Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee

A meeting of the committee will be held on:

Date: Tuesday, 7 April 2015
Time: 6.30pm
Venue: Meeting Room 2 - Level 3, Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham ME4 4TR
Membership: Councillors Bright, Griffiths, Adrian Gulvin (Vice-Chairman), Juby, Mackinlay, Turpin, Carr (Chairman), Stamp, Osborne, Hubbard, Griffin, Irvine and one vacancy (Conservative)

Agenda

1 Record of meeting

To approve the record of the meeting held on 29 January 2015.

2 Apologies for absence

3 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

The Chairman will announce any late items which do not appear on the main agenda but which he has agreed should be considered by reason of special circumstances to be specified in the report.

4 Declarations of interests and whipping

(A) Disclosable pecuniary interests and other interests

A member need only disclose at any meeting the existence of
a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) in a matter to be considered at that meeting if that DPI has not been entered on the disclosable pecuniary interests register maintained by the Monitoring Officer.

A member disclosing a DPI at a meeting must thereafter notify the Monitoring Officer in writing of that interest within 28 days from the date of disclosure at the meeting.

A member may not participate in a discussion of or vote on any matter in which he or she has a DPI (both those already registered and those disclosed at the meeting) and must withdraw from the room during such discussion/vote.

Members may choose to voluntarily disclose a DPI at a meeting even if it is registered on the council’s register of disclosable pecuniary interests but there is no legal requirement to do so.

Members should also ensure they disclose any other interests which may give rise to a conflict under the council’s code of conduct.

In line with the training provided to members by the Monitoring Officer members will also need to consider bias and pre-determination in certain circumstances and whether they have a conflict of interest or should otherwise leave the room for Code reasons.

(B) Whipping

The Council’s constitution also requires any Member of the Committee who is subject to a party whip (ie agreeing to vote in line with the majority view of a private party group meeting) to declare the existence of the whip.

5 Petitions

This report advises the Committee of the petitions presented at Council meetings, received by the Council or sent via the E-Petition facility, including a summary of Officer’s responses to the petitioners.

6 Council Plan 2014/15 Quarter 3 Performance Monitoring Report

This report summarises the performance of the Council’s Key Measures of Success for October/December (Quarter 3) 2014/15 as set out in the refreshed Council Plan 2013/15.

7 Chatham Waterfront Update

This report provides an update on the acquisition of land interests at Chatham Waterfront, which was the subject of a Cabinet report considered on 10 March 2015.
8 Member's item - Closure of Tesco's Store in Chatham

This report sets out a response to a request from Councillor Griffiths for information relating to the impact of the decision by Tesco to close its Chatham store.

9 Work Programme

This item advises Members of the current work programme and allows the Committee to adjust it in the light of latest priorities, issues and circumstances. It gives Members the opportunity to shape and direct the Committee's activities over the year.

For further information please contact Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer on Telephone: 01634 332012 or Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk

Date: 26 March 2015

Reporting on the meeting: Members of the press and public are entitled to report on this meeting except where the public are excluded, as permitted by law. Reporting includes filming and recording of the proceedings and use of the internet and social media such as tweeting and blogging to report the proceedings. Guidance for people wishing to exercise this right is available on the Council’s website and in the public seating area at the meeting.

It is helpful if people wishing to film the proceedings could contact the Council’s media team in advance on 01634 332736 or by email to pressoffice@medway.gov.uk. Please sit in the front row or other designated area if you wish to report on the meeting. If you are attending and do not wish to be filmed or recorded please sit at the back of the public seating area.


Please note that parking is available at Gun Wharf from 5pm
Medway Council
Meeting of Regeneration, Community and Culture
Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Thursday, 29 January 2015
6.30pm to 10.15pm

Record of the meeting
Subject to approval as an accurate record at the next meeting of this committee

Present: Councillors: Carr (Chairman), Griffiths, Adrian Gulvin (Vice-Chairman), Juby, Irvine, Turpin, Stamp, Hubbard and Griffin

Substitutes: Councillors:
Harriott (Substitute for Osborne)
Wildey (Substitute for Bright)

In Attendance: James Bilsland, Assistant Head of Legal - Place
David Bond, Transport Operations Manager
Alan Brier, Senior Tree Officer
Councillor Rodney Chambers, OBE, Leader
Sarah Dagwell, Head of Waste Services
Councillor Howard Doe, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services
Ruth Dulieu, Head of Integrated Transport
Councillor Jane Etheridge
Stephen Gaimster, Assistant Director, Housing and Regeneration
Rosie Gunstone, Democratic Services Officer
Dave Harling, Site Business Manager, FCC Environment
Mick Hayward, Chief Finance Officer
Richard Hicks, Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance
Mr and Mrs Lisgarten, petitioners
Rob Lucas, Greenspace Services Manager
Andy McGrath, Assistant Director, Front Line Services
Melanie Tong, Contracts Manager Medway Municipal (South Region) Veolia Environmental Services (UK) PLC
Christine Wilson, Head of Legal Services

721 Chairman's announcement

The Chairman stated that Councillor Etheridge had left the Committee and been replaced by Councillor Irvine following a reallocation of Committee seats at full Council the previous Thursday.
He, and other Members of the Committee, paid tribute to the Chief Finance Officer who was attending his final meeting of the Committee prior to his retirement and wished him well for the future.

722 Record of meeting

The record of the meeting held on 18 December 2014 was agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

723 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bright and Osborne.

724 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

725 Declarations of interests and whipping

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Other interests

Councillor Stamp advised the Committee of an interest in agenda item 8 (Annual Review of Waste Contracts) by virtue of his employment with the Environment Agency but emphasised that he did not regulate any sites in Medway.

Councillor Juby declared an interest in the same item by virtue of the mention of Kemsley Paper Mill as his daughter works there.

Whipping

There were no declarations of whipping

726 Petitions

Discussion:

At the invitation of the Committee the lead petitioner, Mr Lisgarten, introduced his petition, which had been referred to the Committee for further consideration.

He set out the reason for his petition requesting the removal of unsuitable large trees (such as sycamores) which he felt had been planted too close to his property boundaries on the south side of Kingsfrith Park Playing Field.

He gave the Committee a history of the problems he had experienced with the trees including the blocking out of sunlight and the problem with leaves and
seeds being blown into his property. This subsequently caused a problem with self-seeded trees and blocked gutters. The lead petitioner then handed round a copy of a re-submission to the Local Government Ombudsman requesting a review of his complaint.

The Committee were advised of the background to the development of the land in Magnolia and Primrose Avenues where it was specified that only single storey dwellings could be built on them “in order to preserve the open aspect over Kingsfrith Fields Park”. They were informed that once trees had been planted there, without any consultation with the neighbouring householders, it was impossible to have them cut down as the Council would not remove healthy trees.

The point was made, by the lead petitioner, that the Tree Officers had not been very helpful in dealing with the petitioners concerns and that the last two letters from the lead petitioner had not been answered.

Responding to Members’ questions the Greenspace Services Manager stated that as part of the Council’s policy, trees were reviewed every three years and problems dealt with as required. He distributed photographs of the trees at Kingsfrith Fields Park and it was confirmed that well over 40 trees had been removed over the years. Pruning also took place periodically.

The Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance explained that the Council needed to keep within the policies set out in the Tree Policy and within the Council’s budget but stated he was sympathetic to the points made. Some Members felt that the problems experienced by the lead petitioner were replicated across Medway in various places and was not unique to this particular area, and that trees made a positive contribution to the urban environment.

The Tree Officer confirmed that the trees at Kingsfrith Fields Park had been inspected in 2014 and some thinned.

The lead petitioner stated that a number of residents would be prepared to pay for trees to be cut down if that were to be permitted.

Decision:

(a) The Committee noted the petition response and appropriate officer actions in paragraph 3 of the report; and
(b) The Committee recommended no further action be taken in respect of the petition but that officers would keep the area of Kingsfrith Fields Park under regular inspection and review.

727 Attendance of the Leader

Discussion:
Members received an overview of progress on the areas within the terms of reference of this Committee and covered by the Leader as set out below:

- Inward investment
- Regeneration
- Strategic Partnerships

The Leader then responded to Members’ questions and commented as follows:

- **Growth Fund** – A Member referred to a recent announcement of positive news in respect of funding. The Leader explained that the Council had been successful in bidding for £4.4m from the Growth Fund towards infrastructure at the airport. In respect of a later question about whether the plans for Rochester Airport were more important than repairing roads he stated that the money for road repairs did not come from the Growth Fund but, in his opinion, the work at the airport was very important.

- **River taxis** – Following a question as to progress with the development of the use of river taxis, the Leader stated that before anything further could be done the landing points would need to be put in place. Discussions were continuing with Chatham Maritime Trust for a site adjacent to dockside and plans for a landing adjacent to Upnor Castle were also being considered.

- **Apprentices** – In view of the success of the apprenticeship scheme in the past a question was asked as to whether this success could be maintained. The Leader explained that a further boost of achieving another 100 apprenticeships in 100 days was being planned for late February/early March.

- **Twydall library** – In response to a question about when the work at Twydall library would commence the Leader stated that the scheme had been delayed as there had been enquiries made by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. Following a second question he stated that he was supportive of progressing the scheme but could not give any definite information about timescales. During consideration of this matter the Chief Finance Officer confirmed that HRA funds could only be used to fund HRA assets and confirmed that general funds were being used to pay for the works in Strood.

- **Lower Thames Crossing** – The Leader confirmed, in response to a question, that the Cabinet supported the option C variant which was to have a crossing linking to the A2/M2, down Bluebell Hill to join the M20. Kent County Council were also in support of the same option.

- **Friends of the Great Lines Heritage Park** – Following a question about the need to promote the existence of the Friends of the Great Lines the Leader stated that he had been involved in presenting the organisation
with a Green Flag award recently but agreed that it would be helpful to promote the community group through Medway Matters.

- **Land redevelopment at Brompton Academy** – Further to a query about the land redevelopment at Brompton Academy the Leader stated that the work was progressing to reinstate the playing field.

- **Victory Pier and Chatham Waters development** – discussion took place about the merits of being able to develop the railway line between Chatham Waters and Gillingham station particularly to relieve pressure on traffic when the Northern Link is developed. The Leader confirmed this was something which could usefully be considered.

**Decision:**

(a) The Leader was thanked for his attendance and response to Member questions and congratulated on obtaining the £4.4m for the Rochester Airport works;

(b) Officers were asked to investigate the possibility of using the old Dockyard railway line as a transport corridor.

728 **Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services**

**Discussion:**

The Chairman welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services and pointed out to the Committee that the heading in paragraph 2 of his report should read Achievements 2014/2015.

Members then received an overview of progress on the areas within the terms of reference of this Committee and covered by the Portfolio Holder for Community Services as set out below:

- Events and Festivals
- Greenspaces
- Heritage
- Leisure services
- Libraries and Community Hubs
- Sporting Legacy
- Theatres and arts
- Tourism

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe, responded to Members’ questions and commented as follows:

- **Twydall Library** – Responding to a question, the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services stated that he had spoken to the Leader about the scheme for Twydall Library and would proceed as soon as the finance was cleared and available. In relation to money
from the budget being spent in Strood he stated that this was not part of his remit and was a matter which the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance would need to respond to.

- **Play area improvements** – A Member referred to the condition of some play areas in Medway and questioned whether the replacements were like for like. The Portfolio Holder for Community Services stated that two thirds of the play areas had been improved and confirmed that there was a rolling programme of improvements. There was also a full audit of these improvements as part of the evidence gathered for the new local planning framework. In relation to comments about vandalism at Balmoral Gardens he stated that he would discuss the matter with the Health Centre staff to see if they had any CCTV footage of the vandalism taking place. Following a request, an undertaking was given to share with the Committee the rolling programme of improvements of play areas.

- **Tourism Bus** – Further to a question about the success of the Tourism Bus the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services confirmed the Dickens Country Experience Bus Tour trial had been even more successful than anticipated with 80% take up. Discussions were taking place about the possibility of progressing coach tours out of London given the interest in the Dickens Country bus. Confirmation was also given, by the Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance that the Dickens Country bus does take in the Peninsula.

- **Stirling Centre** – The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, responding to a question as to the development of the Stirling Centre, stated that the partnership with Kings School Rochester to develop a tennis centre had been very successful and should produce quality tennis players in Medway.

- **Christmas Dickens** – A Member stated that 268 coaches had come to Medway for the Christmas Dickens event and congratulated the Portfolio Holder on the number of successful events held in Medway.

