

## WRITTEN COUNCIL QUESTIONS: COUNCIL, 27 MARCH 2014

### EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING

W1	<p><b><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WOODMAN</u></b></p> <p>Could you please explain why our education department do not check the grouping and ISR (Individual School Range) of schools annually?</p> <p>There is a set formula to be used to determine grouping, and I know of a school in my ward that had not had its grouping reviewed for several years being in group 2, when in fact according to the formula it should be in group 5. This has an adverse effect on teaching staff. Will the Cabinet member take steps to ensure all schools are reviewed annually?</p> <p><b><u>Reply</u></b></p> <p>The responsibility for assigning a school to an Individual School Range (ISR) or “group” rests with the individual governing body. This is set out in the School Teachers’ Pay &amp; Conditions Document which is issued to schools on an annual basis. There is no requirement for the group to be reviewed annually – the Document states that a school must be assigned to an ISR whenever the governing body sees fit.</p> <p>There are 8 school groups contained in the Document and each group has a range of spinal points the governing body can use to determine the ISR for the Headteacher post (the salary range). The group is calculated by using a formula which takes account of pupil numbers.</p> <p>At the very least, the school grouping must be reviewed and the ISR confirmed prior to the advertisement of a vacant Headteacher post. Governing bodies can also undertake a review of the school grouping at other times that they consider appropriate – for example, where there has been an increase or decrease in pupil numbers and this can inform any necessary change to the ISR for the Headteacher post. Further advice on this can be provided by HR – People Services.</p>
----	---

## LEADER

W2

### WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR BOYLE

Since the Council signed the Armed Forces Covenant in March 2013, what bids have been submitted to Community Covenant Grant Scheme?

#### Reply

Since the Armed Forces Community Covenant was signed in March 2013, there have been a total of five bids submitted to the grant scheme; of which, four have been successful in securing funding.

The grant scheme has three submission deadlines throughout the year and the Cardiff Community Covenant received applications in September 2013 and January 2014. To date, the total amount of funding that has been granted to the Cardiff projects is £423,478.

The successful projects include:

- **'On Target'** – a programme designed by a youth charity to train veterans to become youth workers and engage with young people who are classed as 'not in education, employment or training' (NEET). The project was granted full funding of £57,698.
- **'Firing Line'** – a project submitted by Cardiff Castle's Museum of the Welsh Soldier to run a series of events, particularly with disengaged young people, to educate them on the sacrifices that have been made by the Welsh Military in past and recent conflicts. The project received partial funding of £46,500.
- **St Fagan's National History Museum** – a regional bid to develop an educational programme with local communities and also to display comprehensive interactive gallery of Armed Forces collections. The project was awarded full funding of £249,280.
- **'Wales at War'** – a project by the University of Wales to develop a platform that will digitalise the names and histories on local war memorials and make them available to a new generation through smartphone apps. Although it is looking potentially at a national audience, the pilot is being launched in Cardiff as this is home to the National War Memorial in Cathays Park. The project received full funding of £70,000.

A bid submission from Alabaré Christian Care has also requested funding to run a befriending service via its Homes for Veterans scheme. However, the organisation had not yet found premises in which to operate from and, therefore, without having a base within Cardiff, the bid has not been successful to date.

The Community Covenant grant scheme was awarded total UK funding of £35million to run over four years until 2015. As we move into the new financial year, the new submission deadlines have been confirmed as May & September 2014 and January 2015. Projects that can demonstrate innovative schemes that promote military and civilian integration are invited to apply.

The allocation of funding for 2014/15 across the UK will be slightly less than last year at £8million. Therefore, it is anticipated that approximately £600,000 in grant funding will be made available for Welsh projects.

W3

**WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR BRIDGES**

On the council website, most councillors are happy to have their home address listed in order that Cardiff citizens can contact them; some members, however, shy away from this and only list a “c/o County Hall” address. The breakdown of the numbers by party group makes for interesting reading:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Home address</b>	<b>“c/o County Hall” address</b>
Labour – cabinet members	60%	40%
Labour – whole group	89%	11%
Lib Dem	100%	0%
Conservative	100%	0%
Other	75%	25%

Why is it that such a high proportion of cabinet members feel the need to hide behind “c/o County Hall” addresses?

**Reply**

I think that these figures simply illustrate the amount of time that Cabinet Members spend at County Hall as part of their role and responsibilities. It therefore seems entirely sensible for them to make use of the facilities and support services provided to them and to direct any postal correspondence to County Hall so that it can be processed in a timely manner.

## STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

W4

### WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR BRIDGES

When works were carried out on North Road last year to create a new bus lane between St. Mark's Church and Australia Road, the footway and cycle path on the other side of the road (between Mynachdy Road and the Gabalfa Clinic) was adjusted to make room. Since the end of the works, what used to be a segregated footway and cycle path has now changed – the white line down the middle has gone, and it has been designated a 'shared use' space.

Residents feel this is unfair and wrong. Unfair because they have already lost green amenity space and trees from in front of their properties, as well as now having a busy road six feet closer to their properties, all for little tangible gain to them. But they also feel it is wrong because of the conflict being caused between cyclists, pedestrians and the residents trying to access driveways with vehicles. There is real concern about safety at this location, yet I have been told the new path will not be segregated because of a change of council policy.

So concerned are residents (and cyclists), they asked for the matter to be made a PACT priority for this month, and I have been asked to raise it as a matter of public record and ask you to explain to residents, pedestrians and cyclists why you will not let common sense prevail and allow the path to be segregated once again.

#### Reply

The Traffic Regulation Order which applies to the path permits shared use by pedestrians and cyclists. It does not require the pedestrian and cycling space to be segregated.

The path width varies from 3.3 metres to 3.6 metres along its length. However, existing hedges in gardens adjacent to the path reduce the actual passable path width in places to an approximate 3.0 metres to 3.3 metres.

This means that the path does not strictly meet the minimum width standards for segregated paths contained in the Council's Cycle Design Guide, which specifies 5.0 metres as the preferred minimum and 3.5 metres as an absolute minimum.

By comparison, the path exceeds the preferred minimum width for unsegregated paths recommended in the Cycle Design Guide, which is 3.0 metres.

In these situations, the Council generally prefers to provide shared paths rather than segregated paths. One reason for this is because pedestrians and cyclists do not naturally stay within their designated side of a segregated path when they are moving along and the transgression of cyclists into the pedestrian section of a path and vice versa can potentially lead to conflict.

The recent works included the installation of bollards at intervals along the centre of the path to restrict vehicular access. The presence of the bollards requires cyclists to check their speed.

Whilst the bollards are centrally located, the hedges along some of the adjacent residential properties actually protrude into the path, thus reducing the amount of space for cyclists on the inside half nearest the driveways. On waste collection days, wheelie bins reduce this space further. Consequently, the preferred line for cyclists to take appears to be on the outside half of the path nearest to the new parking bays/road.

Whilst we are unable to segregate this path because of the conflict with the Council's Cycle Design Guide, I can advise that, in order to allay residents' concerns about cyclists, it would be possible to paint 'SLOW / ARAF' markings at the northern and southern entry points to this section path. Roundel signs indicating the status of the path as an unsegregated, shared path will also be installed.

The situation would be helped further if residents could ensure that they park their vehicles within the designated parking bays and avoid any encroachment on the shared pathway.