a draft Memorandum and Articles of Association was produced by members of the Llanthony Secunda Priory Steering Group. This was based upon a standard template (See Appendix Five).

3.12 The document was then refined by the Steering Group and submitted to the Legal Services department of the Council who could find no fault with it.

3.13 On the advice of the Steering Group, the Memorandum and Articles were also sent to the Chair of the Civic Trust for his comments. The Chair is a lawyer by profession and has considerable experience in the setting up of Trusts.
3.14 He raised no objection to the formal constitution of the Trust although he did remark that he was concerned about how the Trust would be resourced. He further added that he did not think that the Trust would flourish unless the Council put in money to support it.

3.15 The Title for the Priory was investigated by the Policy Design and Conservation Department of the Council. This revealed that a section of ground inside the boundary wall, which runs from the north east to the south west of the property, belongs to Peel Holdings plc. It is understood that Peel Holdings plc are willing to gift this land to the Management Trust, but not to the private individual.

3.16 The Council’s ownership of the main part of the site is recorded with the Land Registry and there should be no problem in transferring the Title.

3.17 Talks have also continued with the private individual who is interested in purchasing the site. The then Managing Director felt that this was prudent while the Trust was being set up and in advance of a final agreement about its constitution. It was felt that should Cabinet reject the proposed Memorandum and Articles of Association another option would be available. The private individual’s proposals for the site are set out in Appendix Four.

3.18 A progress report was submitted to CMT on 14th November 2006. The report recommended that a Management Trust be set up and that this should start operating on January 1st 2007. CMT were cautious about this proposal. They felt that since the sale to English Heritage could not be realised, the options for managing the property should be rehearsed once more.

(b) Financial Implications (Bring in from report)

7.1 Llanthony Priory is a scheduled ancient monument/listed building and consequently has limited alternative uses. This is a difficult site to value but has a capital asset value of £31,612 at 31/3/06. If approval is given to sell the site for a £1 to English Heritage, there ought to be a covenant to prevent onward sale.

7.2 The value of the site is to be included as the Council’s contribution to the Management Trust. The day to day maintenance of the site would transfer to the Management trust.

7.3 There is a revenue budget in 2006/07 for premises and supplies of £9,480 which could be saved if the site is transferred to a trust or private individual.

7.4 Health and safety works in constructing a fence costing £13,050 are not in the budget.

(c) Legal Implications (Bring in from report)

8.1 It is proposed to operate the charitable trust through a company limited by guarantee. This is an alternative type of incorporation used primarily for non-profit organisations that require corporate status. A guarantee company does not have a share capital, but has members who are guarantors instead of shareholders. The guarantor gives an undertaking to contribute a nominal amount towards the winding up of the company and in the event of a shortfall upon cessation of business. It cannot distribute its profits to its members and is therefore eligible to apply for charitable status.
8.2 It is also proposed that the land will be transferred to the Company. The land title is being investigated and it is too early to say whether there will be any problems relating to it. The contractual requirements of the transfer are hard to anticipate in their entirety without first considering the title. It may be that the Council will want an option to re-acquire the property should the trust company be wound up for some reason. There may also be matters in respect of which the Council may want to consider restrictive covenants. There may be activities that the Council would wish to prohibit, but which would otherwise be within the trusts powers. It is assumed that this is to be a transfer of the whole of the title, if not there may be rights to be granted and/or reserved. In theory completion by New Year is feasible but will depend more on incorporation than the conveyancing process. Any enforcement of a covenant to carry out work will be difficult to enforce through the courts.

8.3 The transfer should include appropriate clawback and pre-emption rights for the Council in case events do not turn out as expected, which would give the Council an opportunity to recover the land or any unforeseen profit on development.

(d) Risk Management Implications

Included in Report Appendices

(e) Predictive Impact Assessments (Equalities)

Included in Report Appendices

(f) Other Corporate Implications

4. REPORTING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) CMT:</td>
<td>12th December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cabinet Briefing:</td>
<td>10th January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) OSM: (Pre-Scrutiny - key decisions only)</td>
<td>22nd January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Cabinet:</td>
<td>24th January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Council</td>
<td>15th February 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. RESPONSIBILITY

Portfolio : Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure

Lead Officer : Andrew Fox
### 6. CONSULTATION
(To be carried out or carried out (including method and dates, required for Key decisions only - information must link with information on consultation contained in the Forward Plan).

**6.1 Stakeholders** *(including Ward Councillors where appropriate)*

**6.2 Outcome** *(Brief summary and ref. for minutes, other related documents)*

### 7. OPTIONS *(to be considered/considered - brief summary and reference to reports where appropriate)*

### 8. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - PRE-SCRUTINY COMMENTS
*(Key decisions only)*

### 9. ADDITIONAL OPTIONS CONSIDERED
*(other than those specified in the report)*

### 10. CABINET DECISION TAKEN
*(If in line with 3 above, say, ‘In accordance with 3 above’ - Expand if the decision is otherwise e.g. where views/suggestions of Executive Scrutiny Committee have been taken into account)*

### 11. CONSULTATION/ADVICE
*(Delete as appropriate)*

**11.1 Have the consultation comments been taken into account?**  YES / NO
*(Key Decisions only)*

**11.2 Was the decision taken in accordance with officer advice?**  YES / NO
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong></td>
<td><strong>REASONS FOR THE DECISION:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTERESTS</strong> <em>(Details of any interests declared by a Member or Officer in the subject matter of the decision either (a) personal or (b) personal and prejudicial):</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISPENSATION</strong> <em>(Details of any dispensation granted by Standards Committee):</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform the Council about the latest developments with regard to Llanthony Secunda Priory, a nationally important Scheduled Ancient Monument;

1.2 To present an options’ appraisal for the future management of the site. The options are:
  - Do nothing;
  - Sell to a Management Trust;
  - Sell to a private individual.

1.3 To seek members’ advice about a way forward for the future management of Llanthony Secunda Priory
2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are recommended to:

- Sell to the Management Trust within the current financial year (2006-2007) to take advantage of English Heritage funding (£20,000).

- Keep the current budget for Llanthony Secunda Priory (£10,000) for the first three years (2007 –2010) and to use it to sustain the Management Trust in its early stages; this funding would enable the Council to retain its influence and would be subject to a Service Level Agreement (SLA). The SLA will include access rights for the Council to stage Living History, theatrical and film events at the Priory.

- Covenant the site so that, should the Management Trust fail, ownership of the monument and its grounds would revert to the Council.

- Private individual to be offered a seat on the Management Trust Board.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.3 This report follows the previous ones made to Cabinet Briefing on December 2nd 2004 (Ref: PT02124D), to Cabinet on June 7th 2006 (Ref: 0002/6), and to CMT on November 14th 2006 (Ref: 0009/6).

3.4 Llanthony Secunda Priory is a Scheduled Ancient Monument of national importance. It is situated at the heart of the Gloucester Quays Development and has been in the City Council’s ownership since 1974. Despite its historic significance, the site has suffered from years of neglect and under-investment.

3.3 Two Grade I listed buildings on the site are currently identified by English Heritage as being in the highest risk category, that is ‘at immediate risk’, due to their poor condition and disuse. There are potential public safety issues if the works are not carried out as a matter of priority.

3.4 Given its current state of dilapidation and its national importance as a Scheduled Ancient Monument immediate action is required. It is imperative to bring the site and its component parts back into beneficial use and to create a sustainable future for the Monument.

3.5 At the Cabinet Meeting of June 7th 2006, the Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure sought advice from Cabinet in respect of a way forward for Llanthony Secunda Priory.

3.6 The Managing Director advised that he had been exploring opportunities with management trust partners which would both distance the Council from the risk and increase funding opportunities.

3.7 As a result, Cabinet resolved the following:

1) That a Management Trust be created, as outlined in the Fielden Clegg report (September 2004) which would take responsibility for the site and maximise the eligibility of the site for grant.
2) That Cabinet agreed in principle the sale of Llanthony Secunda Priory to English Heritage and that delegated authority be given to the Managing Director (now Chief Executive) in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Heritage and Leisure to complete the sale of Llanthony Secunda Priory to English Heritage.

3) That officers report to Cabinet in six months.

3.8 Within weeks of the Council’s decision to sell the Priory to English Heritage, exploratory talks between English Heritage and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) revealed the difficulties involved in such a sale.

3.9 DCMS declared that it would take at least nine months to decide whether English Heritage should acquire the Priory. Since members had asked for the sale to take place within six months, it was agreed at the Steering Group that acquisition by English Heritage could not be achieved within the time-period allowed by the Council.

3.9 Further discussion in the Council and at Llanthony Priory Steering Group lead to the decision that the Council should sell the Priory directly to the Trust and that the best time for the transfer to take place was January 1st 2007.

3.11 In the following months, a draft Memorandum and Articles of Association was produced by members of the Llanthony Secunda Priory Steering Group. This was based upon a standard template (See Appendix Five).

3.12 The document was then refined by the Steering Group and submitted to the Legal Services department of the Council who could find no fault with it.

3.13 On the advice of the Steering Group, the Memorandum and Articles were also sent to the Chair of the Civic Trust for his comments. The Chair is a lawyer by profession and has considerable experience in the setting up of Trusts.

3.14 He raised no objection to the formal constitution of the Trust although he did remark that he was concerned about how the Trust would be resourced. He further added that he did not think that the Trust would flourish unless the Council put in money to support it.

3.17 The Title for the Priory was investigated by the Policy Design and Conservation Department of the Council. This revealed that a section of ground inside the boundary wall, which runs from the north east to the south west of the property, belongs to Peel Holdings plc. It is understood that Peel Holdings plc are willing to gift this land to the Management Trust, but not to the private individual.

3.18 The Council’s ownership of the main part of the site is recorded with the Land Registry and there should be no problem in transferring the Title.

3.17 Talks have also continued with the private individual who is interested in purchasing the site. The then Managing Director felt that this was prudent while the Trust was being set up and in advance of a final agreement about its constitution. It was felt that should Cabinet reject the proposed Memorandum and Articles of
Association another option would be available. The private individual’s proposals for the site are set out in Appendix Four.

3.18 A progress report was submitted to CMT on 14th November 2006. The report recommended that a Management Trust be set up and that this should start operating on January 1st 2007. CMT were cautious about this proposal. They felt that since the sale to English Heritage could not be realised, the options for managing the property should be rehearsed once more.

4.0 PROGRESS

4.1 There are three main options:

- Do nothing, i.e., deal with the public safety issues: clear undergrowth and fence off the site to reduce Health and Safety risks, continue current programme of basic maintenance;
- Sell Llanthony Secunda Priory to a Management Trust for £1;
- Sell Llanthony Secunda Priory to a private individual for £100,000 (using the Council’s tendering process to ensure fairness).