- **Dickens Chalet** – The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, following a question, stated that the Council was working with the Dickens Fellowship around plans for refurbishment of the Dickens Chalet and Gardens. However, the plans were costly and would need to wait until sufficient funds were available. The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services undertook to arrange a visit for the Committee to see the planned improvements to Eastgate House, the Gardens and Dickens Chalet at a suitable point. Members also requested a presentation of the plans prior to the visit.

- **Guildhall Museum staff and staff at Eastgate House** – tribute was paid to the Guildhall Museum and Eastgate staff and it was stated that
there was now a ‘Friends of the Guildhall’ group that had been formed. The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services referenced plans to redevelop the Guildhall area. He said that the visits to the Guildhall Museum were up by 41% on the previous year.

- **Litter** – responding to a query about litter being left at Cozenton Park and Splashes car park the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services stated that it was indeed difficult to keep on top of the litter problem but it was indicative of the fact that it was a very successful area, used at all hours of the day.

**Decision:**

(a) The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services was thanked for his presentation and for responding to Members’ questions;

(b) A briefing note was requested in relation to the rolling programme for play area improvements;

(c) A visit for the Committee to be able to see the planned improvements to Eastgate House, the Dickens Chalet and Gardens will be arranged at a suitable point.

**729 Annual Review of Waste Contracts**

**Discussion:**

The Head of Waste Services gave a brief introduction to the annual reports from Veolia and FCC. Dave Harling from FCC and Melanie Tong from Veolia gave presentations and answered questions on the work carried out in the past year, which included:

**FCC**

- An overview of the company – Fomento de Construcciones y Contratas (FCC)
- Recycling rates increased to 63%
- The introduction of recycling of separated paper and card and cooking oil
- High recycling rates at all three Medway sites achieved through strategy, diligence of staff and market innovation
- Reducing landfill and promoting reuse. This included details of the reprocessing of ridged plastics (505 tons in 2013), reuse of mattress contents, composting and developing relationships with local charities to increase the quantity of items sent for re-use in Medway
- An overview of the health and safety reporting and communications
- Details of reviews and investigations of accidents and safety campaigns
- Customer focus questionnaire which obtained a response of 97% to 98% of users stating they are ‘very or fairly satisfied’. The site users stating they are ‘very satisfied’ with the overall service during the most recent survey showed an increase from 68% (May 2013) to 85% (August 2013)
Details of site resourcing and future contract development. In order to assist the Council meet its savings targets FCC are striving to improve reuse/recycling/diversion rates in an attempt to reduce disposal costs for the Council.

Details of the development of a trade waste proposal in partnership with Medway to assist small and medium enterprises in providing a safe and legal route for disposal of waste. The aim was to reduce flytipping, support local businesses and reduce the impact and cost of trade waste on the current service.

The Committee asked various questions, which included:

- The plans for Hoath Way
  
  It was stated that the site was just too small and attempts to restructure it had not been successful.

- Potential improvements for Capstone – re trade waste
  
  The Assistant Director, Front Line Services stated that options for trade waste were being considered. He stated that at present the nearest commercial disposal site was in Sittingbourne which was difficult for Medway businesses.

Veolia

- An overview of the company and new service
- Improvements to vehicles by the introduction of a 360 degree camera with live recording system to provide significant benefits to the contract, such as missed bin reports, driving standards monitoring, health and safety and reductions in insurance claims
- The cost of the new fleet has been paid for from the award from the Department for Local Communities and Government which has reduce the collection cost per household
- A weekly recycling service was now provided to flats and further improvements are planed to introduce the twin stream service to flats
- The strong partnership working had contributed to Medway achieving Customer Service Excellence for the past two years
- Details of recycling tonnages, refuse tonnages, bulky waste, garden and kitchen waste and glass tonnages since 2009 were given
- Details of the WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment) collection and compliance scheme were given
- An overview of street cleaning was given. It was stated that the Response Team had assisted with 137 community clearances
- Waste and recyclable materials picked up by the manual street cleaning staff were separated into double bin barrows
- An alternative disposal location had been identified to recycle all of the street arising from mechanical sweepers providing 95% diversion from landfill
• Details of street cleaning tonnage
• An overview of the disposal contract
• Details of the recycling and street cleansing performance
• Public satisfaction rates were given from the quarterly tacker and annual Residents Opinion Poll
• Staff development, staff welfare and health and safety training details were given

The Committee asked various questions, which included:

• Does Veolia work with residents associations in relation to people residing in flats?

  Veolia and Waste Service staff are already working with Residents Associations on this.

• Can clothing be recycled in Medway?

  This is not done via the kerbside but there are 40 bring sites where clothing can be recycled.

• Can anything be done to avoid people stealing from black sacks?

  If Veolia see people going through bags this is questioned and reported to officers at Medway Council.

• How are dead animals disposed of and are any attempts made to identify owners in the case of pets?

  The dead animals are disposed of as general waste and pets would be scanned through the microchip scanner in attempts to trace owners.

• Could more be done to clean walkways, particularly those linking roads together, not alongside a road?

  It was explained that some of these did not form part of the area which Veolia were contracted to clean. The Assistant Director, Front Line Services confirmed this and stated that across Medway there were 350-400km of alleyways and it was not possible financially to clean them all. Some are privately owned, some are cleaned on a schedule and some are cleaned on demand.

The Head of Waste Services and the representatives from FCC and Veolia were thanked for their presentation.

Decision:
The Committee welcomed the provision of a trade waste facility in Medway and requested further briefings in future with a possible visit, after May 2015, to recycling and transfer facilities.

730 An assessment of the cost of bus travel in Medway

Discussion:

The Parking and Transport Operations Manager gave an introduction to the response to Members’ concerns about bus fare levels in Medway in comparison with other areas.

A Member explained the reasons for requesting this item to come forward to the Committee had been superceded by the Council deciding to encourage Arriva and others to lower fares to make them more affordable and more sustainable because of lower oil prices. The lack of competition in the area was referenced and it was felt that this had contributed to higher prices.

The Parking and Transport Operations Manager referred to Arriva’s practice of purchasing fuel in advance which meant they were unable to currently pass on the reduction in fuel prices to customers in view of the fact they had purchased the fuel at a higher price. A request was made for details of the advance fuel purchasing, but it was stated that this was not something the Committee would be entitled to have.

The Assistant Director, Front Line Services responded and suggested that it might be helpful for there to be a Director- level meeting with Arriva to reflect Members’ concerns. He also took the opportunity of introducing the newly appointed Head of Integrated Transport to the Committee.

Decision:

Further to the motion passed unanimously at Council the Committee noted that Medway has higher bus fares than other areas and requested that the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services and senior officers meet with operators to discuss the impact their fares are having on consumers.

731 Timing of bus routes and bus punctuality

Discussion:

The Parking and Transport Operations Manager introduced a report on the timing of bus routes and bus punctuality. He highlighted areas in need of improvement.

The suggestion was put forward that if traffic wardens went on some of the buses where pinch points occurred they would be in a position to deal with some of the parking problems.
It was pointed out that as there were no parking controls in place this would require a Police officer to be able to enforce inappropriate parking.

Decision:

The Committee noted the report and requested officers to work with bus operators to improve the quality of bus punctuality including the use of parking enforcement and liaison with the Police where appropriate.

732 Member's item: Town Centre Markets

Discussion:

Councillor Etheridge addressed the Committee in relation to her item in which she had a number of questions for officers. She gave details of her research into the success of markets in other areas including Herne Bay, Canterbury and Bromley. She also referred to the use of Facebook by some stallholders which enabled people to order goods which can then be collected later from the stall. She was very keen to ensure that there is continued investment into the markets and better signage to the markets. In her opinion there also needed to be thought given to providing better facilities at the markets such as toilet facilities and electricity. She also felt the officer responses to her questions were not as detailed as she had hoped.

At the commencement of the discussion tribute was paid to Councillor Etheridge as a Ward Councillor and as a Councillor who had contributed to the success of the Strood market.

Discussion took place around the impact of markets on local small independent businesses and the need for careful planning to avoid market stallholders, who do not have to pay for rent or accommodation, taking business from them. The Assistant Director, Housing and Regeneration explained that two new market staff were being recruited and would no doubt bring their own ideas for development of the markets. He undertook to arrange for Council staff to meet with Councillor Etheridge to discuss her concerns further.

Decision:

The Committee noted the report and answers provided and requested that the market officers plans for expansion should be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

733 Provision of a Neighbourhood Community Hub in Twydall

Discussion:

The Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance introduced the report outlining the indicative plans for a Neighbourhood Community Hub facility at Twydall, together with an update on the proposed funding for this project.

This record is available on our website – www.medway.gov.uk
Following a question, he confirmed that the Leader of the Council had expressed his support for the proposal.

**Decision:**

The Committee noted the current position concerning the establishment of a Neighbourhood Community Hub facility at Twydall, and noted the support of senior Members of the Council for this project.

734 **Work programme**

**Discussion:**

A request was made by Councillor Griffiths for a Member’s item on the impact of the decision by Tesco to close their Chatham store. He had concerns about the impact of redundancy for the staff and the impact on the economic offer in Chatham alongside the potential for regeneration.

Mention was made that there may be another store closing in Chatham and officers were asked to consider this as part of their response to the Member’s item.

**Decision:**

(a) The current work programme was noted;
(b) A Member’s item from Councillor Griffiths, as set out above, be added to the work programme.

---

**Chairman**

**Date:**

**Rosie Gunstone, Democratic Services Officer**

Telephone: 01634 332715
Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk

This record is available on our website – [www.medway.gov.uk](http://www.medway.gov.uk)
REGENERATION, COMMUNITY AND CULTURE
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

7 APRIL 2015

PETITIONS

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director Regeneration, Community & Culture
Author: Steve Platt, Democratic Services Officer

Summary
To advise the Committee of any petitions (including e-petitions) received by the Council which fall within the remit of this Committee including a summary of the response sent to petitioners by officers.

1. Budget and policy framework

1.1 In summary, the Council’s Petition Scheme requires the relevant Director to respond to the lead petitioner usually within 10 working days of the receipt of the petition by the Council. Overview and Scrutiny Committee are always advised of any petitions falling within their terms of reference together with the officer response. There is a right of referral of a petition for consideration by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee by the petitioners if they consider the Director’s response to be inadequate. Should the Committee determine that the petition has not been dealt with adequately it may use any of its powers to deal with the matter. These powers include instigating an investigation, making recommendations to Cabinet and arranging for the matter to be considered at a meeting of the Council.

1.2 The petition scheme is set out in full in the Council’s Constitution at: http://www.medway.gov.uk/councilanddemocracy/council/constitution.aspx

1.3 Any budget framework implications will be set out in the specific petition response.

2. Background

2.1 The Council’s Constitution provides that petitions received by the Council relating to matters within the remit of an Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be referred immediately to the relevant Director for consideration at officer level.
2.2 Where the Director is able to fully meet the request of the petitioners a response is sent setting out the proposed action and timescales for implementation. The petition organiser may request to refer the matter to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee if s/he is not satisfied with the answer and has given reasons for their dissatisfaction.

2.3 For petitions where the Director is unable to meet the request of petitioners or where there are a range of alternative responses the petition will be referred to the next relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee for discussion.

