

As currently drafted: Our aim is to provide people living and travelling within Derby with viable travel choices and effective and sustainable transport networks	Proposed rewording: Our aim is to provide people living and travelling within Derby with safe travel choices that are practical and sustainable
--	--

2. That the sections dealing with the Air Quality Action Plan be revised to also include references to the potentially serious risk posed to economic development in the vicinity of Air Quality Management Areas.
3. That the weighting of funding towards Asset Management be supported in the short term, but there should be a commitment to rebalancing between the four 'themes' in the medium and longer term.
4. That feedback be provided to the Commission on the views expressed on the Draft Plan by the Diversity Forums.

Decision

To note the report.

180/10 Bus Lanes Review – Outcome of Scrutiny of Interim Report

The Council Cabinet considered a report from the Neighbourhoods Commission which stated that at its meeting in September 2010 the Neighbourhoods Commission had decided, as a part of its Work Programme for 2010/11, to 'consider the effectiveness of the Kedleston Road bus lane, dependent upon decisions following the current trial'. To avoid duplication the Commission decided to scrutinise the issue when the results of the wider review of bus lanes, commissioned by Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment, was completed. On 17 January 2011 an interim report was considered by Councillor Holmes. This contained information about many but not all bus lanes. A nine part resolution was passed, including decisions regarding the future of Kedleston Road and Duffield Road bus lanes. At its meeting on 7 February the Neighbourhoods scrutinised the report and associated resolution.

The Commission recommend that the bus lanes on Kedleston Road and Duffield Road should be retained for a further period and any decision to remove them should be taken only after a further twelve months to allow a fuller evaluation of the effectiveness of both.

Decision

To note the report.

189/10 Toilet Provision in Derby

[Note: The decision relates to previous scrutiny by the Neighbourhoods and former Community Commission]

The Council Cabinet considered a report on Toilet Provision in Derby. The reasons for the recommendations are financial. Grounds maintenance services were discretionary and budgetary pressures dictate that the Council gives priority to other statutory services.

Options Considered

1. "Do nothing", would not yield the required budget savings.
2. Whilst considering the Council budget proposals, the Neighbourhoods Commission of January 2011 endorsed the principles of the report.
3. The Council had been provided with an indicative cost of £1.86 million to refurbish and automate at the seven outer sites to a similar standard as that proposed for the city centre sites. This would be based on the agreement of a 15 year maintenance contract with the automatic public convenience provider and would equate to £198,000 per annum in capital borrowing costs over a 15 year period.
4. Introducing a small charge for use of the toilet facilities. The main advantage of introducing a charge (typically 20p) for use of public conveniences was that it would help to deter petty vandalism and antisocial behaviour within the toilets.
5. The majority of users of the facilities would know the area well, and in the same way that shoppers become accustomed to bringing bags and a coin for the shopping trolley, potential users would come armed with the necessary coin. Those that object to the charge would find alternative approaches.
6. The introduction of charging would also raise income towards the running costs of the toilets, but after taking into account the cost of collecting, reconciling and banking the money, it was unlikely to have any significant impact on revenue streams

Decision

1. To allocate up to £350,000 of unsupported borrowing from capital under spend to fund the refurbishment of the city centre toilets.
2. To continue the provision of the following public conveniences with a view to investment in refurbishment as set out in the report:
 - Assembly Rooms - City Centre
 - The Spot – City Centre

- Victoria Street – City Centre
3. To continue the provision of the following automatic public conveniences and to review these when current maintenance agreements come to an end:
 - APC Somerfield Car Park, Derby Lane, Normanton contract ends April 2014
 - APC London Road, Alvaston contract ends October 2015
 - APC Nottingham Road, Chaddesden contract ends January 2016.
 4. To close, the following out of city centre public conveniences on 31 March 2011:
 - Sitwell Street Spondon
 - High Street Chellaston
 - Nunsfield (Boulton Lane)
 - Spondon Cemetery
 - Nottingham Road Cemetery and consider alternative provision
 - Robincroft (Allestree Recreation Ground) and consider alternative arrangements
 - Automatic Public Convenience (APC), Burton Road, Littleover,

Reasons

1. Members were aware that good toilet provision in City Centres enhanced the shopping and visitor experience whether this was during the day or at night when people visit the entertainment venues in the City Centre. Investing in modern systems that were available 24 hours per day ensured that the City could meet the City centre daytime and night time economy needs, particularly in the Area of Victoria Street where there were a number of nightclubs.
2. Members had agreed to a budget saving for public conveniences, which were toilets provided by the Council for general public use, for 2011/12, of £100,000. This was on a base budget of around £450,000 for this service. In order to achieve this, all public conveniences in the outer city areas serviced by a mobile cleansing team and listed in would need to be closed.
3. As indicated in 2.3, an automatic public convenience would also be removed, which would have a “one-off” cost up to £15,000 to remove, cap off services and reinstate the footway. This “one-off” cost would be absorbed within Streetpride Budgets for 2011/12.