The “Do Nothing” Option

4.2 There is little to recommend the “do nothing” option. The Council retains full control of the monument, but it also incurs the costs of maintenance and essential repairs. Moreover, the risks remain with the Council. The vulnerability of the site is such that to prevent vandalism and/or injury a HERAS fence will need to be erected around the premises; the cost for this will be £13,050. In addition, essential repairs will be required to the monument at a cost of £700,000 (2004 prices) and this cost will fall to the Council.

The Management Trust Option (See Appendix Three)

4.3 The Feilden Clegg Report, completed in September 2004, estimated that £0.7 million would be required to carry out essential repairs and an additional £1 million required to make the site economically viable. Full development of the site would require further investment.

4.4 A grant request to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for a ‘repairs-only’ project is unlikely to be successful due to the limited social and economic benefits arising from such an approach.

4.5 A ‘repairs-only’ project would also mean that the site would not become self-sustaining; that is, it would not generate sufficient income to cover future maintenance and running costs.

4.6 Feilden Clegg further recommended that responsibility for the site should be
transferred to a new Management Trust in order to maximise funding opportunities for capital works. It stated that the Local Authority on its own is not best placed to do this.

4.7 Such a Trust would be a registered charity and could include representation from all the future stakeholders in the site: not just the City Council but also, potentially, Gloucsat, English Heritage, British Waterways, Peel Holdings plc, the County Council, the Civic Trust, the Heritage Urban Regeneration Company, The Excellence Cluster and other organisations who are able to provide or facilitate funding.

4.8 Transfer of the site to a Management Trust would allow the value of the site to be included as part of a matched-funding contribution towards any future grant request to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

4.9 Shortly after the Feilden Clegg Report was completed, a Commissioner of English Heritage became interested in the site and convened a meeting of what subsequently came to be known as the Llanthony Secunda Priory Steering Group. This included representatives from Gloucester City Council, The Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), English Heritage, British Waterways, Gloucester HURC, and the Civic Trust.

4.10 Should the Management Trust option be chosen an HLF bid would be submitted at an early stage. This application would be centred upon making the site and its related buildings more usable and accessible. Interpretation would be improved. And the Priory could be used chiefly for different kinds of training for people of all ages, in music, the arts, and heritage skills. The creation of a dormitory block in the restored tithe barn would give the opportunity for groups of young people to come to Gloucester and experience the full range of its artistic and sporting facilities. The open space could be used both for re-enactments, concerts, opera and theatrical events throughout the day. The proximity of GLOSCAT, the proposed new hotel, and the Gloucester Quays Development would provide an audience for such events. A commercial tie-in with the new GLOSCAT and the proposed hotel might be negotiated to enhance the economic viability of the site. The site could also be used for weddings and other events.

4.11 It should perhaps be added that GLOSCAT have a vision for the site, which would be facilitated by the creation of a Management Trust. The Management Trust would allow GLOSCAT to integrate the Priory into its future plans, which presently involve the building of the new GLOSCAT on the north side of the Priory and its further proposals for the higher educational use on the south side of the Priory adjacent to the hotel.

4.12 The advantage of this approach for the City Council would be not only to retain a strategic influence on the future of the site, but also to ensure that the vision for skills, employment, education arrangements around the site are not jeopardised by some other kind of owner.
4.13 At the CMT Meeting of December 12th, officers expressed the following concerns that the Management Trust would not be:

- Properly resourced;
- Properly staffed.

4.14 Officers recommended that the current budget for Llanthony Secunda Priory be kept and used to sustain the Management Trust over its first three years.

4.15 Further discussion has taken place subsequently with the Vice-Principal of Gloscat Jeremy Williamson, in respect of staffing issues. It is his intention, should the Management Trust option be chosen, to have the Victorian part of the lodging occupied by Gloscat staff in the first instance as part of a heritage skills training centre.

4.16 Longer term alternative tenants may be found but for the interim this occupation along with the additional fencing will help to demonstrate a site presence which is urgently needed at present. He also intends to make the boundary fencing secure through partnership funding from the Council and SWRDA. This will substantially reduce Council costs by an estimated £9,000 (See para 4.2).

**Sale to a Private Individual Option (See Appendix Four)**

4.17 At about the same time that the feasibility study was completed and the Llanthony Secunda Priory Steering Group was set up, the City Council received a preliminary expression of interest from a private individual who wished to purchase the Priory and to manage it in the future. This timely offer is unquestionably a serious one and the person concerned has established a reputation for his meticulous restoring of other old buildings.

4.18 This individual is interested in acquiring Llanthony Secunda Priory for around £100,000. He would need about 10 to 15 years to complete his project fully, which would consist of restoring the buildings on site and renting them out when completed to businesses whose aims are sympathetic to the heritage of the site.

4.19 The potential buyer’s timetable for the restoration of the Priory would be as follows. In the first twelve months, having acquired the site and set up the agreed management arrangements, the individual would carry out a detailed appraisal of the site and enter into discussions with English Heritage; essential repairs would also be carried out at this time. Applications to the Heritage Lottery Fund and English Heritage would follow in the next two years. The individual has stated that failure to secure these funds would not prevent the successful completion of the project.

4.20 In order to avert some of the perceived problems of an individual owning the site, he would be willing to form a Trust provided its Trustees were carefully selected from the Civic Trust and Gloucester City Council. The individual has been advised that should the Council decide to sell the site its availability would need to
be advertised and a rigorous process undertaken to ensure the Council’s impartiality. This process would follow the pattern adopted by the Authority in respect of the sale of 66 Westgate Street. Expressions of interest would be invited from organisations and individuals and a tendering process would be embarked upon thereafter in line with Council procedures. As part of this process, the Council will lay down the outcomes it was seeking for the property, its targets and objectives.

4.21 One of the most attractive features of this offer is the person’s concern for the historic integrity of the site. However, it should be noted that the acquisition of the site by a private individual, whatever his integrity of purpose, may cause the Council other problems if the ownership of the site were to change because of sale or inheritance.

4.22 The potential buyer is fully aware of the Section 106 agreement attached to the site.

The Options’ Appraisal

4.23 The advantages and disadvantages of each option are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Do nothing” - (put HERAS fencing around</td>
<td>• Property remains under full Council control</td>
<td>• No cash receipt for the Council;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the site and continue grounds’ and</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Costs rise (i.e., £13,050 to fence off and clear site + £10,000 p.a. for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buildings’ maintenance as before)</td>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance costs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Essential repairs need to be carried out, costing some £700,000 (2004 prices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council’s reputation as a guardian of monuments continues to decline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No grant-aid;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation of site negligible;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risks remain with the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust (See APPENDIX THREE AND</td>
<td>• Eligible for grant-aid;</td>
<td>• No cash receipt for the Council;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE )</td>
<td>• Tie-in with educational and other establishments</td>
<td>• Fund raising might not be successful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>around the site;</td>
<td>• Trust will not be underwritten either by the Council or by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity to grow graduate level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>capacity in particular skills areas (heritage and engineering);</strong></td>
<td><strong>English Heritage:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Creation of an educational quarter which is often seen as a precursor to economic growth;</strong></td>
<td><strong>• What will happen to the property should the Trust fail?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Potential for science park development;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Potential for the development of a waterways archive of national significance;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Transfer of freehold will eliminate risk to the Council;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Council can still retain a strategic role in the management trust;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• This option was recommended by Feilden Clegg (2004);</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• This option is supported by English Heritage, Gloscat, Peel Holdings, British Waterways;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Reputation of potential Board Members (in particular, Commissioner of English Heritage)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Section 106 commitments will be delivered;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Consultation delivered through the creation of a Friends’ organisation;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Triangular piece of ground within the boundary wall gifted to the Trust by Peel Holdings plc;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Potential for a substantial part of the boundary fencing to be achieved through SWRDA funding;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale to Private Individual (see APPENDIX FOUR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development might be slow;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cash receipt for the Council (£100,000);</td>
<td>• Section 106 agreement might not be continued when it comes up for review after 5 years;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transfer of freehold will eliminate risk to the Council;</td>
<td>• Spin-off benefits from neighbouring sites are unlikely to be realised;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Willing to create a Trust for Llanthony Secunda Priory;</td>
<td>• Limited or no consultation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risks removed from the Council.</td>
<td>• Triangular piece of ground within the boundary wall unlikely to be gifted by Peel Holdings plc;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What will happen to the property should the Trust fail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What happens if individual sells property, goes bankrupt or dies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What happens if property continues to deteriorate-enforcement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.0 FUTURE WORK

5.1 To act upon the decision taken by the Council in respect of the three options.

### 6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 If the Council wishes to realise a cash sale, then only one option is viable (sale to private individual); if it wishes, however, to integrate the site fully into the Gloucester Quays development, to create possible educational and business synergies which will help sustain and strengthen the overall development, and to further contribute to the regeneration of the City, then the Management Trust option is the likeliest one to achieve these outcomes. The Management Trust option is, therefore, recommended.

6.2 The “Do Nothing” option has little merit.
7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Llanthony Priory is a scheduled ancient monument/listed building and consequently has limited alternative uses. This is a difficult site to value but has a capital asset value of £31,612 at 31/3/06. If approval is given to sell the site for a £1 to English Heritage, there ought to be a covenant to prevent onward sale.

7.2 The value of the site is to be included as the Council’s contribution to the Management Trust. The day to day maintenance of the site would transfer to the Management trust.

7.3 There is a revenue budget in 2006/07 for premises and supplies of £9,480 which could be saved if the site is transferred to a trust or private individual.

7.4 Health and safety works in constructing a fence costing £13,050 are not in the budget.

7.5 Name of the Officer: Steve Meers

8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 It is proposed to operate the charitable trust through a company limited by guarantee. This is an alternative type of incorporation used primarily for non-profit organisations that require corporate status. A guarantee company does not have a share capital, but has members who are guarantors instead of shareholders. The guarantor gives an undertaking to contribute a nominal amount towards the winding up of the company and in the event of a shortfall upon cessation of business. It cannot distribute its profits to its members and is therefore eligible to apply for charitable status.

8.2 It is also proposed that the land will be transferred to the Company. The land title is being investigated and it is too early to say whether there will be any problems relating to it. The contractual requirements of the transfer are hard to anticipate in their entirety without first considering the title. It may be that the Council will want an option to re-acquire the property should the trust company be wound up for some reason. There may also be matters in respect of which the Council may want to consider restrictive covenants. There may be activities that the Council would wish to prohibit, but which would otherwise be within the trusts powers. It is assumed that this is to be a transfer of the whole of the title, if not there may be rights to be granted and/or reserved. In theory completion by New Year is feasible but will depend more on incorporation than the conveyancing process. Any enforcement of a covenant to carry out work will be difficult to enforce through the courts.