3 Completed petitions

3.1 A summary of responses relevant to this Committee that have been accepted by the petitioners are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of petition</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety crossing for Bells Lane, Hoo</td>
<td>Whilst the safety of all road users is a matter of serious concern, the basis upon which the Council introduces safety improvements is casualty reduction whereby locations with the poorest safety records are tackled first. There are regrettably other locations within Medway recording poorer safety records which will need to be addressed first. The collision record of Bells Lane will continue to be monitored. The lead petitioner was invited to meet with representatives of Medway’s Integrated Transport Team to review the current situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to increase road safety at Castle Road and Gordon Road, Chatham</td>
<td>In the last three years of police records, no collisions have been recorded at Gordon Road. Whilst a number of collisions have been recorded in Castle Road, regrettably there are many other locations recording poorer road casualty problems which would receive a higher priority for improvement. The collision records of Castle Road and Gordon Road will continue to be monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved road surface at Southill Road and Holcombe Road, Chatham</td>
<td>At a site inspection, a Highway Engineer noted numerous areas on Southill Road where previous repairs have been carried out and a number of isolated areas where the road surface had stripped off. The site obtained the highest priority rating of 1 and was therefore a high contender for resurfacing works in 2016/17 or sooner should additional funds become available. With regard to Holcombe Road, the Highway Engineer noted a number of areas where previous repairs and utility reinstatements have been carried out and also a number of isolated areas of minor failure. The site was given a priority rating of 2/3 (where 1 is the highest priority) and it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain packaging on cigarettes</td>
<td>It is the Government’s stated intention to introduce plain packaging following the findings of an independent review which concluded that it was highly likely that this would serve to reduce the rate of children taking up smoking. Medway has a duty to protect young people from this lethal addiction including implementation of measures likely to reduce uptake of smoking by children. On 21 January 2015, the Government announced that legislation for plain packaging would be brought forward to before the end of this Parliament. Medway’s Trading Standards Service is responsible for enforcing the provisions of any legislation that controls tobacco sales and is confident that plain packaging requirements will not hinder the detection of counterfeit products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the gate at the end of Sandling Way, St Mary’s Island, Chatham</td>
<td>The gate was put in place by the current developer, Countryside, across Marine View. Various options were discussed at a site meeting on 5 February 2015 and it was decided that the matter will be discussed at the next meeting of the St Mary’s Island Residents Association on 25 February 2015 with a view to agreeing an outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Petitions referred to this Committee

4.1 The following petitions have been referred to this Committee, as the lead petitioners have indicated that he or she is dissatisfied with the response received from the directorate.

4.2 A petition regarding the speed of vehicles travelling along Watling Street, Strood.

4.2.1 This petition was received by the Council on 4 August 2014. The petition stated:

“Watling Street, in Strood, is one of the main roads in and out of the town. It currently has a speed restriction of 40 mph. We, the undersigned, believe that it is time for Medway Council to urgently review the speed restrictions on this residential street by 1) reducing it to 30 mph and 2) consider installing traffic mitigation measures.”
4.2.2 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture responded to the petition (the Director’s response is attached at Appendix A) and the lead petitioner, on receipt of the Director’s response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner’s email is attached at Appendix B).

4.2.3 As reported to the Committee on 2 October 2014, the Assistant Director of Frontline Services had advised that a traffic survey had to be undertaken at a time of normal traffic usage. Therefore the survey was likely to be done sometime after Christmas 2014 as there were major road works in Strood in the locality of Darnley Road/Cuxton Road which were altering the traffic flow in and around Strood. Also, during the Christmas shopping period traffic patterns were not considered to be normal. Therefore the petitioner had agreed that the petition be referred to a meeting of the Committee after the traffic survey had been undertaken and the results were available for consideration.

4.2.4 Director’s comments

The Director’s response, prior to the traffic survey, is set out at Appendix A.

Additionally, the Director has commented that traffic surveys were undertaken at two locations on Watling Street, Strood, during January 2015. Following this, the existing speed limit at Watling Street has been reviewed.

The results of the traffic surveys summarise as follows.

Near to the junction with Chapter Road

*Eastbound*
Average speed = 35mph
85th percentile speed (speed at which 85% of the traffic is travelling at or less) = 40mph

*Westbound*
Average speed = 36mph
85th percentile speed = 41mph

Between Lancelot Avenue and Rede Court Road

*Eastbound*
Average speed = 35mph
85th percentile speed = 39mph

*Westbound*
Average speed = 40mph
85th percentile speed = 45mph

The existing speed limit has been reviewed taking account of national guidance published by the Department for Transport. The speed limit assessment is attached at Appendix C.

The existing 40mph speed limit at Watling Street is considered to be in line with national speed limit setting guidance, and the traffic speed surveys have indicated that actual speeds are generally in accordance with the signed 40mph limit. A reduction of the speed limit to 30mph is considered unlikely to be observed by road users due to the inherent road characteristics such as; the road width,
the segregated footway/cycleway facilities, and set back nature of the properties.

It is also noted that 30mph speed limits within street lit areas do not permit the use of 30mph repeater signs (in accordance with national signing regulations). If a 30mph limit were to be introduced, road users would be faced with the same road characteristics and no regular signing to remind them of the speed limit. This may result in higher speeds than currently observed.

The recorded personal injury collision history has also been assessed and Watling Street, Strood, is not currently identified as a priority for the introduction of casualty reduction measures.

It is recommended that the existing 40mph speed limit should be retained.

The existing 40mph speed limit could be enhanced through the improvement of the existing speed limit signing and the introduction of on carriageway ‘40; roundel road markings.

4.3 A petition regarding the proposed share use bay installation for York Avenue, Gillingham.

4.3.1 This petition was received on 21 November 2014 in response to a statutory consultation relating to proposed parking charges in York Avenue. The petition stated:

“We the undersigned, would like to make known our objection to the creation of shared use parking bays along York Avenue, Gillingham.”

4.3.2 The response sent to all respondents to the consultation is attached at Appendix D. The lead petitioner, on receipt of this response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner’s email is attached at Appendix E).

4.3.3 Director’s comments

The Director’s response is set out at Appendix D.

Additionally, the Director has commented that the scheme is utilising spare weekday bays only and will be reviewed in 6 months.

4.4 A petition regarding the resurfacing of New Road, Chatham to help reduce excessive tyre on road noise.

4.4.1 This petition was presented to Council on 22 January 2015 by Councillor Shaw. The petition stated:

“We the undersigned call on Medway Council to resurface New Road to help reduce excessive tyre on road noise which is impacting on our quality of life”
4.4.2 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture responded to the petition (the Director’s response is attached at Appendix F) and the lead petitioner, on receipt of the Director’s response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner’s email is attached at Appendix G).

4.4.3 Director’s comments

The Director’s response is set out at Appendix F.

Additionally, the Director has commented that New Road Avenue was resurfaced full width between its junction with Gibraltar Hill and Old Road during the 2002/2003 financial year. The material used was Stone Mastic Asphalt and although this product does have some noise reducing properties, this was not the main reason for using this product.

New Road Avenue is not a fast main road and therefore noise-reducing qualities would not be a main consideration for its use at this site.

During the forthcoming financial year two large lane width patching works will be carried out on the south side of the road. These patches will include most of the minor defects and provide a smoother surface thereby reducing noise problems in the area.

4.5 A petition regarding improving access to the River Medway at the Strand, Gillingham.

4.5.1 This petition was presented to Council on 22 January 2015 by Councillor Stamp. The petition stated:

“We the undersigned call on Medway Council to improve access to the River Medway at the Strand in Gillingham. The condition of the slipway at the Strand, known as Commodore’s Hard, has deteriorated in recent years due to lack of maintenance. The edges of the slipway have broken away, making it increasingly difficult and dangerous to use. Until now it has been recognised as an excellent, all-tide access point and is well used by Medway Cruising Club, Medway Watersports, Rowing Clubs, Children’s Charities, Sea Scouts and individual residents. But we are in danger of completely losing this facility. The Council-owned access road leading up to Commodore’s Head has also been neglected and is full of potholes which need attention. We urge Medway Council to help achieve its aim of “Making better use of the River Medway” by making permanent, extensive repairs to Commodore’s Hard and resurfacing the access road leading to it”

4.5.2 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture responded to the petition (the Director’s response is attached at Appendix H) and the lead petitioner, on receipt of the Director’s response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner’s email is attached at Appendix I).

4.5.3 Director’s comments

The Director’s response is set out at Appendix H.
4.6. A petition regarding adopting Florence Street, Strood.

4.6.1 This petition was presented to Council on 22 January 2015 by Councillor Stamp. The petition stated:

"Florence Street in Strood is one of the few streets in the town that remains un-adopted. We, the undersigned, believe that it is time for Medway Council to adopt the road and to add street lighting on our street".

4.6.2 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture responded to the petition (the Director’s response is attached at Appendix J) and the lead petitioner, on receipt of the Director’s response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner’s email is attached at Appendix K).

4.6.3 Director’s comments

The Director’s response to the petition is set out at Appendix J.

Additionally, the Director has commented that if the Council adopted this "Private" street it would be at a cost to the Council of around £65,000 to bring the construction of the highway up to an adoptable standard. This cost estimate takes into account a reconstruction of the existing highway for durability and risk mitigation towards public liability claims. Other key infrastructure requirements such as Street Lighting, Surface Water Drainage and vehicle movements for access/egress would be needed and are included in these costs. The road would not conform to the standards used for the design of cul-de-sac that Medway are confident with, where a dead end road should have a sufficient turning head facility to allow drivers to turn their vehicle around safely and within the confines of the actual highway. In addition there would be ongoing costs. Once adopted all liability for future maintenance would fall to the Council.

If Florence Street were kept as a “Private” road, under S.205 of the Highways Act 1980, future maintenance liabilities would rest solely with the frontagers/landowners at no cost to the Council.

Based on the 2 options mentioned above, risk management for the Council to adopt would primarily be the cost to the Council. This is a high risk with high mitigation to the Council. As stated in Appendix J, each household would be required to contribute to the cost of upgrading the street and this is estimated to be in the region of £4,000 per house. If an Association was set up, then all households must contribute. If one opted out, then the whole process would fail. If the Council chooses to keep the situation as it is and does not adopt Florence Street, financial and public risk is low.

Medway should decide not to adopt Florence Street unless the owners/frontagers enter into an agreed adoption process with Medway Council, meeting the costs associated with the adoption process.

Members are advised that there are around 350 other "Private" streets in its area along with nearly 60 other mixed status streets (partly "Private"/partly
"Adopted". If Medway agree to adopt away from the process already established, this would set precedents for the other streets and funding could then have a serious implication on future budgets of the Council.

4.7 **A petition regarding the replacement of barriers to woods in Fowey Close, Lordswood, Chatham.**

4.7.1 This petition was received by the Council on 5 February 2015. The petition stated:

"Although the barriers (installed in the corner of Fowey Close to deter motorbikes of going into the woods) have stopped the majority of motorbikes from going into the woods it has not stopped all of them! However, the major concern was that these barriers are NOT a deterrent to felons using it as a quick getaway to the woods and beyond. This letter is a petition to get these barriers replaced with a 'kissing gate' based construction at either end of the walkway into the woods. We are aware that a determined felon(s) will be able to go through this gate but it will slow down these people if being pursued by the Police. Also, this type of gate will not stop walkers, joggers or dog walkers being able to enter and enjoy the woods."

4.7.2 The Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture responded to the petition (the Director's response is attached at Appendix L) and the lead petitioner, on receipt of the Director's response, requested that the matter be referred to this Committee (the petitioner's email is attached at Appendix M).

4.7.3 **Director's comments**

The Director's response is set out at Appendix L.

Additionally, the Director has commented that a "kissing gate" is usually only seen on a Public Right of Way footpath, across fields and soft ground, as it was traditionally designed to allow pedestrians access to footpaths, but to restrict the movement of cattle across the land in question. However, even in this context and taking into account the Disability Discrimination Act, the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), has suggested that "kissing gates" should, in time, be replaced or supplemented with a type that would allow access to a wider range of users.

As such, the use of "kissing gates" has never been to act as a deterrent for motorcyclists or to be used on the public highway.

With regard to "deterring felons", no item of street furniture is designed or installed to prevent or hinder individuals, who have committed a crime and are seeking to leave the scene of that crime. Such behaviour is only enforceable by the Police and through the criminal justice system.
5 Financial and Legal Implications

5.1 Any financial implications arising from the issues raised by the petitions are set out in the comments on the petitions.

5.2 Overview and Scrutiny Rule 22.1 (xiv) in the Council’s Constitution provides that the terms of reference of this Committee include the power to deal with petitions referred to the Committee under and in accordance with the Council’s petition scheme. The consideration of this petition is therefore a proper matter for this Committee.

6’ Risk Management

6.1 The Council has a clear scheme for handling petitions set out in its Constitution. This ensures consistency and clarity of process, minimising the risk of complaints about the administration of petitions.

7 Recommendation

7.1 The Committee is requested to:

(a) note the petition responses and appropriate officer actions in paragraph 3 of the report; and

(b) consider the petition referral requests and the Director’s comments in paragraph 4 of this report and in the Appendices.

Background papers

None

Contact for further details:

Name: Steve Platt
Tel: 01634 332011 Email: stephen.platt@medway.gov.uk
Mr Gareth Batts

Petition to Request Review of Speed Restrictions at Watling Street

Thank you for your recent petition requesting that speed restrictions be reviewed at Watling Street, Strood, with a view to lowering the speed limit and introduction of other traffic mitigation measures.