195/10 Recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Commissions on the draft Revenue and Capital Budgets 2011/12 – 2013/14

The Council Cabinet considered a report on recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Commissions on the draft Revenue and Capital Budgets 2011/12 – 2013/14.

The Revenue Budget proposals were considered by the five Overview and Scrutiny Commissions at their meetings in January/February 2011. The Capital Budget proposals were considered by the Scrutiny Management Commission on 1 February.

Appropriate Cabinet Members and chief officers were supplied with the individual commissions' recommendations immediately after the wording was finalised by the respective chair and vice chair. This repeated the practice trialled in 2010 and allowed the fullest consideration to be given to the scrutiny input.

The recommendations of the individual Commissions and the reasons for those recommendations were as set out in the Appendices to the report.

The process set out in the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules required the Cabinet to formally consider the reports of the overview and scrutiny commissions and report to Council on how it had taken into account any recommendations made.

The Council Cabinet also considered a supplementary report from the Scrutiny Management Commission on Stage 2 of the Revenue Budget Proposals and a response from the Council Cabinet to the recommendations.

Decision

To take the recommendations of the overview and scrutiny commissions into account when considering the capital and revenue budgets (minutes numbers 196/10 and 197/10)

196/10 General Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2011/12 *[part only]*

Decision

To recommend to Council the following ...

12. To note the feedback from the budget consultation and approve the Council Cabinet response to the consultation recommendations at Appendix 6 of the report.

Appendix 6 [extract only]

Commission	Recommendations	Response from Cabinet
Neighbourhoods	<p>CCTv Cameras –</p> <p>a) There should be proper consultation prior to decisions on removal regarding each location.</p> <p>b)) Following removal of CCTv at any site there should be monitoring to gauge any change in the incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour at that location,</p>	<p>Full consultation prior to any removal will be undertaken, as will monitoring of activity.</p>
Neighbourhoods	<p>Derby LIVE –</p> <p>a) The outcome of the review should not result in the closure of the outdoor programme;</p> <p>b) Cabinet should be cautious about the likely scale and durability of potential sponsorship as a means of supporting the programme</p> <p>c) Cabinet note that the Commission will later wish to scrutinise the various policy options considered by the Directorate regarding the sponsorship and charging strategies needed to implement this policy.</p>	<p>All options will be explored to support the outdoor events programme through charging and sponsorship. If this is not achievable it may result in some reduction in the programme.</p> <p>Sponsorship and charging strategies will be shared with the Commission.</p>
Neighbourhoods	<p>Recycling</p> <p>That the phasing of the closure of the bring sites over the two years should be co-ordinated with the roll out of domestic recycling to the remaining households not currently on the three bin system and that efforts should continue to persuade supermarkets to take over sites that are in their car parks.</p>	<p>Supermarkets will be encouraged to do this as the Commission requests.</p> <p>Phasing is not possible as savings would not be</p>

		achieved.
Neighbourhoods	<p>Wild Derby</p> <p>That the proposed withdrawal of £60k from Wild Derby should not proceed.</p>	Cabinet are still investigating all options available to retain this service.
Neighbourhoods	<p>Grounds Maintenance</p> <p>That Cabinet use its best endeavours to reduce the impact of the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduce grass cutting from 18 to 12 cuts per year - reduce flower bedding by 40% - close the Glass House - reduce non-routine maintenance 	Cabinet will ensure that the impact of these proposals will be kept to a minimum.
Neighbourhoods	<p>Public Conveniences</p> <p>That Cabinet note that the Commission endorse this proposal to reduce the number of public conveniences, but improve city centre conveniences.</p>	Cabinet note this endorsement.
Scrutiny Management – 14 February 2011	<p>Planning Enforcement</p> <p>That a) the current budget for planning enforcement be retained in the budget to avoid the proposed reduction from 2 to 1 enforcement staff and other savings be identified to make this cost neutral.</p>	Cabinet note the concerns of the Commission and agree to monitor the effect of this proposal closely during 2011-12.