The transfer should include appropriate clawback and pre-emption rights for the Council in case events do not turn out as expected, which would give the Council an opportunity to recover the land or any unforeseen profit on development.

8.2 Name of the Officer: Gary Spencer
9.0 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS  (Authors to complete) Identify all key risks (scoring 8 and above) for the recommendation including the impact and likelihood of the risk occurring and what measures will be taken to mitigate the risk.

See Risk Assessment (Appendix Two)

10.0 PREDICTIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (EQUALITIES)  (Authors to complete) Identify all risks for customers and staff, in the areas of gender, disability, age, race, religion, sexual orientation etc.

See Predictive Impact Assessment

11.0 OTHER CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

1. Community Safety (Author to complete)

Community safety is a considerable issue on this site. There have been numerous break-ins during the past year and at least two fires have been extinguished in the grounds. There is also a problem with rough sleepers using the grounds. A number have been moved on.

A secure boundary fence should be erected around the site to protect the buildings and to prevent accident and injury.

2. Environmental (Author to complete)

The Priory, if properly resourced and managed, could be developed as a nature reserve. This is not possible at present while access to the grounds is not controlled and finances are restricted.

3. Staffing (Personnel to complete)

None

4. Trade Union (TU to complete)

None received
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Published Papers : 

Person to Contact : Andrew Fox
Tel: (01452) 396124
E-mail: andrew.fox@gloucester.gov.uk
APPENDIX ONE

Llanthony Secunda Priory
Site Plan

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Gloucester City Council Licence No.078050 (2004)
APPENDIX TWO

1. “Do Nothing” Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council fails to protect Llanthony Priory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• HERAS fencing erected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• £700,000 invested for essential works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Risk Assessment for Management Trust
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management Trust does not succeed with HLF bid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• HLF bid is timely (before 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding partners involved with the Trust from the bid’s inception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Failure of Management Board to agree a way forward</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Ensure a common agenda from the inception of the trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement procedures for reconciling different agendas of Board Members should they arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trust fails</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Covenant to transfer land back to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with Partners and obtain grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Risk Assessment for Purchase by an Individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual does not carry out his plans for the site</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>• Covenants in place to ensure site is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formation of a Trust to protect the interests of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual's plans do not meet with the Council's approval</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>• Formation of a Trust in which both Council and English Heritage are represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Covenants in place to ensure proper development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SAM legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual sells land, goes bankrupt, dies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Restrictions on disposal of land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE

Llanthony Secunda Priory Position Paper

1. Background

1.1 The Gloucester Quays scheme and more specifically the relocation of Gloscat has created an opportunity to breathe new life into the Llanthony scheduled ancient monument site.

This opportunity was recognised early on and members of the then Western Waterfront Steering Group (the precursor of the URC) generated a funding pot to enable a detailed study, which was undertaken by Fielden Clegg in the Summer of 2004 with active supervision from English Heritage.

1.2 The outputs of that study were

- Options for future repair and re-use
- The need to consider future ownership given the potential for a heritage lottery bid
- The formation of a steering group to champion the project

1.3 The Steering Group, driven by Gloscat as the proposed new neighbour has had the following membership:

- Gilly Drummond   EH Commissioner (Chair)
- Bob Bewley / Andrew Vines   English Heritage
- Jeremy Williamson   Gloscat
- Richard Sermon /Andrew Fox   Gloucester City Council
- Mick Thorpe/Ian Heywood   Gloucester City Council
- Peter Wynn   Gloucester Heritage URC
- Nigel Spry   Gloucester Civic Trust

2. Current Position

2.1 The Steering Group has pursued the following themes:

2.1.1 The development of heritage construction skills through Gloscat. This is proving successful following the achievement of an LSC bid to develop an appropriate curriculum offer; local business and heritage interest organisations have particularly welcomed this development

2.1.2 The explanation of potential uses to ensure future viability of the whole Priory site. A range of options have been explored and the Essex County Council income generation model deployed at Cressing Temple (a set of Knights Templar barns) provides a potential useful template to adopt.

Other options have included:

- Suitable anchor tenants
- Furthering the education campus theme
- Relations with the proposed hotel
2.1.3 The future ownership of the Priory. It is our understanding that any bids to the heritage lottery fund are unlikely to be successful whilst ownership of the Priory remains with Gloucester City Council, as a statutory body. It has been proposed to create a management trust consisting of Gloucester City Council, English Heritage, Gloscat, and Peel / British Waterways (potentially in the guise of the hotel operation). The proposal for a management trust has been clouded by the intervention of a third party expressing a wish to purchase the site.

2.2 The most successful element of our work to date has been the educational aspect. The start on site by Gloscat contractors has increased interest in a greater educational offer in the Docks and detailed discussions have been taking place between Gloscat, UWE and the University of Gloucestershire as the educational partners and SWRDA in their role promoting higher level skills within the region.

2.2.1 It is likely that a HEFCE bid will emerge to deliver an HE offer (with a particular emphasis on engineering, construction and media technology). A potential site could be the land lying to the South of the Priory currently designated for residential use within the Gloucester Quays Scheme (see Appendix 1), with a proposal for a teaching and residential block, other facilities such as sports and catering would be serviced from the new Gloscat site. Preliminary discussions with Peel Holdings suggest that the land could be made available and it is believed that this HE use may even be more favourable to planners generally and English Heritage particularly in generating a holistic solution for Priory enclosure.

2.2.2 This proposal would generate a true educational campus with both a further education and higher education offer linked by the grounds of Llanthony Priory. The benefit of such an approach is that funding bids could help lever-in refurbishment costs for the Priory as part of a wider scheme. A key factor in this proposal would be win-win outcomes for all concerned, notably:

- The underwriting of risks
- The opportunity to grow graduate level capacity within the City in particular skill areas
- The emergence of an educational quarter which is often seen as a precursor to economic growth and potential for science park style developments

3. The Conundrum

3.1 For Gloucester City Council the ownership of a large number of scheduled monuments and listed buildings presents the double-edged sword of opportunity and liability; a situation recognised by the formation of the Gloucester Heritage URC.

3.5 A range of options have been explored with various parties including:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Advantages / Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) The sale of the Priory site to a 3rd party.</td>
<td>(i) Provides a cash receipt for Gloucester City. Removes long term liability for City. Difficult to envisage how the existing S106 agreement between Gloscat and Gloucester City Council would be honoured given the break clause. Any restrictions to Priory access would negate one of the primary attractions of the site as a relocation option for Gloscat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The acquisition of the Priory by English Heritage for a given sum; any such monies to be re-invested in other ‘at risk’ heritage sites in the City. English Heritage would then create the management trust mentioned earlier.</td>
<td>(ii) Provides a cash receipt for GCC to re-invest in other ‘at-risk’ sites. Enables Gloucester City to play a role in future management of the Priory. Expectation that S106 commitments will be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) The acquisition of the Priory by English Heritage for £1 with any other available sums being committed to ground / site works as an enabling package. The management trust would then, in concert with other bodies, seek funds to undertake the necessary building refurbishment / restoration.</td>
<td>(iii) No cash receipt for Gloucester City and hence no spin-off relating to re-investment in an alternative ‘at risk’ City owned site, but removal of the long term liability and an opportunity to play a strategic role on the management trust. Any English Heritage “dowry” funds would enable a start on ground works and send a positive message over long term intentions. Expectation that S106 commitments will be delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **The Way Forward**

4.1 A meeting of the key strategic partners

- Gloucester City Council
- English Heritage
- SWRDA
- Gloscat
- University of West of England
- University of Gloucestershire
- Gloucester Heritage URC
has been scheduled for 23\textsuperscript{rd} May 2006 at 3.30 pm at North Warehouse, Gloucester with the aim of achieving a consensus view on the way forward and hopefully identify funds to enable:

- A detailed capacity study to justify a HEFCE bid
- The development of a detailed business case that builds upon the 2004 Fielden Clegg study

Jeremy Williamson  
Vice Principal – Glocat
APPENDIX FOUR

Llanthony Priory, Gloucester

A summary of key objectives for the restoration and future use of this important historic site.

Prepared by Tim Wiltshire owner of Brockworth Court, previously a manorial estate once owned by the Priory.

Much has already been written about the history of the Priory by able historians including John Rhodes and Philip Moss, which has been of enormous assistance in providing a better understanding of the site.

It is quite clearly a group of buildings representing an important part of the development of Gloucester’s unique heritage and is also most certainly of national interest.

Despite the deterioration that has afflicted the building fabric, the remnants of the remaining buildings are still together as one and therefore still maintain a strong unique presence, which is enhanced by the single ownership of the site. It is to the credit of the City Council that although they have not been able to fund further restoration they have at least kept the site intact. Separation of the various segments of the whole would undoubtedly have caused a much greater decline in the overall integrity of the site.

I have studied the various building surveys and appraisals recently prepared on behalf of the City Council which I found to be reasonably comprehensive and provide to some extent a budget of the likely costs of restoration involved.

Having had the benefit of similar restoration work at Brockworth Court and Tithe Barn I understand from firsthand knowledge the enormous challenge that lies ahead. It can be demonstrated that it is possible to revive the Priory to a position where it is playing as great a part in the life of Gloucester as has done since the dissolution of the Monasteries in 1538.

The key objectives are as follows:-

Immediately

To preserve the fabric of the existing buildings in order to prevent any further deterioration.

Within the next 12 months.

To prepare a plan of action to completely restore all of the existing buildings using traditional materials and where possible traditional methods of construction. It is imperative that a plan for a viable and cohesive future use of the buildings is produced. This must ensure the continued repair and maintenance in the future so that the buildings can be used, understood and enjoyed for many generations to come.

Over the next 2-5 years
A concentrated works programme of restoration of the middle range and south range of the stables. Repair of the C19th farmhouse.
Repairs to the gatehouse and walls.
Restoration of the West range and the North range
Landscaping work including the C19th cattle pond.

Over the next 4-7 years.

Restoration of the Tithe Barn in traditional materials.

Projected costs and funding Summary

Over the next 2-5 years. An estimated total of £975,000
Over the next 4-7 years. An additional £900,000

Funding

It is anticipated that the business plan will assume private funding based on viability, it is possible that some grant monies may be available but I do not propose to rely on this in order to complete the programme of works.

Future use:-

Over the past 5 years or so my interest in Llanthony has developed to become what is now a passion, and I am therefore very keen that something happens to preserve and bring back to life the treasure that is such a part of Gloucester City Life.