I understand the concern for speeding drivers. It is difficult to understand the attitude of those road users that put themselves and others at risk by driving dangerously or in excess of the speed limit.

Whilst speeding, inconsiderate and dangerous drivers are of course a matter of serious concern, the basis upon which Medway Council introduces road safety improvements is casualty reduction, whereby locations with an ongoing poor road casualty history are tackled first, to help prevent further casualties on our roads.

Watling Street, Strood, has been investigated and regrettably, at the current time I must report that there are other locations within Medway recording poorer safety records. Those areas are, therefore, a higher priority for safety engineering intervention. Following due consideration, it is unfortunately not possible for physical speed restriction measures to be introduced at this time. The collision record will of course continue to be monitored.

The current 40mph speed limit is generally in line within current guidance on the setting of local speed limits for this type of road. I would, however, record that future speed limit alterations are not ruled out should they be deemed appropriate, for example, on the grounds of casualty reduction.

In order to help highlight speeds at this location and remind users of the legal speed limit, this location will be added to a programme of attendance by Medway Council's Speed Indicating Device. This is a vehicle activated sign that is temporarily erected at the roadside to highlight speeds to users.
If you do not consider that the issues raised in your petition have been addressed, please refer to the procedure sent with the acknowledgment letter for a possible further course of action.

Yours sincerely

Robin Cooper
Director of Regeneration, Community & Culture
Sent: 27 August 2014 21:30
To: wallis, lauren; filmer, phil; cooper, robin
Subject: Petition : Reduce Speed of Vehicles travelling along Watling Street Strood

Dear Mr Cooper,

Thank you for taking you time to reply to our petition about reducing the speed/ placing traffic mitigation measures on Watling Street, Strood. However I am disappointed with the reply you have given and wish for this matter to be taken to Overview and Scrutiny Committee please.

I thank you for stating in the letter about the temporarily Speed Indicating Device being placed along Watling Street. However I do not believe that this will be a solution for the long term to help reduce the speed of traffic along the Road.

I have been speaking to a number of residents, many of whom have signed the petition, and we are worried about the speed of traffic along this road, hence why the petition was set up. I have seen first hand cars speeding up the road, well over the 40mph limit.

This situation is made worse by the number of children attending Strood Academy the road is used daily by pupils and this school is one of the major schools in the area. Traffic such as heavy duty Lorries use the road often at all times of the day. The stopping distance for a lorry would be far greater at 40mph then 30mph and with a large number of school children crossing the road to reach the Academy there is a potential that a serious accident could happen, and this could only be a matter of time.

This is a cross party campaign and we believe that the reduction of speed should take place at the top of Watling Street, by the petrol station & traffic lights, and down the hill to the town centre. Rede Court Road, which also starts at the petrol station & traffic lights, has a speed restriction of 30mph – so why not Watling Street. By using the traffic lights as the start of the speed restriction, it would mean, any vehicle entering Strood’s residential streets would have to reduce their speed to 30mph.

I look forward to talking to the committee to state the case for reducing the speed / placing permanent traffic mitigation measures Watling Street.

Kind Regards

Gareth Batts
Speed limit advice: Field Notes
March 2015
Site: (road number and name) A2 Watling Street/London Road, Strood

Section: from Carnation Road, Strood, to 30mph terminal at 26 Watling St (100m west of j/w Gravesend Road)

Length (m): 1060m

Existing speed limit: 40 mph

Street lighting: mainly very tall columns, partly hidden in trees in places

Environment: urban / semi-rural / rural / village but properties set well back from carriageway. No frontage property towards western end of section (east of j/w Rede Court Road).

Geometry (general description): straight, gentle gradient downhill west-to-east (ave 3.5%), Tree-lined avenue 9.5m to 12.6m wide with six islands (four for pedestrian use) plus signalled crossing at Rede Court Road as part of signalled ‘T’ junction.

Undulations (vertical curvature): few / relatively high / high slight crest east of j/w Rede Court Road

Bends (horizontal alignment): few / relatively high / high effectively straight with very large radius bends

Forward visibility: good / moderate / poor excellent forward visibility

Junctions: few / relatively high / high cross-roads / T junction / staggered / roundabout

Accesses: few / relatively high / high

Footways: both sides / one side only / alternate / intermittent / none
Segregated cycleways?: Y / N both sides

Traffic
Vulnerable road users: few / moderate / high-frequency few crossing movements
HGVs: few / moderate / high-frequency

Gateways/Terminals: good / fair / poor Western terminal has small signs (600mm diameter) which could be larger.

There are no ‘40’ signs when entering from Rede Court Road; other side-road entries have two ‘40’ in most cases even though none are needed when there are repeaters nearby. Some side-road terminals are faded.

Crash record:

During three years July 2011 to June 2014 there had been twelve incidents reported to the Police in which at least one person was injured, all resulting in slight injuries.

There were no crashes recorded at the signalled junction with Rede Court Road nor at Carnation Road on the western extent of the existing 40mph limit apart from a pedal cyclist riding across the road at the traffic signals near the petrol filling station. There were two incidents with vehicles turning right out of the filling station and a fight.

There were three incidents at the junction with Elaine Avenue, which is a popular through route. These involved vehicle-vehicle conflicts with: 1) a vehicle turning left out of Elaine
Avenue; 2) a vehicle turning right out of Elaine Avenue; and 3) a vehicle turning right into this side road.

There were two incidents at the junction with River Drive, one of which involved a vehicle turning right out of the side road. The other involved a vehicle that had been witnessed speeding, overtaking, undertaking and then lost control.

Two pedestrians were hit just to the east of River Drive where there is a refuge island. One was a child of six years old and one was described as drunk (29 years old).

A drunk-driver also hit parked cars towards the eastern end of the existing 40mph limit, heading westbound.

Of the twelve incidents one third occurred in the dark and one third on a wet road surface, which are the proportions that would be expected.

The absence of serious injuries may imply that speed was not necessarily a predominant factor in any of these incidents as serious injuries can result from crashes at 40mph, which would be legal at this location.

**Speed surveys:**

Speed surveys undertaken in October 2011 showed eastbound average speeds of 39mph, with 85%ile of 44/45mph; and westbound average speed was 41mph with an 85%ile of 46 indicating a reasonably well-obeyed 40mph limit. It was noted, however, that eastbound speeds rose between 7am and 8am with an 85%ile above 55mph.

Recent speed surveys (January 2015) were undertaken near the junction with Chapter Road and also towards the western end in the undeveloped section (where there is no frontage property, between Lancelot Avenue and Rede Court Road).

The 85%ile near Chapter Road was 40mph eastbound, and 41mph westbound (average speeds 35/36mph respectively).

The survey towards the western end showed similar eastbound speeds but westbound average speed had risen to 40mph and 85%ile was recorded at 45mph but this is still a reasonable expectation for a 40mph limit.

**Other notes or comments:**

'40' repeater signs are regular and reasonably visible, some accompanied by 'bellows' camera signs as this is a mobile Safety Camera site.

'Patrol' warning signs near Elaine Avenue and some junction warning signs including signal warning near Rede Court Road and 'School' warning signs near Rede Court Road.

Trees enclose road but add to semi-rural nature.

Through lanes are generally around 3.4m wide up to 3.75m and could be reduced with wider hatching to reduce the open nature of the road. This would require removal of existing hatching at some expense.
Applicable Speed Limits

Speed Limits in Urban Areas - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed limit (mph)</th>
<th>Where limit should apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 (including 20 mph zone)</td>
<td>In streets that are primarily residential and in other town or city streets where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high, such as around schools, shops, markets, playgrounds and other areas, where motor vehicle movement is not the primary function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>In other built-up areas (where motor vehicle movement is deemed more important), with development on both sides of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>On higher quality suburban roads or those on the outskirts of urban areas where there is little development, with few cyclists, pedestrians or equestrians. On roads with good width and layout, parking and waiting restrictions in operation, and buildings set back from the road. On roads that, wherever possible, cater for the needs of non-motorised users through segregation of road space, and have adequate footways and crossing places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** change-(to--0mph) / part-change-(describe) / no change

The A2 Watling Street serves a significant road function, linking to strategic highways, serving through traffic and providing local access. The road has a wide nature, good alignment, has building set back from the road, and caters for the needs of non-motorised users through segregated off carriageway facilities.

It is recommended that the existing 40mph speed limit is appropriate for the nature of the route and its topography.

It is further noted that compliance with the speed limit by motorists is good but could be marginally improved by:

- Increase size of terminal signs at western end,
- Clean repeater signs and check for gaps,
- Paint ‘40’ roundels on road adjacent to existing upright ‘40’ repeater signs,
- Existing ‘patrol’ warning signs to be replaced with ‘School’ plate
Please contact: Daniel Adenle
Your Ref: Parking
Our Ref: YA/GN
Date: 27/02/15

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: York Avenue – Parking Changes

As you may be aware, the Council conducted several consultations in York Avenue after a number of parking surveys in the area identified numerous vacant on-street parking spaces during the daytime period.

The feedback from the consultation highlighted various residents’ concerns; namely the effect the parking changes may pose and the detrimental effect it may have on their properties.

Following careful analysis of the feedbacks received and consideration for the best use of vacant parking spaces during the daytime, several amendments to the proposal have now been made. The Council believes these amendments will alleviate many of the concerns raised by residents during the consultation period. The amendments are to;

- Reduce the operational days of the proposed Shared Use Bay (Residents / Pay & Display) from Monday to Sunday to Mon – Fri; 10am – 5pm (York Avenue – hospital side of road only).

- The pay & display to have a maximum stay of 4hrs (Mon – Fri; 10am – 5pm)

- Monitor and review the parking conditions on York Avenue after 6 months of implementation.

The provision of Shared Use Bay will improve the flow of traffic around the Hospital by providing visitors with alternative parking spaces.

Please be aware residents and their visitors will still be able to park in the Shared Use Bay.
The Council intends for the implementation of the parking changes to be completed by Summer 2015.

Yours sincerely

Daniel Adenle
Parking /Transport Operations

Plan - Parking Changes

Index

- Shared Use Bay (Residents Parking and Pay & Display [Mon – Fri; 10am – 5pm])
- Existing Residents Bay
Subject: FW: Appeal to outcome of proposed shared use parking bays in York Avenue

The Head of Democratic Services
Medway Council
Gun Wharf
Dock Road
Chatham
ME4 4TR

For the attention of Mr Steve Platt

Dear Mr Platt

Appeal to outcome of the proposed shared use parking bay installation in York Avenue

Having received the response to our petition against the installation of parking meters in York Avenue we are requesting a review and appealing against the decision made by the Council.

Our objections include the fact that York Avenue and Windmill Road are too narrow for two cars to pass when vehicles are parked both sides of the road; one vehicle has to pull over to make way for the other. With more cars parked, spaces in which vehicles can pull over to make way will be gone leading to more congestion and the risk of damage to residents vehicles.

The Council maintains that the shared use bays will improve the flow of traffic around the hospital, however as vehicles still need to come along Rock Avenue and Montgomery Road to access York Avenue it is difficult to see how this will alleviate the congestion problems or improve traffic flow. With vehicles having to wait for any approaching car to reach the top of Windmill Road before proceeding in the direction of York Avenue congestion at the roundabout into the hospital will increase. Council planning has been a major reason for the increase in traffic along Rock Avenue as the erection of the new bus station and closure of Medway Street to vehicles other than buses and taxis, forces most traffic up Chatham Hill to access Medway Hospital via Rock Avenue.

Insufficient parking spaces in Windmill Road, Frederick Road and other adjoining roads, mean these residents rely on spaces in the Avenue too. One of the Councils comments referred to seventy available spaces however this number seems overstated. As with most other residential roads, when people are at work during the daytime there are sometimes more free spaces and at other times very few. There is also the issue of ambulances having to use York Avenue, sometimes with blue lights, if an oncoming vehicle cannot pull over this will delay the emergency vehicle.

Some residents recall there being parking meters in Windmill Road, installed for the same reason as this proposal, which were removed as the scheme was not successful. Why then would the Council wish to waste more public money on a scheme already known to have failed.

The Council will be aware that Medway Hospital has recently made more parking available for patients and visitors, thus reducing congestion and improving the flow of traffic in the locality. It is our understanding that they have identified further spaces which could be utilised for patients and visitors a step which the hospital should surely be taking rather than inconveniencing local residents.
Residents of York Avenue will suffer increased congestion, more noise and the risk of damage to their vehicles. An attractive Avenue will be spoilt with the erection of parking meters; delivery vehicles will have no where to stop and pay and display will detract from the saleability of our properties.