In essence the priory will become a heritage site with a museum dedicated to the history of life as it once was in the C15th.
There will be craft workshops, art galleries, indoor and outdoor exhibitions and space for a venue for a variety of activities and functions.
Landscaped gardens will provide a peaceful haven for members of the public to enjoy.

It is proposed that the site would be purchased from the Council by a special form of limited company and a management directorate which could include a member of the City Council, a local historian, project managers and myself would also be set up to administer the operations.

I confirm that the initial purchase price, subject to contract would be the sum of £100,000.

TJ Wiltshire
November 2006
APPENDIX FIVE

COMPANIES ACTS 1985 AND 1989

COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE AND
NOT HAVING A SHARE CAPITAL

ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION OF

LLANTHONY SECUNDA PRIORY TRUST

1. MEMBERSHIP

1.1 The number of members with which the company proposes to be registered is unlimited

1.2 The Charity must maintain a register of members

1.3 Membership of the Charity is open to any individual [or organisation] interested in promoting the Objects who

1.3.1 applies to the Charity in the form required by the Trustees

1.3.2 is approved by the Trustees

and

1.3.3 signs the Register of members or consents in writing to become a member [either personally or (in the case of a member organisation) through an authorised representative]

1.4 The Trustees may establish different classes of membership and prescribe their respective privileges and duties and set the amounts of any subscriptions

1.5 Membership is terminated if the member concerned

1.5.1 gives written notice of resignation to the Charity

1.5.2 dies [or (in the case of an organisation) ceases to exist]

1.5.3 is six months in arrears in paying the relevant subscription (if any) (but in such a case the member may be reinstated on payment of the amount due)

or

1.5.4 is removed from membership by resolution of the Trustees on the ground that in their reasonable opinion the member's continued membership is harmful to the Charity (but only after notifying the member in writing and considering the matter in the light of any written representations which the member concerned puts forward within 14 clear days after receiving notice)
1.6 Membership of the Charity is not transferable

2. GENERAL MEETINGS

2.1 Members are entitled to attend general meetings [either] personally [or (in the case of a member organisation) by an authorised representative]. General meetings are called on at least clear 21 days written notice specifying the business to be discussed.

2.2 There is a quorum at a general meeting if the number of members [or authorised representatives] personally present is at least 6 (or 20% of the members if greater).

2.3 The [Chairman] or (if the Chairman is unable or unwilling to do so) some other member elected by those present presides at a general meeting.

2.4 Except where otherwise provided by the Act, every issue is decided by a majority of the votes cast.

2.5 Except for the chairman of the meeting, who has a second or casting vote, every member present in person [or through an authorised representative] has one vote on each issue.

2.6 A written resolution signed by all those entitled to vote at a general meeting is as valid as a resolution actually passed at a general meeting (and for this purpose the written resolution may be set out in more than one document and will be treated as passed on the date of the last signature).

2.7 The Charity must hold an AGM in every year which all members are entitled to attend. The first AGM may be held within 18 months after the Charity’s incorporation.

2.8 At an AGM the members:

2.8.1 receive the accounts of the Charity for the previous financial year

2.8.2 receive the Trustees’ report on the Charity’s activities since the previous AGM

2.8.3 accept the retirement of those Trustees who wish to retire or who are retiring by rotation

2.8.4 elect persons to be Trustees to fill the vacancies arising

2.8.5 appoint auditors for the Charity

2.8.6 may confer on any individual (with his or her consent) the honorary title of Patron, President or Vice-President of the Charity and

2.8.7 discuss and determine any issues of policy or deal with any other business put before them.

2.9 Any general meeting which is not an AGM is an EGM.

2.10 An EGM may be called at any time by the Trustees and must be called within 28 days on a written request from at least 5 members.
3. **THE TRUSTEES**

3.1 The Trustees as charity trustees have control of the Charity and its property and funds.

3.2 The Trustees when complete consist of at least 3 and not more than 12 individuals, all of whom must be members.

3.3 The subscribers to the Memorandum are the first Trustees of the Charity.

3.4 Every Trustee must sign a declaration of willingness to act as a charity trustee of the Charity before he or she is eligible to vote at any meeting of the Trustees.

3.5 One third (or the number nearest one third) of the Trustees must retire at each AGM, those longest in office retiring first and the choice between any of equal service being made by drawing lots. Those Trustees who are retiring are eligible to seek re-election.

3.6 A Trustee's term of office automatically terminates if he or she:

   3.6.1 is disqualified under the Charities Act 1993 from acting as a charity trustee

   3.6.2 is incapable, whether mentally or physically, of managing his or her own affairs

   3.6.3 is absent from 3 consecutive meetings of the Trustees

   3.6.4 ceases to be a member [(but such a person may be reinstated by resolution passed by all the other Trustees on resuming membership of the Charity before the next AGM)]

   3.6.5 resigns by written notice to the Trustees (but only if at least two Trustees will remain in office)

   3.6.6 is removed by resolution passed by at least 75% of the members present and voting at a general meeting after the meeting has invited the views of the Trustee concerned and considered the matter in the light of any such views]

3.7 The Trustees may at any time co-opt any person duly qualified to be appointed as a Trustee to fill a vacancy in their number or as an additional Trustee, but a co-opted Trustee holds office only until the next AGM.

3.8 A technical defect in the appointment of a Trustee of which the Trustees are unaware at the time does not invalidate decisions taken at a meeting.
4. **PROCEEDINGS OF TRUSTEES**

4.1 The Trustees must hold at least 3 meetings each year

4.2 A quorum at a meeting of the Trustees is 3 Trustees

4.3 A meeting of the Trustees may be held either in person or by suitable electronic means agreed by the Trustees in which all participants may communicate with all the other participants]

4.4 The Chairman or (if the Chairman is unable or unwilling to do so) some other Trustee chosen by the Trustees present presides at each meeting

4.5 Every issue may be determined by a simple majority of the votes cast at a meeting but a written resolution signed by all the Trustees is as valid as a resolution passed at a meeting (and for this purpose the resolution may be contained in more than one document and will be treated as passed on the date of the last signature)

4.6 Except for the chairman of the meeting, who has a second or casting vote, only to be used when no majority has previously been reached, every Trustee has one vote on each issue

4.7 A procedural defect of which the Trustees are unaware at the time does not invalidate decisions taken at a meeting

5. **POWERS OF TRUSTEES**

The Trustees have the following powers in the administration of the Charity:

5.1 to appoint (and remove) any member (who may be a Trustee) to act as Secretary to the Charity in accordance with the Act

5.2 to appoint a Chairman, Treasurer and other honorary officers from among their number

5.3 to delegate any of their functions to committees consisting of two or more individuals appointed by them (but at least 1 member of every committee must be a Trustee and all proceedings of committees must be reported promptly to the Trustees)

5.4 to make Standing Orders consistent with the Memorandum, these Articles and the Act to govern proceedings at general meetings

5.5 to make Rules consistent with the Memorandum, these Articles and the Act to govern proceedings at their meetings and at meetings of committees

5.6 to make Regulations consistent with the Memorandum, these Articles and the Act to govern the administration of the Charity and the use of its seal (if any)

5.7 to establish procedures to assist the resolution of disputes within the Charity

5.8 to exercise any powers of the Charity which are not reserved to a general meeting
6. RECORDS & ACCOUNTS

6.1 The Trustees must comply with the requirements of the Act and of the Charities Act 1993 as to keeping financial records, the audit of accounts and the preparation and transmission to the Registrar of Companies and the Commission of:

6.1.1 annual reports
6.1.2 annual returns
6.1.3 annual statements of account

6.2 The Trustees must keep proper records of

6.2.1 all proceedings at general meetings
6.2.2 all proceedings at meetings of the Trustees
6.2.3 all reports of committees and
6.2.4 all professional advice obtained

6.3 Accounting records relating to the Charity must be made available for inspection by any Trustee at any reasonable time during normal office hours and may be made available for inspection by members who are not Trustees if the Trustees so decide.

6.4 A copy of the Charity's latest available statement of account must be supplied on request to any Trustee or member, or to any other person who makes a written request and pays the Charity’s reasonable costs, within two months.

7. NOTICES

7.1 Notices under these Articles may be sent by hand, or by post or by suitable electronic means or (where applicable to members generally) may be published in any suitable journal or [national] newspaper [circulating in area of benefit] or any newsletter distributed by the Charity.

7.2 The only address at which a member is entitled to receive notices is the address shown in the register of members.

7.3 Any notice given in accordance with these Articles is to be treated for all purposes as having been received

7.3.1 24 hours after being sent by electronic means or delivered by hand to the relevant address
7.3.2 two clear days after being sent by first class post to that address
7.3.3 three clear days after being sent by second class or overseas post to that address
7.3.4 on the date of publication of a newspaper containing the notice

7.3.5 on being handed to the member [(or, in the case of a member organisation, its authorized representative)] personally or, if earlier,

7.3.6 as soon as the member acknowledges actual receipt

7.4 A technical defect in the giving of notice of which the Trustees are unaware at the time does not invalidate decisions taken at a meeting

8. DISSOLUTION

The provisions of the Memorandum relating to dissolution of the Charity take effect as though repeated here

9. INTERPRETATION

In the Memorandum in and in these Articles:

9.1 ["beneficiaries" means

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

[qualifications of beneficiaries]]

"The Act" means the Companies Act 1985

"AGM" means an annual general meeting of the Charity

"area of benefit means LLANTHONY SECUNDA PRIORY

"these Articles" means these articles of association ["authorised representative" means an individual who is authorised by a member organisation to act on its behalf at meetings of the Charity and whose name is given to the Secretary]

"Chairman" means the chairman of the Trustees

"the Charity" means the company governed by these Articles

"charity trustee" has the meaning prescribed by section 97(1) of the Charities Act 1993

"clear day" means 24 hours from midnight following the relevant event

"the Commission" means the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales

"EGM" means an extraordinary general meeting of the Charity
"financial expert" means an individual, company or firm who is an authorised person or an exempted person within the meaning of the Financial Services Act 1986

"material benefit" means a benefit which may not be financial but has a monetary value

"member" and "membership" refer to membership of the Charity

"Memorandum" means the Charity's Memorandum of Association

"month" means calendar month

"the Objects" means the Objects of the Charity as defined in clause 3 of the Memorandum

"Secretary" means the Secretary of the Charity

"taxable trading" means carrying on a trade or business on a continuing basis for the principal purpose of raising funds and not for the purpose of actually carrying out the Objects

"Trustee" means a director of the Charity and "Trustees" means all of the directors.

"written" or "in writing" refers to a legible document on paper [not] including a fax message

"year" means calendar year

9.2 Expressions defined in the Act have the same meaning

9.3 References to an Act of Parliament are to the Act as amended or re-enacted from time to time and to any subordinate legislation made under it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES &amp; ADDRESSES OF SUBSCRIBERS</th>
<th>SIGNATURES OF SUBSCRIBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[List the full names and residential addresses of each of the subscribers]</td>
<td>[signatures of each of the subscribers]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Robert H Bewley  
The Manse  
Fore Street  
ASHTON KEYNES  
Wiltshire  
SN6 6NP

Mr Jeremy Williamson  
45 Winchcombe Road  
Sedgeberrow  
EVESHAM  
Worcestershire  
WR11 7UZ

Mrs Gilly Drummond  
Cadland House  
Fawley  
SOUTHAMPTON  
Hampshire  
SO45 1AA

Mr Mark Owen  
181 Tuffley Avenue  
Gloucester  
GL2 5JH

Mr Peter Wynn  
2 The Ridings  
Maisemore  
Gloucestershire  
GL2 8JD

Lindsey Ashworth  
1 Birshaw Close,  
Shaw,  
OLDHAM  
OL2 8SU
Date ______________________________________________________________________________ [Date]

Witness to the above signatures

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________  _________________________________________

[Name, address and occupation of witness]   [Signature of witness]
COMPANIES ACTS 1985 & 1989

COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE AND
NOT HAVING A SHARE CAPITAL

MEMORANDUM OF ASSOCIATION OF

LLANTHONY SECUNDA PRIORY TRUST

1. NAME

The name of the Company is LLANTHONY SECUNDA PRIORY TRUST ("the Charity")

2. REGISTERED OFFICE

The registered office of the Charity is GLOSCAT, GLOUCESTER CAMPUS, BRUNSWICK ROAD, GLOUCESTER. GL1 1HU

3. OBJECTS

To manage, restore and preserve for the benefit of the public the physical and historic environment contained within the site. As per the title for Llanthony Secunda Priory, hereinafter referred to as “the site”, as shown on map (Appendix 1).

To facilitate the use of the site for educational, cultural and recreational purposes for the benefit of local communities and general public through:

a) The restoration and conservation of the historic buildings, monuments and buried features/structures located on the site;
b) Investigation into the conservation of other historical and archaeological features of public interest on the site;
c) The provision of managed access to the site, providing information centres, offices ancillary to the objects herein contained and workshops, horticultural facilities, and educational craft workshops;
d) Raising awareness of the site’s history through a wide range of creative, scientific, practical and other learning activity, including support and encouragement of research and technical innovation, of the study and understanding by children and adults of the built heritage, and its conservation and use;
e) And other traditional rural crafts and skills, which link conservation with proper use of the historic environment.
f) To obtain charitable status, as soon as practically possible.
4. **POWERS**

The Trust has the following powers, which may be exercised only in promoting the Objects:

4.1 To promote or carry out research

4.2 To provide advice

4.3 To publish or distribute information and by publishing books or pamphlets or in other appropriate manner to make known to the public the existence of buildings of particular beauty or historical, architectural or constructional interest or the features of especial interest of such buildings

4.4 To co-operate with other bodies

4.5 To raise funds (but not by means of **taxable trading**)  

4.6 To borrow money and give security for loans (but only in accordance with the restrictions imposed by the Charities Act 1993)

4.7 To acquire or hire property of any kind

4.8 To let or dispose of property of any kind (but only in accordance with the restrictions imposed by the Charities Act 1993), such letting or disposal to be subject to such covenants, conditions and restrictions as are reasonably necessary to ensure the preservation of any buildings or land.

4.9 To repair, renovate, restore, rebuild and generally promote the preservation of any buildings or land

4.10 To buy or otherwise acquire furniture and other equipment for use in connection with any such buildings or land; and to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any such furniture or equipment

4.11 To make such arrangements as are necessary to enable the public to view and enjoy any buildings or land (whether free or at a charge

4.12 To make planning applications for consent under by-laws or building regulations and other like applications.

4.13 To set aside funds for special purposes or as reserves against future expenditure

4.14 To deposit or invest funds in any manner (but to invest only after obtaining advice from a **financial expert** and having regard to the suitability of investments and the need for diversification)

4.15 To delegate the management of investments to a financial expert, but only on terms that:
4.15.1 the investment policy is set down in writing for the financial expert by the Trustees

4.15.2 every transaction is reported promptly to the Trustees

4.15.3 the performance of the investments is reviewed regularly with the Trustees

4.15.4 the Trustees are entitled to cancel the delegation arrangement at any time

4.15.5 the investment policy and the delegation arrangement are reviewed at least once a year

4.15.6 all payments due to the financial expert are on a scale or at a level which is agreed in advance and are notified promptly to the Trustees on receipt

4.15.7 the financial expert must not do anything outside the powers of the Trustees

4.16 To arrange for investments or other property of the Trust to be held in the name of a nominee (being a corporate body registered or having an established place of business in England and Wales) under the control of the Trustees or of a financial expert acting under their instructions and to pay any reasonable fee required

4.17 To insure the property of the Charity against any foreseeable risk and take out other insurance policies to protect the Charity when required

4.18 To insure the Trustees against the costs of a successful defence to a criminal prosecution brought against them as charity trustees or against personal liability incurred in respect of any act or omission which is or is alleged to be a breach of trust or breach of duty, unless the Trustee concerned knew that, or was reckless whether, the act or omission was a breach of trust or breach of duty

4.19 Subject to clause 5, to employ paid or unpaid agents, staff or advisers

4.20 To enter into contracts to provide services to or on behalf of other bodies

4.21 To establish subsidiary companies to assist or act as agents for the Trust

4.22 To pay the costs of forming the Trust

4.23 To do anything else within the law which promotes or helps to promote the Objects
5. BENEFITS TO MEMBERS AND TRUSTEES

5.1 The property and funds of the Trust must be used only for promoting the Objects and do not belong to the members of the Charity but

5.1.1 members who are not Trustees may be employed by or enter into contracts with the Trust and receive reasonable payment for goods or services supplied

5.1.2 members (including Trustees) may be paid interest at a reasonable rate on money lent to the Trust

5.1.3 members (including Trustees) may be paid a reasonable rent or hiring fee for property let or hired to the Trust

5.1.4 individual members who are not Trustees but who are beneficiaries may receive charitable benefits in that capacity

5.2 A Trustee must not receive any payment of money or other material benefit (whether directly or indirectly) from the Trust except

5.2.1 as mentioned in clauses 4.20, 5.1.2, 5.1.3 or 5.3

5.2.2 reimbursement of reasonable out-of-pocket expenses (including hotel and travel costs) actually incurred in running the Trust

5.2.3 an indemnity in respect of any liabilities properly incurred in running the Trust (including the costs of a successful defence to criminal proceedings)

5.2.4 payment to any company in which a Trustee has no more than a 1 per cent shareholding

5.2.5 in exceptional cases, other payments or benefits (but only with the written approval of the Commission in advance)

5.3 Any Trustee (or any firm or company of which a Trustee is a member or employee) may enter into a contract with the Trust to supply goods or services in return for a payment or other material benefit but only if

5.3.1 the goods or services are actually required by the Trust

5.3.2 the nature and level of the remuneration is no more than is reasonable in relation to the value of the goods or services and is set in accordance with the procedure in clause 5.4

5.3.3 no more than one half of the Trustees are subject to such a contract in any financial year

5.4 Whenever a Trustee has a personal interest in a matter to be discussed at a meeting of the Trustees or a committee the Trustee concerned must:

5.4.1 declare an interest at or before discussion begins on the matter
5.4.2 withdraw from the meeting for that item unless expressly invited to remain in order to provide information

5.4.3 not be counted in the quorum for that part of the meeting

5.4.4 withdraw during the vote and have no vote on the matter

5.5 This clause may not be amended without the prior written consent of the Commission

6. LIMITED LIABILITY

The liability of members is limited

7. GUARANTEE

Every member promises, if the Trust is dissolved while he, she or corporate members remains a member or within 12 months afterwards, to pay up to [£1] towards the costs of dissolution and the liabilities incurred by the Trust while the contributor was a member

8. DISSOLUTION

8.1 If the Trust is dissolved the assets (if any) remaining after provision has been made for all its liabilities must be applied in one or more of the following ways:

8.1.1 by transfer to one or more other bodies established for exclusively charitable purposes within, the same as or similar to the Objects

8.1.2 directly for the Objects or charitable purposes within or similar to the Objects

8.1.3 in such other manner consistent with charitable status as the Commission approve in writing in advance

8.2 A final report and statement of account must be sent to the Commission

9. INTERPRETATION

9.1 Words and expressions defined in the Articles have the same meanings in this Memorandum.

9.2 References to an Act of Parliament are references to the Act as amended or re-enacted from time to time and to any subordinate legislation made under it
We wish to be formed into a company under this Memorandum of Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES &amp; ADDRESSES OF SUBSCRIBERS</th>
<th>SIGNATURES OF SUBSCRIBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[List the full name and residential address of each of the subscribers]</td>
<td>[signature of each of the subscribers]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr Robert H Bewley  
The Manse  
Fore Street  
ASHTON KEYNES  
Wiltshire  
SN6 6NP

Mr Jeremy Williamson  
45 Winchcombe Road  
Sedgeberrow  
EVESHAM  
Worcestershire  
WR11 7UZ

Mrs Gilly Drummond  
Cadland House  
Fawley  
SOUTHAMPTON  
Hampshire  
SO45 1AA

Mr Mark Owen  
181 Tuffley Avenue  
Gloucester  
GL2 5JH

Mr Peter Wynn  
2 The Ridings  
Maisemore  
Gloucestershire  
GL2 8JD

Lindsey Ashworth  
1 Birshaw Close  
Shaw  
OLDHAM  
OL2 8SU
Date ______________________________________________________________________ [Date]

Witness to the above signatures

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

____________________________________________

[Name, address and occupation of witness]   [Signature of witness]
CABINET DECISION TRACKER AND MONITORING FORM
(To accompany all Cabinet decisions [key and non-key] except reports for information and noting)
(*F11 to form fields)

1. SUBJECT
   (a) Title: Streetcare : Eastern Avenue Depot Improvements
   (b) Ward: All

2. *KEY DECISION/
   That the full council make a capital provision of £3million available in the capital programme for the development of the new Streetcare Depot facilities at the Eastern Avenue site as follows:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£1,363,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>£1,580,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DECISION TO BE CONSIDERED (As per recommendations of report)
To approve the initiation of the Streetcare Depot Development Project as set out in Appendix 1.

3. SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE

   (a) Background

   It has been recognised for some time that the Eastern Avenue Depot has been in need of a major refurbishment. Now that decisions have been made on the future standard and level of service required and a streetcare partner has been selected it is timely to progress the depot improvements.

   Members are also reminded that the ability of Accord Operations Limited to deliver the 50% recycling targets agreed is dependant on certain improvements to the depot being realised.

   Following completion of the brief and the feasibility stage a report will come to the March Cabinet outlining the options available and recommending the way forward along with a revised cost profile. At the March cabinet meeting, officers will be seeking approval for release of the capital funding so that the project can proceed.

   (b) Financial Implications (Bring in from report)

   There is a budget of approximately £3million contained within the councils capital programme split over the financial years 2006/2007 –2008/2009 to cover the costs of improvements and associated works to the depot

Name of the Officer: Nigel Kennedy Assistant Director (Finance and Asset Management)
(c) Legal Implications (*Bring in from report*)

The procurement of the architect services and construction works will be subject to the Council’s Contract Standing Orders, which incorporate references to the Public Procurement Regulations (consolidated in the 2006 form).

The Public Procurement Regulation thresholds currently in force (from January 2006) are £93,738 for Services and £3,611,319 for Works. These thresholds are periodically reviewed and new thresholds may be due. Further feasibility work may also bring the project to the thresholds. These matters will need to be kept under review.

If the Services and Works are subject to the Regulations, either voluntary or because of the thresholds, then an EU procurement process and timetable will need to be incorporated into the project.

**Name of the Officer:** Steve Isaac

(d) Risk Management Implications

To be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

(e) Predictive Impact Assessments (Equalities)

To be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

(f) Other Corporate Implications

To be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

---

### 4. REPORTING DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) CMT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cabinet Briefing:</td>
<td>10th Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) OSM: <em>(Pre-Scrutiny - key decisions only)</em></td>
<td>22nd Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Cabinet:</td>
<td>24th Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Full Council</td>
<td>15th Feb 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. RESPONSIBILITY

**Portfolio:** Streetcare

**Lead Officer:** Assistant Director Streetcare, George Milne
6. CONSULTATION
(To be carried out or carried out (including method and dates, required for Key decisions only - information must link with information on consultation contained in the Forward Plan).

6.1 Stakeholders (including Ward Councillors where appropriate)

- Accord Operations Limited - are part of the project team and will input into the development of the brief and the site
- Streetcare staff based at the depot – Accord will be responsible for consulting with\ staff on site as the project develops
- Planning- sustainability, transport, general planning
- Environment agency
- Health & Safety

6.2 Outcome (Brief summary and ref. for minutes, other related documents)

The views of the above will be taken on board in the development of the brief, which will be reported to March 2007 cabinet.

7. OPTIONS (/considered - brief summary and reference to reports where appropriate)

- For the Streetcare partner to invest in the depot: this would increase the annual contract price and it would make the potential transfer at the end of the contract to a new provider more complex. Lastly but not least it is more cost effective for the council to raise the capital.
- To sell the depot to the incoming streetcare partner. At the end of the contract the council could end up with no depot site in the city. This would require the council to either purchase back the depot at the end of the contract or acquire an alternative site elsewhere in the city, which may not be easy. This could be a very expensive option for the council in the long run.
- To continue operating in the existing depot and make do and mend. The existing depot is now too big for the current operations left on site. This option would not maximise use of the council’s assets. Without investment the 50% recycling target required for 2008 is not achievable. The cost of “making do and mend” may be more costly than investment in the long run as over time investment will be required but it will be undertaken in an ad hoc manner.
- For the council to invest in the depot. The council retains a valuable asset and can maximise the benefits from the area of the depot no longer required for Streetcare Services. This is a more cost effective means of raising capital.

8. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - PRE-SCRUTINY COMMENTS
(Key decisions only)
9. **ADDITIONAL OPTIONS CONSIDERED**  
*(other than those specified in the report)*  

none

10. **CABINET DECISION TAKEN**  
*(If in line with 3 above, say, ‘In accordance with 3 above’ - Expand if the decision is otherwise e.g. where views/suggestions of Executive Scrutiny Committee have been taken into account)*

11. **CONSULTATION/ADVICE**  
*(Delete as appropriate)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.1 Have the consultation comments been taken into account?</th>
<th>YES / NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Key Decisions only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 Was the decision taken in accordance with officer advice?</td>
<td>YES / NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

13. **INTERESTS** *(Details of any interests declared by a Member or Officer in the subject matter of the decision either (a) personal or (b) personal and prejudicial):*

14. **DISPENSATION** *(Details of any dispensation granted by Standards Committee):*
Gloucester City Council

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To request approval for the Project Initiation Document (PID) for the Streetcare Depot Development Project; and

1.2 To request approval for capital provision of £3million to be made in the Capital Programme for the development of the Streetcare Depot at the Eastern Avenue site subject to the completion of a feasibility study.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To approve the initiation of the Streetcare Depot Development Project as set out in Appendix 1.

2.1 That the Council make a capital provision of £3million available in the capital programme for the development of the new Streetcare Depot facilities at the Eastern Avenue site as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£1,363,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>£1,580,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 As part of the business case for the Streetcare Strategic Partnering Project the Cabinet, December 2004, agreed to retain 1/3rd (approximately) of the existing Eastern Avenue Depot site, or an equivalent site elsewhere, to provide a refurbished depot for the future delivery of Streetcare Services.
3.2 Following extensive research with other local authorities, as part of the procurement process, the council have taken the view that in order to safeguard its strategic asset, it will finance the cost of refurbishment estimated to be in the region of £3 million.

3.3 In June 2006 the performance targets for the contract were reviewed requiring Accord Operations Limited to achieve top quartile performance in all streetcare service areas, by the end of 2009/10. This includes providing residents the opportunity to recycle 50% of their waste by the end of 2008. To achieve this the first phase of the Streetcare depot improvements will need to be in place by spring 2008 and all improvement work complete by the end of 2008.

3.4 Council agreed, at its November 2007, to award the 15-year Streetcare Services contract (incorporating street cleaning, refuse and recyclate collection and grounds maintenance) to Accord Operations Limited. The contract is due to be signed on the 25th January and commence on the 1st February 2007.

4.0 PROGRESS

4.1 A Project Board and Project Team has been set up to manage the Streetcare Depot Improvements Project which includes input from Accord Operations Limited, who will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the depot following completion. A copy of the Project Initiation Documents (PID) is attached for members’ consideration, see appendix 1

4.2 The Project Board has already authorised work to commence on the feasibility study for the project. This includes

- Undertaking preliminary surveys to identify the extent of possible contamination and service requirements on the site and how this can best be managed;
- Development of a brief along with subsequent quantity surveyors estimates of costs;
- Identifying any planning considerations;
- Assessing the overall configuration of the site and possible acquisition of adjacent land to maximise the benefits to the council both in terms of operational efficiency and future marketing of the residual part of the site

4.3 Until the results of the feasibility work are complete, in particular the surveys and a final brief and quantity surveyors costs is prepared, it is not possible to provide an accurate estimate for the capital costs of the project. However, on the information available to date, officers have compiled an outline cost and budget profile to indicate the level of funding required from the capital programme. This is summarised below and set out in appendix 1.

4.4 The estimated budget is inclusive of the cost of the feasibility study and the capital funding approved at December 2006 Council for the acquisition of the former Driver Training Centre. At this stage the DVLA has not indicated when or if the adjacent Driver Training Centre will be put on the market.
45. Estimated capital budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>66,222</td>
<td>58,864</td>
<td>142,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and admin etc</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees Architect, ordnance survey, M&amp;E, structural engineers etc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, building regs etc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS fees</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation/legal fees</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction /acquisitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>2,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fittings</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total est costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,363,222</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,580,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000,086</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 FUTURE WORK

5.1 Following completion of the brief and the feasibility stage a report will come to the March Cabinet outlining the options available and recommending the way forward along with a revised cost profile. At the March cabinet meeting, officers will be seeking approval for release of the capital funding so that the project can proceed.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 It has been recognised for some time that the Eastern Avenue Depot has been in need of a major refurbishment. Now that decisions have been made on the future standard and level of service required and a Streetcare partner has been selected it is timely to progress the depot improvements.

6.2 Members are also reminded that the ability of Accord Operations Limited to deliver the 50% recycling targets agreed is dependant on key elements of the improvements to the depot being realised.

7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There is a budget of approximately £3 million contained within the councils capital programme split over the financial years 2006/2007 –2008/2009 to cover the costs of improvements and associated works to the depot.

7.2 **Name of the Officer:** Nigel Kennedy Assistant Director (Finance and Asset Management)
8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The procurement of the architect services and construction works will be subject to the Council’s Contract Standing Orders, which incorporate references to the Public Procurement Regulations (consolidated in the 2006 form).

8.2 The Public Procurement Regulation thresholds currently in force (from January 2006) are £93,738 for Services and £3,611,319 for Works. These thresholds are periodically reviewed and new thresholds may be due. Further feasibility work may also bring the project to the thresholds. These matters will need to be kept under review.

8.3 If the Services and Works are subject to the Regulations, either voluntary or because of the thresholds, then an EU procurement process and timetable will need to be incorporated into the project.

8.4. Name of the Officer: Steve Isaac

9.0 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS
A full risk assessment will be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

10.0 PREDICTIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (EQUALITIES)
A full predicitve impact assessment will be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

11.0 OTHER CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

1. Community Safety (Author to complete)
To be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

2. Environmental (Author to complete)
To be available as part of the feasibility report due to come to March 2007 cabinet

3. Staffing (Personnel to complete)
No direct staffing implications

4. Trade Union (TU to complete)
Due to the current circumstances regarding the union, we do not have the capacity at the present time to supply implications for this report.

Ivan Hughes, on behalf of Unison

Background Papers : Streetcare Strategic Partnering Business Case: Version 2, May 05

Published Papers :
Person to Contact: Frances Mangan, Project Manager
Tel: 396275
E-mail: francesmangan@gloucester.gov.uk
This page is intentionally left blank
Streetcare Depot Development – Eastern Avenue Depot

1. Background
As part of the business case for the Streetcare Strategic Partnering Project the cabinet, December 2004, agreed in to retain around 1/3rd of the existing Eastern Avenue Depot site, or an equivalent site elsewhere, to provide a refurbished depot for the future delivery of Streetcare Services.

Following extensive research with other local authorities, as part of the procurement process the council have taken the view that in order to safeguard its strategic asset, it will finance the cost of refurbishment estimated to be in the region of £3 million.