Is the installation of parking meters just another way for the council to make money at the expense of its constituents?

It is noted that the number of days the Council wishes to introduce this scheme has been reduced to five but it is our wish that this plan is withdrawn altogether. You will see from the number of signatures collected that the majority of residents in York Avenue and the surrounding roads are against this proposal.

Would you please be kind enough to acknowledge receipt of my email.

Yours sincerely

Terrie Baker
Dear Mr Carolan

Petition to consider resurfacing New Road, Chatham.

Thank you for your recent petition received on 22nd January 2015 concerning excessive tyre on road noise in New Road, Chatham.

I can confirm that this site is not included within the 2015/16 programme for total road resurfacing works.

Since receiving your petition a site visit has been carried out by a Highway Engineer to determine the overall condition of the road.

This road was inspected with a view to total resurfacing of the whole area. It was noted that generally the road was in good condition on the North side. On the south side there were a couple of large localised areas where previous repairs have been carried out along with a number of utility reinstatements and some minor surface stripping.

The site obtained a priority rating of 4 (where 1 is the highest priority) and therefore taking this into account it is unlikely that the road would be totally resurfaced within the near future.

We will however be carrying out large full lane width patching works on the south side of the road during next financial year. Two large patches will incorporate most of the minor defects and provide a smoother surface thereby reducing road noise problems in the area.

In the meantime our Highways Inspection Team will continue to monitor this site during their routine inspections.

You (the lead petitioner) may ask for the matter to be reviewed by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee if the petitioner feels that the Council has not dealt
with the petition properly. The petitioner should do this by giving notice to the Head of Democratic Services at the postal address above or by email (democratic.services@medway.gov.uk) within 10 days of receiving the response. It would be helpful if you could provide reasons should you decide to request a review.

Yours sincerely

Robin Cooper
Director of Regeneration, Community & Culture
I'm thankful for your efforts to investigate the road surface on New Road however I think it has failed to look at the sound pollution which the road surface is omitting.

It is vital that noise levels are measured on street level and potentially in home to be able to give a proper indication of what the detrimental effects can be.

As you may be aware noise pollution is quite complex as it depends on various db frequencies, some frequencies are very hard to block out through preventive measures such as secondary glazing.

So there are various factors I’d like to be considered to ultimately reassess the priority rating of 4, as I fear with a rating like that it will take many many many years for something to happen. I myself cannot bear this noise pollution for much longer and it has caused a lot of unnecessary stress in my household due to sleepless nights and having no peace and quiet. A home should be somewhere you go to relax and distress not restress.

Please consider the following:

1) Road needs to be checked from a noise omission perspective, on street and in home. I’m very happy to allow anyone into my house for these purposes
2) I’d like the council to look at history of road surface as I have been made aware that the road was previously resurfaced with a special noise reducing surface.. this was obviously done as there was a feeling that the road was noisy
3) When this was resurfaced (some time ago, at least 8+ yrs) this was when there was less traffic on the road
4) An understanding that tyre on road noise is more prevalent with free moving traffic so definitely in the evening, through to early morning
5) Some empathy that the noise is affecting quality of life and potentially the value of our properties, I myself have to sleep in a back bedroom as I can’t sleep in front bedrooms even though I have secondary glazing. Even in back bedroom when two doors are closed I can still hear traffic but it obviously isn’t as bad. However not being able to use the master bedroom is not ideal, I’m sure you would not be happy if this was your house.
6) I have moved from London and spent quite a lot of money to improve my house as I really love the house itself but the traffic noise is making it unbearable to live. This does not just apply to bedroom but applies to ground floor and first floor as well. We cannot get a minutes rest without being disturbed by traffic noise. It is driving me insane.

I and my fellow residents who live on New Road, would really benefit you giving this the attention it deserves as our lives are really being impacted upon with this excessive tyre on road noise pollution.

I’m waiting to discuss this matter with Vince Maple and so this is not my complete reason for appealing on your decision, I will let you know if I would like to add anything further. Conscious of time limit so wanted to at least get this to you today.

I look forward to hearing from you about all of this.

Many thanks

John
(Lead petitioner)
Please contact: Leigh Ann Thurgood
Your ref:
Our Ref: RC/GE04 07/2015
Date: 9th February 2015

Mr Trevor Peen

Dear Mr Peen

Petition to request improvements to access the River Medway at The Strand in Gillingham

Thank you for your petition relating to improving access to the River Medway and concerns over the condition of the slipway known as Commodore’s Hard.

A full condition survey was carried out in 2011. Dredging of the slipway was carried out by GPS Marine at the beginning of 2014 to remove the mud which had built up. A site visit was carried out by officers in October 2014 to assess the condition of the slipway and to look at the approach road.

Having looked at the slipway itself we feel that the current state of repair is of an acceptable level and is fit for purpose. It is certainly in comparable condition to other similar slipways such as the Harty Ferry on the Isle of Sheppey.

To carry out longer term repair works to the slipway would cost a considerable sum of money which we simply do not have in our budget. However, we will be looking at developer contributions which could possibly be used in the future to improve the approach road and the slipway.

You (the lead petitioner) may ask for the matter to be reviewed by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee if the petitioner feels that the Council has not dealt with the petition properly. The petitioner should do this by giving notice to the Head of Democratic Services at the postal address above or by email (democratic.services@medway.gov.uk) within 10 days of receiving the response. It would be helpful if you could provide reasons should you decide to request a review.

Yours sincerely

Robyn Cobber
Director of Regeneration, Community & Culture
To whom it may concern

I wish the relevant Overview and Scrutiny committee to consider the response received from the council regarding the above.

Commodores hard is currently in a poor state of repair with pot holes almost the full length which is 575 feet. Some of the edging has broken away making it difficult to safely identify the edge of the causeway. It is not relevant to compare it to Harty Ferry slipway which does not see the same amount of traffic and is also in a poor condition. There are at least three clubs that use the causeway one club with over 250 members, this without charities canoe clubs scouts and the public that rely on this resource.

I welcome the opportunity to actually see the condition survey which you say took place in 2011.

As to officers visiting the site to claim that the causeway is fit for purpose, I only hope that this took place at low water springs to fully assess the entire length. Actually trying to launch a boat in these conditions would have been a more practicable and thorough assessment.

The only way I could consider the causeway as fit for purpose would be to launch and recover boats by way of a tractor to cater for the uneven surface which is not a viable option due to the width.

In 2002 Assistant Director for Education and leisure Mari Jones thought that the causeway was in need of repairs. I was part of a small group that were tasked with putting a bid together, via the new Opportunities fund. Although we were successful, unfortunately six other council projects overspent leaving no monies for the 200k refurbishment.

Vital repairs are well overdue to ensure that it can be used safely in the future. Gillingham is the Cinderella of Medway's waterfront.

Trevor Peen
Dear Mr Payne

Petition to consider adopting Florence Street, Strood.

Thank you for your petition received on 22nd January 2015 requesting that we consider adopting Florence Street in Strood.

The term "Private Street" is essentially a Highway Maintained at Private Expense, such status having been provided to Medway by KCC in April 1998 when Medway took over Highway Authority powers from KCC. There is a means by which private roads can become publicly maintained but here the frontagers have to contribute the cost of upgrading the street to adoptable standards in terms of carriageway, footway, surface water drainage, street lighting and surfacing before the Council will take on the responsibility (Part XI of The Highway Act 1980). Here, costs are apportioned on the basis of frontage, a long and tortuous route for both residents and the Council and likely to be extremely costly for property owners.

Florence Street is designated as a Private Street. It serves a total of 16 terraced houses (built in 1875) and has its junction with A228 Frindsbury. Surface Water Drainage is by way of street gullies. There are no turning facilities, so vehicles have to reverse from Frindsbury Road in order to serve the houses or park.

All frontagers should be made fully aware of their obligations to a financial contribution, if one resident opts out, then the whole process will fall apart. The Council has no funds to do the work required to bring the road up to adoption standard and no liability to do so. Indeed, the lack of turning facilities and the sub-standard width of the road make it virtually impossible to achieve the criteria for adoption, particularly as the road itself, is for access only and does not serve a wider purpose.

You (the lead petitioner) may ask for the matter to be reviewed by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee if the petitioner feels that the Council has not dealt with the petition properly. The petitioner should do this by giving notice to the Head of
Democratic Services at the postal address above or by email (democratic.services@medway.gov.uk) within 10 days of receiving the response. It would be helpful if you could provide reasons should you decide to request a review.

Yours sincerely

Robin Cooper
Director of Regeneration, Community & Culture
10th February 2015

You're Reference: RC/GE08 10/2015

Petition to consider adopting Florence Street, Strood.

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your response dated 2nd February, the contents of which I note. However, I would request that the petition be reviewed by the relevant overview and scrutiny committee as indicated in your letter.

Taking into account the council's statutory responsibilities and any Acts of Parliament that may cover such matters, I would take the view that all of these things can, at first reading, seem to be insurmountable problems; but, when subsequently reviewed through different eyes, (for the benefit and well-being of the residents of Florence Street), these obstructions can be overcome.

I base my concerns mainly on the environment within Florence Street and the health of the said residents; in short, my case for the improvement of Florence Street has become one of an Environmental Health and a Health and Safety issue.

This street is typical of the Victorian workers cottages that were built in their thousands the length and breadth of the country; and with good but basic amenities for their time. Modern road traffic was not a consideration at that time, and so many streets did not have to go anywhere in particular, and did not have to accommodate motor vehicles. The road surface of Florence Street when laid down in 1875 was adequate for horse and cart access and/or bicycles, or indeed, your own two feet.

The health of the nation was not a great consideration at this time, and I can scarcely recall seeing a house of this period that did not have a boot scraper set into the outside wall, which allowed only rudimentary removal of animal faeces and mud, and whatever else may have been dropped onto the road surface. Goodness only knows how much more of this filth did in fact get carried inside the home? I think we all know that disease was common-place and that life expectancy was nothing like what we would expect today.
Some 140 years have now passed and this original road surface has deteriorated to such an extent that I am fearful for the health of my family.

Firstly, the road, being made up of rubble and subsoil is absorbent. Therefore, for the last 140 years, all manner of animal (horse/cat/dog/vermin) faeces, and any human waste etc, has seeped into the surface and must by now be at a dangerous level of contamination. Clearly, due to the porous nature of the road surface, any filth that is deposited upon becomes trapped within the subsoil, and is not washed away by rainwater.

Even a modest amount of rain reduces the surface to mud which can be brought directly into the household on the soles of your shoes. Any filth that is deposited upon the surface is disguised within this morass, and therefore one cannot easily pick their way around it as it is very difficult to spot. In short, the road surface of Florence Street has reached the point where it has become an open sewer.

During the hot summer of 2014 I was horrified to see a good number of the resident’s children playing and crawling around on the road surface when it was dry. If they had been dressed in period clothing I could have been looking at a scene from the end of the 19th century. They were filthy and were covered in whatever lurks within that road surface. I would be interested to know what levels of contamination would be revealed by a soil test should one be carried out?

I must also point out that the road surface is so disturbed that there are possibly hundreds of severe trip hazards, to which my wife and young daughter have both succumbed.

The method of directing rainwater away and into a drain is also 140 old and is no longer functional (if it ever was). The only surface drain is located at the end of the street where it adjoins the Frindsbury road. There are two loose-brick gullies (one bordering the pavement on either side of the street) that are now in a poor state of repair. They cannot direct the water down the street and into the drain due to their poor condition, and they are frequently blocked by loose stone and rubble and general dirt build-up etc. I would imagine that the original builders were trying to take advantage of the slight slope that the street is on in order to hurry the water away, but the poor condition of everything is against this method.

The gullies are not cleared as the street is not swept by our local council.

The bulk of rainwater falling directly upon the road is absorbed into the road surface, turning it to mud.

Rainwater from the house guttering is simply directed onto the pavement and is supposed to find its way into the gullies and then into the drains at the end of the street? This is, to say the least, a very hit and miss affair. Not only that, but during freezing weather the paved surfaces become glacier-like; the only option when leaving your house is to take to the uneven road, thus avoiding the pavement altogether. Not a happy alternative.

I would agree with the council that the routes to adoption of Florence Street would indeed be torturous if those routes outlined in your letter were followed. What I would ask is that the council would consider a compulsory adoption on the grounds of environmental health and health and safety, and would ask the council if they could explore a route whereby special funding could be obtained from central government to bring streets like ours up to date on both environmental and health grounds.
Finally, I would like to extend an invitation to council members to my home, to discuss this matter on a more personal level if that would help to explain further, and I will provide plenty of tea and coffee. I am not suggesting this as a gimmick for publicity reasons, I just want this matter to be placed upon a serious footing with a view that sometime in the not too distant future, the residents of Florence Street can enjoy the basic facilities that we should all expect in the present times that we live,

Yours Sincerely,

Richard Payne.
Dear Mr. Stringer,

PETITION REQUESTING THE REPLACEMENT OF BARRIERS WITH A KISSING GATE ON ACCESS LEADING INTO NORTH DANE WOOD

I refer to your petition relating to a request to have an existing barrier replaced with a kissing gate.

Whilst I appreciate your comments that the existing barrier prevents most, but not all motorcycles from using this route as an access point into the woods, it does still permit other users with pushchairs or mobility scooters from gaining access if they so wish.

The existing barrier complies with DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) requirements in that it can be used by the mobility impaired, such as those with a mobility scooter and allows for easy access for pushchairs to manoeuvre through. A kissing gate at this location would not allow easy access for pushchair users or mobility scooters, as there is insufficient width at this point to install such a gate. This would make the opening of the gate too small with little or no manoeuvrability for such users to navigate their way through it.

To install any other form of motorcycle inhibitor at this location is not an option as they are designed for narrower paths where you can only go through it and not around it. The width of the path is too large for this type of inhibitor and would not therefore prevent motorcycles from gaining access from the space to the side of such barrier.

I sympathise with the problems anti-social behaviour causes, but also have to give consideration to other users of the highway. Therefore with the limited available space at this location to install a kissing gate, I am unable to grant approval for your request on this occasion.

You (the lead petitioner) may ask for the matter to be reviewed by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee if the petitioner feels that the Council has not dealt
with the petition properly. The petitioner should do this by giving notice to the Head of Democratic services at the postal address or by email (democratic.services@medway.gov.uk) with 10 days of receiving the response. It would be helpful if you could provide reasons should you decide to request a review.

Yours sincerely,

Robin Cooper
Director of Regeneration, Community & Culture
24th February 2015
Ref: RC/GE12 14 /2015 (Refusal of Petition to install Kissing Gate at the corner of Fowey Close).

Dear Head of Democratic Services.

Following the refusal letter from a Mr Robin Cooper in regards to the refusal of a kissing gate at the corner of Fowey Close, I would like the matter to be reviewed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the following grounds:-

a) You state that the existing barrier complies with the Disability Discrimination Act to allow access to the green space behind the houses.

Reply: Without undertaking a detailed study of all the mobility scooters on the current market or their physical size and turning radius, the access is very limited to only a few small Mobility scooters.

b) You state that pushchair uses have to have access to the green space behind the houses.

Reply: Yet again single pushchair users will be able to manoeuvre around the barrier. However, a larger pram or a twin (side by side) pram will also have trouble gaining access via this barrier.

So, you base your refusal for a kissing gate to comply with the law and access to the space for pram users. However, in our replies, access is already limited to only certain types of Prams and Mobility scooters.

If by installing a kissing gate access will be restricted to the aforementioned access requirements, there is the same type of current access gate at the end Tay Close that will allow access to the green space behind the houses.
May I also add that in the thirty plus years I have lived here I have never seen a mobility scooter come down Fowey Close to get to the space behind the houses.

To conclude, you have based your refusal to allow the kissing gate to be installed for access to the space behind the houses due to Mobility scooters and Pram Users requiring access under the aforementioned DDA. However, by using the other access gate via Tay Close access can be still provided to the green space. Also, access to the green space by Mobility scooters and Pram users might happen occasionally or even not at all!
However, Anti-Social behaviour and robberies in the Close are happening now (on Police Records).

I would strongly recommend that you reconsider your refusal.

Regards Mr Graham Stringer (Lead petitioner)
Summary
This report summarises the performance of the Council’s Key Measures of Success for October/December (Quarter 3) 2014/15 as set out in the refreshed Council Plan 2013/15.

This report includes progress on how we have performed against:

- 19 Key Measures of Success
- 11 Key projects

The performance results and associated service comments are set out under each of Medway’s key priorities and values.

Performance highlights

- 8 out of 8 measures with targets are achieving target in Quarter 3
- 3 out of 8 measures have improved over the long trend
- 3 out of 8 measures have improved since the previous quarter

Awards and achievements

- The most improved performer for Public Transport and Walking & Cycling in the UK (National Highways and Transport Awards 2014)

1. Budget and Policy Framework

This report summarises the performance of the Council’s Key Measures of Success for Quarter 3 2014/15 as set out in the refreshed Council Plan 2013/15.
2. **Background**

2.1 This report sets out the performance summary against the two relevant Council priorities and two values for this Committee:

**Medway’s Priorities**
- Safe Clean and Green Medway
- Everyone benefiting from regeneration

**Medway’s Values**
- Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do
- Giving value for money

2.1 It focuses on where we have achieved or exceeded our targets, and how we are addressing areas for improvement.

2.2 Members should note that Council agreed on 25 July 2013 that the scrutiny of housing performance would be discussed at Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Therefore any performance information highlighted grey within the report is not relevant to this Committee and fall under other Overview and Scrutiny Committees. They have been included to provide context and clarity of how the priorities as a whole have been performing.

2.3 Sections 6 and 7 are similarly highlighted grey, as these related to Council wide performance against the values, rather than just RCC specifically. These sections are to be reviewed at other Committees. Therefore these sections are also only included to provide context and clarity of how the values as a whole have been performing.

3. **Summary of performance of Key Measures of Success 2014/15 Quarter 3**

We monitor 19 Key Measures of Success to gauge if we are delivering the priorities in our Council Plan. Details of these 19 Measures are included in Appendix 1.

We are able to report on only 8 of these measures for Q3 because 2 are data only (target not required or appropriate), and for 9 measures, data is not available until Q4.

- The Council has successfully met 8 out of 8 measures with targets for Q3.

4. **Key priority: Safe, Clean and Green Medway**

4.1 **Key measures of success - Summary**

Details of the 9 key measures of success for this Council priority are included in Appendix 1.

We are able to report on two of the key measures of success at Quarter 3 because we do not set a target for two of the measures, and the remaining five measures are based on bi-annual Tracker information which is due in Quarter 4 2014/15.
• 2 out of 2 measures of success achieved/exceeded target

4.2 Community Safety

The Community Safety Partnership (CSP) shop was opened in the Pentagon Centre for 6 weeks in the run up to Christmas. Community Wardens, Kent Police, KFRS, Public Health, Road Safety and Turning Point supported the shop. The shop received over 4,000 visitors and was viewed positively by partners.

4.3 Street Scene Enforcement Team

To ensure environmental crimes in the public realm are detected and enforced, the Street Scene Enforcement Team attend every fly tip to search for evidence and where possible, remove it immediately. All fly tips are attended within one working day with 90% removed on the same day and 15% yielding evidence for further investigation. For Q3 593 flytips were dealt with before being reported to the Council. Total 31 tonnes were cleared. During Q3 20 Cases were prosecuted at Medway Magistrates Court with fines and costs totalling £10,975.

In Q3 the Community Wardens dealt with 119 stray dogs 60 of which were taken to the kennels, of which 25 were subsequently reunited with their owners. The remaining 59 were scanned for microchips on street and returned directly to the owner. The home boarding licensing scheme, which involves regulating the keeping and running of animal boarding establishments received positive media coverage during Q3 with 9 premises now licensed in Medway.

4.4 Domestic Abuse

Medway Council working with its partners is committed to prevent and reduce Domestic Abuse (DA). The Pan Kent Independent Domestic Violence Advocate Service (IDVA) operates across Kent and Medway and is provided by a consortium of four voluntary sector organisations: KDAC (Kent Domestic Abuse Consortium). The service has been running since April 2013 and is in its second of a three-year term. The multi-agency funding supports high and lower risk of domestic abuse.

Figures for domestic abuse have been finalised up to Q2 2014/15. During the first 6 months of 2014/15 KDAC has already supported 250 clients, compared to a total of 295 clients in its entire first year. 98.4% (61/62) in 2014/15 have had their risk of domestic abuse reduced as a result of IDVA intervention. Reported incidence of domestic abuse in Medway increased; Kent Police dealt with 2,837 in the first 6 months of 2014/15 compared to 2,583 during the same period of time in 2013/14. It is believed that improved access arrangements account for the rise, rather than the incidence increasing within Medway.

Medway Council conducted a range of events to promote awareness of domestic abuse in Q3. To mark the national elimination of violence against women and girls campaign, the Medway Domestic Abuse Forum organised a conference the week beginning 24th November incorporating various themes including domestic abuse in adolescents, safety planning for victims and working with perpetrators of domestic abuse. The conference was attended by over 120 people from multi agency partners and was an invaluable resource for information sharing. Continuing with the theme, on 25 November 2014 Medway Council launched its revised and updated Domestic Abuse Policy.
In October 2014 it was agreed that Medway Council would become a White Ribbon Authority. The CSP will be taking forward this campaign where the White Ribbon is used as a symbol of hope for a world where women and girls can live free from the fear of violence.

4.5 Parks and open spaces

There are currently 27 Volunteer Groups supporting a diverse range of activity from allotment management through to site tasks and supporting funding applications. The Lordswood Leisure Centre play area refurbishment and Riverside Country Park play area extension were completed in Q3.

4.6 Recycling

In Q3 The Council with its contractor Veolia have been finalising the rollout of twin stream recycling in flats, and anticipate the first bins being changed over in February 2015. The full rollout is likely to take up to two years to complete as each site must be visited and bin numbers agreed with landlords/residents.

4.7 Key Project: Weekly kerbside recycling and composting service

The weekly recycling collection was launched in October 2013. Since then 14 articles and adverts have been published in Medway Matters encouraging residents to recycle and minimise their waste. The most recent article in Oct/Nov thanked residents for a successful year of weekly recycling and explained more about recycling end destinations. A short video was produced to reinforce the recycling message which has been promoted on the Medway Matters website and broadcast on the Big Screen since mid December.

In 2014/15 there has been an increase in kerbside recycling rate compared with 2013/14:

- Q1 2014/15 48.5% (Q1 2013/14 42.1%)
- Q2 2014/15 45.0% (Q2 2013/14 40.0%)
- Q3 2014/15 40.0% (Q3 2013/14 42.0%) (Based on 2 complete months and an estimate for December)

The kerbside recycling rate varies seasonally (e.g. more garden organics in spring/summer) and was greater in Q3 2013/14 following the introduction of weekly recycling collections. The effect is that although Q3 performance for 2014/15 is lower that Q3 2013/14, the annual target of 43% is predicted to be met.

From November 2013 to October 2014, compared to the same 12-month period the year before, the weekly collections have yielded positive results including:

- An overall decrease of 3% black sacks
- An overall increase of 5% in mixed recycling and paper
- An overall increase of 29% in organic waste
5 Key priority: Everyone benefiting from the area’s regeneration

5.1 Key measures of success - Summary

Details of the 10 key measures of success for this Council priority are included in Appendix 1.

We are able to report on six of the measures at Quarter 3 because information on four measures are not available until Quarter 4.

- 6 out of 6 measures of success have achieved/exceeded target
- 3 out of 6 measures have improved since last quarter
- 3 out of 6 measures have improved compared with the average of the previous four quarters

Service Comments

5.2 Homelessness

The level of homeless applications in Medway has seen a year on year increase, which is reflective of both national and regional trends. The increase in demand for the homeless service is driven by a number of factors, primarily connected with the difficulties households have in securing suitable affordable accommodation in the private sector, and a limited supply of affordable housing.

The number of households making a homeless application in Q3 2014/15 has increased by 48% compared to the same period last year (Q3 2013/14 240, Q3 2014/15 356).

In Q3 14/15 388 decisions were made on homeless applications, compared to 277 in Q3 13/14. Despite the increase in the number of decisions being made, officers have achieved 76.8% of homelessness decisions within the government recommended target of 33 days, which is an improvement on Q3 2013/14 (74.7%).

If the Council cannot prevent homelessness, there is a requirement to provide some households with temporary accommodation (TA) whilst their situation is investigated or suitable alternative accommodation is sourced. At the end of Q3 there were 230 households living in TA. Whilst an increase in homeless applications had been anticipated, the actual level has been above that expected. This has meant that the demand for temporary accommodation (TA) has increased whilst applications are investigated or until suitable affordable housing is available.