In June 2006 it the performance targets for the contract were reviewed requiring Accord Operations Limited to achieve top quartile performance in all Streetcare service areas by the end of 2009/10. This includes providing residents the opportunity to recycle 50% of their waste by the end of 2008. To achieve this first phase of the streetcare depot improvements will need to be in place by spring 2008 and all work complete by the end of 2008.

Council agreed at its November 2007 to award the 15-year Streetcare Services contract (incorporating street cleaning, refuse collection and grounds maintenance) to Accord Operations Limited. The contract is due to be signed on the 25th January and commence on the 1st February 2007.

2. Business case
- Site now too big for Streetcare alone – need to release part of site – thus generating a capital receipt or an income from the remainder of the site
- Current physical condition of the buildings, asbestos and ground contamination
- Council requirement for 50% recycling by end of 2008. Current depot layout does not lend itself to cost effective delivery of this service.

3. Indicative key dates and outline programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key action</th>
<th>Key dates and interdependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding agreed in principle</td>
<td>19th September – Budget planning meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Board to approve the PID</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up project team</td>
<td>End September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify cost for initial surveys, seek approval to spend and commission</td>
<td>End September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint preferred partner for Streetcare</td>
<td>End September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up Streetcare depot project board</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree design brief and project plan including risk assessment of continuing operations during improvements with preferred partner as part of the preferred partner final negotiations</td>
<td>Mid October 2006 – January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award streetcare partnering contract</td>
<td>1st December 2006 - needs to be appointed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1

| Project feasibility to identify options and costs. | Required to secure funding – will need to go to cabinet for approval of funding.  
| Aim for January 2007 approval of capital provision and March 2007 approval of the project and release of funding. |

| STAGE 2 |  
| Appointment architect design build company | Feb- May 2007 |
| Develop and agree design proposals | June – September 2007 |
| Finalise designs and obtain necessary planning permission and consents required | October – December 2007 |

| STAGE 3 |  
| Let contracts as required (if design and build this may well be foreshortened) | January – March 2008 |
| Commence construction | April 2008 |
| Completion | December 2008 |

### 4. Stage 1.
The aim of stage 1 is to undertake a feasibility study and prepare a business case to seek approval from the January Cabinet to agree the PID, Business case and funding for the project.

### 5. Project sponsors
The Streetcare Strategic Partnering Project Board and the Depot Utilisation Board have both has considered the outline PID attached and are recommending the Streetcare Depot Development be set up as a discreet project.

### 6. Management
**Project Board** – lead client, purpose to set tolerances for the Project Manager, sign off business case, sign off brief and project timetable, policy decisions, and quality assurance

- Assistant Director Streetcare (Chair/ project owner) **George Milne**
- Accord Operations Limited (Senior User) **Tony Charlton**
- Assistant Director Finance and Resources **Nigel Kennedy**
- Head of Building Design **Barrie Aldridge**
- Procurement officer (Quality assurance contract letting) **Peter Roberts**

**Advisor**
- Project Manager for Stage 1 (reporting to the board) **Frances Mangan**

---

Frances Mangan 21.09.06
SSPT.3.f.Jan 2006 capital funding app1
Appendix 1

Stakeholders and communication
- Streetcare Partnering Board – Highlight report
- Streetcare Partner - member of board, project team and highlight report
- Depot project Board – highlight report
- Capital programme Board – monthly reporting
- Cabinet member street care - member of partnering board, and highlight report
- County Council and other districts – Highlight report
- Council Streetcare team staff- Highlight report through GM
- Streetcare Partner staff – Highlight report through TC

Project team
- Project Manager - Frances Mangan
- Project Team:
  - Design team (including engineers etc) tba
  - GCC technical advisor Bob Marrows
  - Finance rep- Steve Phelps
  - Property Services – valuation Mark Vincent

7. Links with other projects
- Streetcare Strategic Partnering Project
- Depot utilisation project

8. Resource Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management and technical support from team</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>66,222</td>
<td>58864</td>
<td>142,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and admin etc</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect, ordanance survey, M&amp;E, structural engineers etc 15% of contract price</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, building regs etc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuers and legal fees</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS fees</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction /acquisitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>2,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fittings</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated costs</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>1,363,222</td>
<td>1,580,364</td>
<td>3,000,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frances Mangan 21.09.06
SSPT.3.f.Jan 2006 capital funding app1
## 9. Initial Risks identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Risks identifies</th>
<th>Possible actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Council develops the depot but it does not meet the partners operational need to deliver the 50% recycling target (FM) | o  Ensure the partner is a part of the project team from the outset  
o  Partner to be party to signing off the brief |
| Depot development programme overruns and the partner cannot implement the 50% recycling target (FM) | o  Make sure this is covered in the streetcare contract  
o  Look at bringing completion date forward to April2008  
o  Alternatively look at phasing in the works to enable step change to take place |
| Capital receipts are not forthcoming to fund the capital (NK)                        | o  Borrow capital and fund through projected increase from recycling credits  
o  Possible use of Local Government Business Growth Incentive (LGBGI) funding (amount available not determined until March 2007) |
| Asbestos or contamination found on site (FM)                                         | o  Undertake early survey and ensure this is taken into account in the business case                        |
| Not possible to continue to deliver the service during construction                   | •  Whole site to be retained until such time as the Streetcare depot development is complete or alternatively the design and build programme is clear and the space required to continue operations during the development has been clearly identified |
| Land title problems at a later date                                                  | •  Double check land title                                                                                |
| Overspend on projects                                                                | •  Spend time at the beginning ensuring all aspects are properly included in the brief and specification.  
•  Prevent over specification  
•  Undertake preliminary surveys prior to seeking fund in to identify all possible costs  
•  Make sure planning and environment agency requirements are built into the requirements from the start  
•  Monthly budget reports to the Capital Programme Board and the Assistant Director Streetcare |
## SUBJECT
### GL1 – COMBINED HEAT AND POWER INSTALLATION

That Cabinet recommend to Council that it should waive Contract Standing Orders to give approval for the Head of Building Design Services to accept the higher tender in the sum of £175,846 from COGENCO for the capital purchase cost of a Combined Heat and Power plant at GL1.

### GLOUCESTER PARK BANDSTAND (CS200611)

1. That Cabinet support the results of the public consultation and adopt Option 3 – the Victorian style bandstand – as their preferred option, pending planning permission.

2. That Cabinet agree to use £50,000 from the 2006-2007 LABGI Budget (Local Authority Business Growth Incentive funding) towards the cost of the new bandstand.

### LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT – FINAL DRAFT (RMD200623)

That Cabinet give delegated authority to the Acting Chief Executive to agree the final draft of the LAA.

### TAPESTRY SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – A PROGRESS REPORT

1. That approval be given for the deletion of the post as set out within the report.

2. That approval be given to Officers to negotiate a severance package with the post-holder and effect deletion of the post by 31 January 2007.

### MAINSTREAMING COMMUNITY SAFETY (CS200610)

1. That Gloucester City Council should celebrate and promote the good work that it does, in its own right and in partnership with others, in improving community safety and reducing anti-social behaviour and crime.

2. That methods and mechanisms used to mainstream community safety should compliment and be consistent with those used to mainstream other cross-cutting themes. Lead Officers for Equalities, Community Safety, Community Engagement and Cohesion, Customer Focus and Sustainability should consider how they could work collectively to support colleagues in incorporating all of these themes in their policies and practices.

3. That the gaps in practice identified in the course of this review and summarised in Appendix 1 of the report should be considered by each of the relevant services in the course of putting together their Service Development Plans for 2007-2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DECISIONS TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. That Council should produce a Statement of Intent in respect of Community Safety, an Annual Community Safety Plan and an Annual Community Safety report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. That the City Council’s Community Safety team should explore with partners the opportunity to develop their capacity to support Community Safety activity at a neighbourhood level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. That all Council staff should be encouraged to act as the eyes and ears of the partnership by providing them with the information they need about how and where to report incidents, give feedback where possible on the outcome of their report and recognising and rewarding those whose reports have made a particularly valuable contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. That the Action Plan set out in Section 5 of the report be agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOBLEYS DRIVE (PT13126A) That the Council adopt the footpath as Public Highway 101 Private Streetworks Code – Vine Terrace (PT14116V).

PRIVATE STREET WORKS CODE – VINE TERRACE (PT14116V) 1. That the Private Streetworks Code be applied to Vine Terrace. 2. That the specification of the streetworks shown on drawing numbers MCR/D/206430/1200A, /500A, /700A, /710A; the estimate of £45,000 which was the probable expenses of the works and the provisional proportionment of the probable expenses to New Dawn Homes Plc be approved.


NETHERIDGE FARM – REDEVELOPMENT – SITUATION AND PROGRESS REPORT (RDG2633) 1. That Cabinet agree a waiver of Contract Standing Orders to allow the Property and Markets Services to enter into one-to-one negotiations with Vincent Jones, the owner of the Gloucestershire Owl Centre, for the grant of a long leasehold interest in land and redundant farm buildings at Netheridge Farm, for the relocation of the Barn Owl Centre from Brockworth Court. 2. That in view of the complexity of the Netheridge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DECISIONS TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project, Cabinet delegates approval to the Assistant Director (Finance and Asset Management) to act in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Deputy Leader of the Council where any matters arise that require any urgent decisions or approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That the Netheridge progress report be noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-LOCATION OF GLOUCESTER ROWING CLUB – DISPOSAL OF LAND AT NETHERIDGE (RMD2635)</td>
<td>That the valuation of this site be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That approval be granted to the sale of 2 acres of land at Netheridge Farm to Gloucester Rowing Club on the terms set out in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.9 of the report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006