In order to ensure households are moved on from TA as quickly as possible, the time taken to make homeless decisions is being closely monitored and work is continuing within the team to find suitable alternative arrangements to TA. Whilst there has been an increase in the overall number of households in temporary accommodation from Q2 to Q3, there were no households with dependent children living in bed and breakfast for more than six weeks at the end of Q3 2014/15. This highlights the efforts made by the Housing team to secure and move families into alternative accommodation as soon as possible.
5.3 Employment

In November 2014 only 2.2% of Medway’s population aged 16-64 claimed job seekers allowance, the lowest it has been since July 2008. As a result of unemployment decreasing, the number of referrals to Employ Medway is decreasing; reducing the amount of customers Employ Medway has to work with.

During Q3 Medway Council assisted 55 people finding a first job and a further 52 customers re-entering the workplace. Employ Medway has out performed all other G4S sub contractors in Kent on outcome targets (customers staying in work for 6 months). Q3 saw a provisional figure of 49 customers being helped to sustain work for at least 6 months, an increase on Q2 (41). In addition provisional figures show that Medway Council have helped create and safeguard 363 Jobs for the year to date 2014/15.

The TIGER scheme, which supported the start up or growth of local businesses through loans, ended in October 2014. The scheme lent a total of £14.5m, of which £4.3m went to 13 businesses in Medway, creating 328 jobs and safeguarding a further 115. Three of these businesses were new inward investments into Medway.

The Council sponsored a Construction Expo in October 2014, in which business and industry leaders from the South East met to discuss the latest construction, manufacturing and engineering trends. More than 95 exhibitors presented products and services at the Expo and offered the latest initiatives in regeneration, sustainability, innovation and growth. The Expo also highlighted a series of new regeneration sites in Medway, showcasing Rochester Riverside and Chatham Waters developments. Exhibitors at the event also provided workshops and apprentice zones, with students building a brick arch and a timber roof.

5.4 Key project: Enjoy Medway - Culture, heritage, sport & tourism

The Council continues to work to establish Medway as a destination for culture, heritage, sports and tourism and Cabinet adopted the new Cultural Strategy on 28th October 2014.

Medway successfully delivered a diverse range of cultural and leisure events in Q3. The Dickens Country Experience bus was launched in November and ran on weekends from Saturday 15 November to Sunday 21 December. 427 people took part in the experience with most tours sold out in advance.

The Rochester Christmas Market and Dickensian Christmas were visited by a total of 328 tourist coaches this year compared to 297 in 2013. The Dickensian Christmas weekend witnessed a record number of foreign visitors, with 40 coaches attending in 2014 compared to 31 in 2013. Direct user surveys were conducted at the events and reported 99% (518/522) of respondents answering very or fairly satisfied. The events also helped increase the number of visitors to Council attractions in Q3 from 34,518 in 2013 to 43,041 in 2014. The Council is on track to exceed this target by year end.

Medway Council is committed to provide leisure facilities for all. The major refurbishment programme worth £1.9m at Strood Sports Centre is on schedule for completion. The new reception area was completed and opened in time for Christmas and phase 1 of the new fitness suite will open in January 2015.
opening of the new section of the fitness suite will allow work to continue on converting the existing part of the gym and the creation of three new dance studios and the new café. Work is due to be completed in the spring.

Improvements to Medway Park in Q3 have included the opening of the new functional training area, and the development of the former shooting range into a multi-use room. This has allowed an increased number of fitness classes to be held in the centre, with more than 100 per week now being held. Improvements to the centre have helped increase footfall and Medway Park welcomed its 800,000th visitor of 2014, a record level of attendance.

5.5 Transport

Medway Council took part in the annual National Highways and Transport (NHT) Survey in summer 2014 alongside 78 other Local Authorities. The Survey was sent to 5,200 Medway residents asking satisfaction questions on topics including Public transport and traffic congestion.

Results were published in October showing improvement in the satisfaction of Medway’s residents; overall satisfaction increasing from 55.2% in 2013 to 56.4% in 2014, above the Unitary Authority average of 55.5%.

The NHT Public Satisfaction Survey 2014 Outstanding Performance Awards were held in on 14th October 2014 and of the 78 participating authorities, Medway Council was awarded the most improved performer for Public Transport and Walking & Cycling in the UK. In addition, Medway was in the top five most improved performers for Tackling Congestion and Road Safety.

To improve the quality of public transport, the Council have worked in partnership with Arriva who have made some significant fleet improvements during Q3, including the rolling out of the new “Sapphire” bus on the key 101-commuter route. This flagship vehicle includes new leather-type seating, free on-board wifi, power sockets, and arrival destination screens and voice announcements.

To assist with improving health, reducing car journeys and reducing traffic around schools, the Council took part in International Walk to School Month in October 2014 with 19 Medway schools taking part. In addition to this, eight Medway schools have signed up to a pilot project in partnership with Public Health that will commence in Q4 aimed at tackling child obesity by encouraging walking to school.

5.6 Key Project – Highways Maintenance 2014/15

The Council continues to invest with its programme of planned road maintenance schemes. There are 38 planned road-resurfacing sites (33 completed), however one site, The Street, Halling, will be carried forward into the 2015/16 programme due to utility works. The other 37 planned road-resurfacing sites will be completed on time and within budget.

The Council is also progressing with its programme of repairs and schemes to ensure pavements reach a good standard of maintenance. This is underpinned by an inspection programme based on the level of risk associated with the highway. Of the 21 planned pavement-resurfacing sites, 18 have been completed and the full programme of works will be completed on time and within
budget. These robust programmes have been funded by the additional £2.4m secured from the council along with a further £440k from the Department for Transport.

The road-marking programme started on the 8 October is now complete and the programme to paint roundabouts directional arrows (the black and white chevrons) on appropriate roundabouts is 98% completed. Cyclic gully cleansing has been completed on 19 of the 22 wards, including the first cycle of all A and B roads.

The Council has now entered the Winter maintenance period and Veolia and Quadron have been supplied with updated plans of the prioritised footway salting routes. The Snow Warden pilot has also been advertised through various forms of media including the Council’s website and local papers.

5.7 **Key Project – Rochester Riverside next phase**

Rochester Riverside is a flagship project in Medway Council’s regeneration programme. The site comprises 32 hectares (74 acres) of brownfield development land, stretching from Rochester Bridge to the north and Doust Way to the south. Whilst meeting the Council’s objective of providing new homes and jobs for Medway, the development at Rochester Riverside will bring other benefits including a range of publicly accessible open spaces, retail and leisure facilities as well as improvements to the ‘Gateways’ between the River and Rochester High St.

Following adoption of the 2014 Development Brief and Masterplan, the Council is to commence the procurement of a development partner to work with the Council and Homes and Communities Agency to deliver the remaining phases of Rochester Riverside. A contract notice will be issued in January 2015 and it is anticipated that a preferred developer will be appointed by the end of the year.

5.8 **Key Project – New Rochester Station**

Network Rail has now commenced construction of the new station building. Construction of the building will take place over the course of the year, with the new opening in December 2015.

5.9 **Key Project – Chatham Town Centre – Growing Places Fund**

Phase 2 of Sun Pier Pontoon is underway which includes additional anti-climb measures and refurbishment of the Pier itself. The final specification has been agreed and the works will be complete by the end of the Q4.

The Medway Street site detailed design for a potential car park extension is now complete and under review; work is expected to commence in Q4.

Phase 1 of the River Walk Works is nearing completion with the final detail of the new gun carriages to be delivered in Q4. Phase 2 of the River Walk Works has a draft detail design currently under review. Implementation will begin in Q4 2014/15.

5.10 **Key Project – New council homes for Medway Council**

Progress is being made on the two work streams to provide new Council homes for Medway. The first is the provision of new homes on former council garage
sites. Detailed planning permissions have been granted on 10 former garage sites, which will provide 23 homes, ranging from 1-bedroom bungalows to 5-bedroom family house. The construction contract was awarded in June 2014 and the contractor has taken possession of 9 of the sites. It is expected that the final site will be given to the contractor in early 2015 once the rights of way issue has legally completed. The first 13 homes will be available for occupation during March 2015.

The second provision is to develop the former Gillingham College site (Beatty Avenue) to provide 32 affordable bungalows to rent. A planning application for the scheme has been submitted and a decision is expected by mid 2015. The procurement process has commenced for a contractor to build the scheme for the Council. The Invitation to tender was received back by the Council on the 17th December 2014 and Officers and the Council’s consultants are reviewing the returns. The Council is expected to be in a position to let the contract by mid 2015.

5.11 **Key Project – Rochester Airport**

The Council approved the master plan for the redevelopment of Rochester Airport in January 2014, and a new lease to the airport operator for a 25-year period was also granted in 2014. Consideration of the current planning application to improve the airport’s operational infrastructure and install a hard paved runway was deferred for a site visit mid January 2015, and the planning application was approved by the Planning Committee on 4th February 2015.

Several high value businesses have expressed an interest in building their own high specification premises on the land at Rochester Airport. The development process for the airport operator’s facilities is anticipated to start in 2015.

5.12 **Key Project – RECREATE**

The Community Interest Company (CIC) is responsible for the management of the creative workspace at Sun Pier House and regular meetings are held by the Council with the CIC to ensure that there is a good exchange of information and a coherent link with other creative venues in Chatham. Medway Council provided the CIC with a Business Advisor from Kent Invicta Chamber, who meets with them regularly to review their business plan and to advise them on key business decisions.

The Council launched a business support programme for established businesses, run by The Artists Information Company and comprising of a series of 6 workshops and 1-2-1s with the speakers. The course covers subjects such as Negotiating Public Art and Commissioning Projects and Crowd Funding. Recreate also took an exhibition stand at Kent 2020 Start-up Live, where 10 Medway artists exhibited and demonstrated their work to over 500 visitors.

Following the launch of the Designer-Maker Fair, ‘Bespoke’ in June 2014, a second Fair was held in the Sun Pier House Gallery on 15th November 2014. This was preceded by a Meet the Buyer and preview event on Friday 14th November.

The Pop-Up Creative Space in Chatham has been continually occupied and has hosted a further 12 exhibitions and 7 events. A further 31 artists have used the
space and there have been almost 600 visitors during Q3, making a total of 107 artists benefiting directly from the space and 1,582 visitors to date.

Recreate sponsored the Film, Video and Digital Arts Festival in October 2014, which took place across several venues such as the Guildhall Museum, POP Creative Space, Sun Pier House and Rochester Corn Exchange. Work from UCA graduates and French film-makers were amongst 2 major commissions and other original works to be shown over 3 days.

2 Graduates have received a bursary from the University of Kent to exhibit at Rochester Art Gallery from January - March 2015. Recreate funded a studio for the graduates for the 2 months prior to the exhibition, and Medway Council Arts Team is providing support for marketing, insurance and logistics in the build up to and during the exhibition.

5.13 **Key Project – Eastgate House**

Tendering of the main refurbishment works at Eastgate House has been completed and the contract was awarded to Fairhurst Ward and Abbot Restoration Ltd at Cabinet in December 2014. Pre-start discussions are now taking place and a meeting has been held with the Friends Group to update them on progress.

A condition Survey for the Dickens Chalet has also been completed and a revised cost plan for Eastgate House Gardens has been produced.

During the Rochester Christmas Market and Dickensian Christmas Festival, Eastgate House opened, with over 6,000 people visiting.

5.14 **Key Project: Community Hub Development – Libraries**

The development of Community Hubs is the key strategic driver for libraries. The contract for the Strood Community Hub is almost at the end of the construction programme and the project is running to programme and to budget.

Key project phases delivered during Q3 were the decant plan for opening being approved, external planning conditions (building) discharged and the fit out contract awarded and scheduled to commence in January 2015.

5.15 **Key Project – Sporting Legacy**

Medway Council is now running a strong active senior sports programme in community settings encouraging the older generation to continue to play sport and be active. The sessions include new age curling, Boccia, table tennis, dance and chair based exercise. These sessions are running within retirement groups across Medway. It also includes the successful Tea Dance programme, which will be extending to the peninsula and Lordswood.