(Functions: Co-ordination, Corporate Performance, General Scrutiny Issues, Corporate Governance (Scrutiny), Financial Monitoring, Manage Overall Scrutiny Work Plan and resolve resource issues, pre-scrutiny of executive decisions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK (Status)</th>
<th>SCRUTINY METHOD</th>
<th>AIMS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP (if task and finish group)</th>
<th>LEAD OFFICER</th>
<th>TIMESCALE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny Study into Sickness Management</td>
<td>Regular monitoring</td>
<td>To inform members of the Sickness Absence statistics</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>RM (Corporate Personnel)</td>
<td>Report to OSM every 6 months</td>
<td>Next update due January 2007. <em>Postponed to March 2007</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task and Finish Group on External Scrutiny to include Gloucestershire Airport, Local Strategic Partnerships, URC, new Local Area Agreements</td>
<td>Task and Finish Group</td>
<td>Develop proposals on how scrutiny of such bodies might be undertaken. Scrutiny of Gloucestershire Airport and Gloucester URC. Ascertaining how Partnership agencies impact on Council’s Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>Cllr Phil Mclellan, Cllr Harjit Gill, Cllr Stuart Wilson</td>
<td>RM (Legal &amp; Democratic Services)</td>
<td>Completed April 06. Install next external scrutiny arrangements as from Annual Council May 2006. <em>Meeting scheduled for Monday 5 February 2007</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK (Status)</td>
<td>SCRUTINY METHOD</td>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP (if task and finish group)</td>
<td>LEAD OFFICER</td>
<td>TIMESCALE</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Review (ongoing)</td>
<td>Task and Finish Group</td>
<td>To assist the RM (LDS) in carrying out the Annual Review of the Council’s Constitution and to recommend changes to Annual Council. Need to identify areas for review</td>
<td>Cllrs Lise Noakes, Declan Wilson, Mary Smith</td>
<td>RM (Legal &amp; Democratic Services)</td>
<td>Start September 06. Complete by end March 2007. Meeting scheduled for 17 January 2007*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK (Status)</td>
<td>SCRUTINY METHOD</td>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP (if task and finish group)</td>
<td>OFFICER SUPPORT</td>
<td>TIMESCALE</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the learning points from the Westgate Hotel Scrutiny Study</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1. To understand why the Westgate Hotel project failed;</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Scrutiny Study completed January 2006.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To identify organisational failures in the project;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial report on review of implementation points: 29 January 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To learn from the project;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To advise the Council of any action that might be necessary in order to ensure that similar projects succeed in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK (Status)</td>
<td>SCRUTINY METHOD</td>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP (if task and finish group)</td>
<td>LEAD OFFICER</td>
<td>TIMESCALE</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Licensing Review                    | Task and Finish Group                  | 1. Understand the changes in legislation  
2. How are the changes being implemented  
3. Are the changes being implemented effectively? | Cllrs Jonathan Whittaker, Mary Smith, Mike Rentell (excludes Licensing & Enforcement Committee members) | Gill Ragon Phil Lane  | Start Winter 2006/2007 |                          |
| Buildings at Risk Register (Ongoing) | Update reports at each meeting         |                                                                      |                                                                    | Conservation and Design Officer | ongoing            |                          |
| GCH : Progress towards a two star rating, including feedback on arrangements between the GCH and Gloucester City Council | Provide update reports at each meeting of the Committee | To ensure Gloucester City Homes achieves two star rating. | Phil Lane              | ongoing            |                          |
| Homelessness in the light of changes to Government Policy | Report                                  |                                                                      | N/a                                                              | Phil Lane              | January 2007 meeting |                          |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Choice Based letting system | Report | | Housing Allocations Team | January 2007 meeting |
## SCRUTINY 2 WORK PROGRAMME 2006
(Covering the following portfolios : Heritage & Leisure, Streetcare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK (Status)</th>
<th>SCRUTINY METHOD</th>
<th>AIMS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP (if task and finish group)</th>
<th>LEAD OFFICER</th>
<th>TIMESCALE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare Partnership Development (Ongoing)</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>To advise the project board</td>
<td>Cllrs Witts, Suddards-Moss, Hobbs</td>
<td>George Milne/Frances Mangan</td>
<td>Up until implementation of streetcare contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Leisure Services</td>
<td>Task &amp; Finish Group</td>
<td>To monitor the review of leisure services</td>
<td>Cllrs Stuart Wilson, Lucy Nethsingha, Jan Lugg</td>
<td>Tony Hughes</td>
<td>Start August 2006 Next meeting 16 November 2006. Members to provide update to Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Management Policy (Item proposed at Council 9/02/06)</td>
<td>Task &amp; Finish Group</td>
<td>To assess the effectiveness of the Council’s Tree Strategy</td>
<td>Cllrs Elaine Emerton, Lucy Nethsingha/Gordon Heath, Nick Durrant</td>
<td>Tony Hughes</td>
<td>1st meeting held 26/10/06. Next meeting to be arranged following outcome of mini highways agency discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gloucester City Council

FORWARD PLAN - CABINET

(MARCH - JUNE 2007)

(Cabinet Meetings: 7 March 2007, 18 April 2007 and 6 June 2007)

Cabinet Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader and Corporate Performance, Finance and Resources</td>
<td>Councillor Mark Hawthorne</td>
<td>3 Pitch View, 46 Kingsholm Road, Gloucester GL1 3AU Tel: 540307  e-mail: <a href="mailto:MarkH@gloucester.gov.uk">MarkH@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Leader and Housing and Health</td>
<td>Councillor Andrew Gravells</td>
<td>39 Drivemoor, Abbeydale, Gloucester GL4 5XP Tel: 503974  e-mail: <a href="mailto:Andrew.Gravells@gloucestershire.gov.uk">Andrew.Gravells@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration and Culture</td>
<td>Councillor Paul James</td>
<td>4 Pitch View, 46 Kingsholm Road, Gloucester GL1 3AU Tel: 384051  e-mail: <a href="mailto:psj@gloucester.gov.uk">psj@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and the Environment</td>
<td>Councillor Steve Morgan</td>
<td>92 Hempsted Lane, Gloucester GL2 5JS Tel: 520534  e-mail: <a href="mailto:Stephen.Morgan@gloucester.gov.uk">Stephen.Morgan@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Leisure</td>
<td>Councillor Martyn White</td>
<td>Coglan Lodge, Old Monmouth Road, Longhope, Gloucester GL17 0NZ Tel: 831618  e-mail: <a href="mailto:MartynW@gloucester.gov.uk">MartynW@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcare</td>
<td>Councillor Andy Lewis</td>
<td>22 Spoonbill Close, Qedgeley, Gloucester GL2 4LB Tel: 723057  e-mail: <a href="mailto:Andrew.Lewis@gloucester.gov.uk">Andrew.Lewis@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Forward Plan contains details of all the key decisions that are planned over the next four months. It will be updated and published on or near the 1st day of every month. The Forward Plan also includes Budget Framework and Policy Development items; proposals relevant to the Budget Framework and Policy Development are subject to a period of consultation and Overview and Scrutiny Committees have the opportunity to respond in relation to the consultation process.

Cabinet dates may change during the year and you are advised to contact the Democratic and Members’ Services Unit - details below
A Key Decision is one that:

- involves significant expenditure or savings
- has a significant effect on communities in two or more electoral divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>= Key Decision</th>
<th>BPF</th>
<th>= Budget Framework and Policy Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CONTACT:**

For further information on any of the items please contact the Officer shown.

To make your views known on any of the items please also contact the Officer shown or the portfolio holder (details overleaf).

For information on attending meetings or asking questions, presenting petitions or making statements at Cabinet meetings and other meetings of the Council, please contact:

Tony Hughes on telephone no. (01452) 396127, Fax: (01452) 396140, e-mail: Tony.Hughes@gloucester.gov.uk

For a copy of the Forward Plan please call (01452) 396127 (Democratic and Members’ Services Unit).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CABINET DECISION</th>
<th>BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>CONSULTATION METHOD OF CONSULTATION AND MAIN CONSULTEEES</th>
<th>PLANNED DATES</th>
<th>CONTACT OFFICER/COUNCILLOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet 7th Mar 2007</td>
<td>Council 15th Mar 2007</td>
<td>Officer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patience Tsakpo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: (Tel: 01452 396908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Patience.Tsakpo@gloucester.gov.uk">Patience.Tsakpo@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council 15th Mar 2007</td>
<td>Officer:Nigel Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: (Tel: 01452 396410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:NigelK@gloucester.gov.uk">NigelK@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CABINET: 7 MARCH 2007**

**PORTFOLIO: CORPORATE PERFORMANCE, FINANCE AND RESOURCES**

**COUNCILLOR MARK HAWTHORNE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Race Equality Scheme</th>
<th>None.</th>
<th>Cabinet 7th Mar 2007</th>
<th>Officer: Patience Tsakpo Tel: (Tel: 01452 396908) Email: <a href="mailto:Patience.Tsakpo@gloucester.gov.uk">Patience.Tsakpo@gloucester.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPF</td>
<td>Review and update the Blueprint for Change by February 2007</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Council 15th Mar 2007</td>
<td>Officer: Nigel Kennedy Tel: (Tel: 01452 396410) Email: <a href="mailto:NigelK@gloucester.gov.uk">NigelK@gloucester.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTFOLIO: PLANNING AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

**COUNCILLOR STEVE MORGAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Climate Change Strategy</th>
<th>None.</th>
<th>Council 15th Mar 2007</th>
<th>Officer: Phil Staddon Tel: (Tel: 01452 396701) Email: <a href="mailto:PhilipS@gloucester.gov.uk">PhilipS@gloucester.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PORTFOLIO: STREETCARE**

**COUNCILLOR ANDY LEWIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Streetcare Depot Eastern Avenue</th>
<th>None.</th>
<th>Cabinet 7th Mar 2007</th>
<th>Officer: George Milne Tel: (Tel: 01452 397322) Email: <a href="mailto:George.Milne@gloucester.gov.uk">George.Milne@gloucester.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABINET DECISION</td>
<td>BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</td>
<td>CONSULTATION METHOD OF CONSULTATION AND MAIN CONSULTEES</td>
<td>PLANNED DATES</td>
<td>CONTACT OFFICER/COUNCILLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>CABINET DATE: 18 APRIL 2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>PORTFOLIO: CORPORATE PERFORMANCE, FINANCE AND RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNCILLOR MARK HAWTHORNE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>Review of Community Support Grants</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Meetings with representatives from the Grants and Community Development Forum and Linking Communities to develop draft proposals.</td>
<td>Cabinet 18th Apr 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>Annual Work Programme</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council 21st May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORTFOLIO: PLANNING AND THE ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNCILLOR STEVE MORGAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPF</td>
<td>Results of the Safer City Referendum Consultation - Westgate, Barton and Tredworth</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Consultation with residents – leaflet distributed to all households and to statutory consultees.</td>
<td>Cabinet 18th Apr 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABINET DECISION</td>
<td>BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</td>
<td>CONSULTATION</td>
<td>CONTACT OFFICER/COUNCILLOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CABINET DATE: 6 JUNE 2007**

**PORTFOLIO: REGENERATION AND CULTURE**

**COUNCILLOR PAUL JAMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Cultural Strategy</th>
<th>Tender documents</th>
<th>Cabinet 6th Jun 2007</th>
<th>Officer: Phil Staddon Tel: (01452) 396701 Email: <a href="mailto:PhilipS@gloucester.gov.uk">PhilipS@gloucester.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Strategy</td>
<td>Tender documents</td>
<td>Two standing conferences, face to face interviews, telephone interviews. Key stakeholders and general public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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