The Medway Sports Awards took place Friday 12th December 2014, presented by guest of honour, Olympic, Commonwealth and European long jump champion Greg Rutherford. Among those nominated were a Paralympic gold medallist, a world champion, and two Commonwealth Games finalists. Q3 also saw the inaugural inductees into the Medway sporting Hall of Fame.
Value 1: Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do

6.1 Investors in people

Medway achieved Investors in People (IiP) Gold award in October. This is an external accreditation which acknowledges that the most successful, customer-focused businesses are those that invest in their staff. It measured our approach to the support, development and recognition of staff together with arrangements for communications, management practice, social responsibility and employee benefits. It puts us in the top 7% of all employers in the Country.

6.2 Customer Perception

We use a variety of methods to find out what our customers think of our services. These include:

- Citizens Panel – Postal survey sent to over 2,000 residents on a quarterly basis
- Tracker – Bi-Annual telephone survey of around 400 residents. Data from the Tracker is used under each priority heading, reported as Key Measures of Success detailed in Appendix 1 and at section 9.3 below.
- GovMetric - A customer feedback tool that gives customer ratings data from face-to-face (FTF), telephone and web channels. See section 9.5 below for further information.

6.3 Tracker

The results of the next Tracker survey scheduled for March will be included in the Quarter 1 performance report for 2015/16.

6.4 Citizen Panel

The Citizen Panel is a postal survey sent to over 2,000 residents who have been selected to match the community profile as near as possible. The Citizen Panel are asked standard questions to find out how well they believe we are delivering on our key priorities and values. This enables Medway to track the satisfaction rating over time. The survey is carried out on a quarterly basis.

- 738 residents completed the survey in November 2014
  - 63% were very or fairly satisfied with the way the Council runs its services
  - 12.3% very satisfied
  - 8.9% very or fairly dissatisfied
  - 4.1% very dissatisfied
  - 24.7% were neither satisfied or dissatisfied

- There has been a significant increase in satisfaction (from 57% in Q2 to 63% in Q3). The overall rate of satisfaction is now the same as the Q1 survey.

6.5 GovMetric

The following tables show the percentage of GovMetric respondents who have rated their service as “Good.”
Face to face users rating service as “Good”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 2013/14</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Short Trend</th>
<th>Long Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GovMetric. Short Trend: Comparison with previous quarter. Long trend - Comparison with same time period previous year.

Web users rating service as “Good”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q3 2013/14</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Short Trend</th>
<th>Long Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GovMetric. Short Trend: Comparison with previous quarter. Long trend - Comparison with same time period previous year.

- 5,248 ratings were received across all channels in Quarter 3 2014/15
- Overall the percentage of “good” ratings received has improved in all channels between Q2 and Q3 2014/15.
- We benchmark against 70 other local authorities. Over the last quarter we have improved against our benchmarking partners:
  - Top quartile – face to face
  - Top ten ranking – face to face
  - Top quartile – web

6.6 Complaints

Q2 2014/15 Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of complaints received</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cases closed</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cases dealt within 10 days</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of cases dealt within 10 days</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NB Q2 volumes are untypical, reflecting a large number of complaints on one issue)

Service Comments

The Quarter 3 performance on the 10-day response indicator was 73.3%, against the target of 75%, which is very disappointing after the target was reached in both of the previous quarters.

Performance in October, November and December respectively was 69.2%, 80.9% and 72.7%. As often happens, in both of those months that missed the 75% target, more complaints were responded to than were received, and commonly some of those responses will have been out of time, dragging down the timeliness indicator.

In the 9 months to date the 75% target was reached in 5 of those months, and the year to date average is 75.7%. Overall performance compared to the 2013/14 average remains up from 66%.
There remains a challenge to improving further but the Customer Relations Team is working with service areas across the whole council to achieve that step up to 75% this year.

7 Value 2: Giving value for money

Phase 4 customer contact and administration

The e-forms to allow online booking of bulky waste collections and pest control bookings went live as planned in October. With all digital technology it is important to continue to develop and improve it so customers get the best experience. Further customer testing has taken place with a report with recommendations for enhancements due in January.

Scoping has started for the business case for investment in a new council website which will be accessible from mobile devices and have improved search facilities. This lack of functionality is a major deficiency with the current site. In the meantime, work continues to overhaul the content on the website to make it easier to use.

The next phase of reviews of customer contact and administration activity have commenced in economic development, student services and mental health.

8 Risk management

Risk management helps to deliver performance improvement and is at the core of decision-making, business planning, managing change and innovation. It is practised at both management and service delivery level, enabling the effective use of resources, and securing the assets of the organisation and its continued financial and organisational well-being. The purpose of the Council Plan performance monitoring reports during the year is to enable managers and members to manage the key risks identified in delivering priorities.

9 Financial and legal implications

There are no finance or legal implications arising from this report.

10 Recommendation

It is recommended that Members consider Quarter 3 2014/15 performance against the Key Measures of Success used to monitor progress against the Council Plan 2013/15

Lead officer contact

Anthony Lewis, Corporate Performance and Intelligence Manager
Tele no 01634 332092
Email anthony.lewis@medway.gov.uk
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### Regeneration Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee

#### Appendix 1: Council Plan Monitoring - Q3 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI Status</th>
<th>Trend Arrows</th>
<th>Success is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟥 This PI is significantly below target</td>
<td>🚀 The performance of this PI has improved</td>
<td>📈 Higher figures are better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟢 This PI is slightly below target</td>
<td>🚡 The performance of this PI has worsened</td>
<td>📉 Lower figures are better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟢 This PI has met or exceeded the target</td>
<td>▼ The performance of this PI is static</td>
<td>N/A - Desired performance is neither too high nor too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟢 This PI is data only. There is no target and is provided for reference only.</td>
<td>N/A - Rating not appropriate / possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.1 We will work with the community to keep Medway clean and safe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF15 C</td>
<td>Percentage of people who feel Medway is safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>Satisfaction with street cleaning (tracker)</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

10-Jan-2014 Previously this information was received from the Kent Crime Victim Survey quarterly. From March 13 Kent Police no longer complete the survey and the measure has now been collected as part of the annual Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment. A Citizens Panel Survey took place in August 13 85% of respondents felt safe during the day and as expected less people felt safe after dark 56%. These results will be shared with partners and used to refresh the Community Safety Partnership Plan.

09-Jan-2015 This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

### 3.2 We will support victims of domestic abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Short Trend</td>
<td>Long Trend</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA6</td>
<td>Number of high risk clients referred for IDVA support</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

12-Jan-2015 Due to the timing of the data release for this indicator, figures will be published 1 qtr in arrears. Q2 performance has now been confirmed as 132.

Q2 demonstrates a significant increase in cases being referred. At the end of Q2 14/15...
### 3.3 We will increase recycling and reduce waste to landfill sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.20%</td>
<td>49.24%</td>
<td>46.89%</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DA7** Percentage of clients where risk is reduced as a result of IDVA intervention

- 2013/14 Value: N/A
- Q1 2014/15 Value: 67.8%
- Q2 2014/15 Value: 100.0%
- Q3 2014/15 Value: 97.1%
- Target: N/A
- Status: N/A
- Short Trend: N/A
- Long Trend: N/A

**Note**

- 250 cases have been dealt with, compared to 129 at the same point of time 13/14. This is excellent news for high-risk victims, who are better placed to receive help and support. However as demand increases it puts pressure on the services resources. Medway's cases represent 18.8% of the total across the Kent and Medway area.

- 12-Jan-2015 Due to the timing of the data release for this indicator, figures will be published 1 qtr in arrears. Q2 performance has now been confirmed as 97.1%.

- In Q2 34 out of 35 clients reported a significant or moderate reduction in risk after IDVA intervention. The remaining client reported a limited reduction in risk. Q2 figures exceed the Co-ordinated Action Against Domestic Abuse (CAADA) benchmark, which is 74%. The performance for other Kent authorities is 80.6%. In addition in Q2, 63% (22) reported a complete cessation of abuse, which equals the CAADA benchmark of 63%.
### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>2013/14 Value</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15 Target</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>Satisfaction with refuse collection (tracker)</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93.80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>Satisfaction with recycling facilities (tracker)</td>
<td>87.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4 We will work with local people to maintain parks and open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>2013/14 Value</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15 Value</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15 Target</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GH4</td>
<td>Citizen participation hours - Greenspaces</td>
<td>17724</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>3349</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>12000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note

- **4Q 2013/14**
  - More garden organic and was greater in Q3 2013/14 following the introduction of weekly recycling collections. The effect is that although Q3 performance for 2014/15 is lower than Q3 2013/14, the annual target of 43% is predicted to be met.

- **09-Jan-2015** This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

- **09-Jan-2015** This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

14-Jan-2015 There are currently 27 Active Groups supporting a diverse range of activity from allotment management through to site tasks and supporting funding applications. Whilst Q3 Citizens Participation hours were slightly down on Q2 (Q2 3349, Q3 2672) the Council has secured 10,002 hours participation year to date, putting us on track to achieve the year end target 12,000.
### 3.5 We will tackle and reduce the harm caused by alcohol and drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Long Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH6</td>
<td>Satisfaction with parks and open spaces (tracker)</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 09-Jan-2015 This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

### 4.1 We will secure a reliable and efficient local transport network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Long Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH11</td>
<td>Number of users of opiates that left drug treatment successfully (free of drug dependence) who do not then represent to treatment again within 6 months as a percentage of the total number of opiate users in treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH12</td>
<td>The percentage of alcohol users that were in treatment in the last 12 months who successfully complete treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 07-Jan-2015 A small increase in Q2 but as the new contract only went live in July, no significant improvements were anticipated this year

Please note trend is against Q2 2014/15 performance due to time lag in obtaining data.

07-Jan-2015 Q3 data not available yet - this represents Q2 data

Please note status and trend is against Q2 2014/15 performance due to time lag in obtaining data. Q2 target = 32%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Success 1s</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Long Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 167</td>
<td>Average journey time along 6 primary transport corridors into Chatham (mins per mile)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP26</td>
<td>Satisfaction with road maintenance (tracker)</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP27</td>
<td>Satisfaction with pavement maintenance (tracker)</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

- **14-Jan-2015** Monitoring of the six strategic corridor routes into the boundary of Chatham Town Centre over the 2014/15 Q3 period in the morning peak between 8am - 9am has shown the measure of congestion has increased slightly from the last quarter, however this appears to be a season variation in Q3 on the run up to Christmas for the past three years. In addition there were major road works on the strategic network during this period that caused traffic displacement.

- **09-Jan-2015** This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

- **09-Jan-2015** This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

### 4.2 Support the provision of new homes and improve existing housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Success 1s</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Long Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 156</td>
<td>Number of households living in temporary accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

- **15-Jan-2015** The number of households making homeless applications has increased by 48% compared to the same period last year (Q3 13/14 240, Q3 14/15 356). Whilst an increase in homeless applications had...
### 4.3 Ensure that people have the skills to take up job opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Success Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRCC4a</td>
<td>Number of jobs created and safeguarded through intensive assists (cumulative)</td>
<td>![Increase symbol]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD48c</td>
<td>Employment that has lasted 26 weeks</td>
<td>![Increase symbol]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Short Trend</th>
<th>Long Trend</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRCC4a</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>![Green Check]</td>
<td>![Red Down]</td>
<td>![Blue Down]</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD48c</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

12-Jan-2015 Data now finalised for Q2 and actual cumulative figure at the end of Q2 was 307 not 277 as provisionally reported.

Q3 provisional cumulative figure reported as 363, final figures will be available during Q4 and figures will be updated to reflect this. Although final figures are still to be received, the Council has exceeded the cumulative Q3 target of 300.

12-Jan-2015 There is a time delay for this measure and therefore final figures will always be reported a quarter in arrears. Q2 figures have been finalised as 41. Referral numbers have decreased dramatically as a result of falling unemployment numbers and performance outcomes reflective this. In November 14 only 2.2% of Medway’s population aged 16-
### 4.4 Medway as a destination for culture, heritage, tourism & sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Success Is</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>Q1 2014/15</th>
<th>Q2 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>Q3 2014/15</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>50 claimed job seekers allowance, the lowest it has been since July 2008. Provisional figures for Q3 currently stand at 50, final figures for Q3 will be confirmed during Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12-Jan-2015 There is a time delay for this measure and therefore final figures will always be reported a quarter in arrears. Q2 14/15 figures were previously reported as 6; during Q3 we received additional information of apprenticeships in Q2 and Q2 figure has now been amended to 14 achieving the quarterly target. Provisional figures for Q3 currently stand at 40, final figures for Q3 will be confirmed during Q4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>Leisure - Level of user satisfaction (% satisfied)</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>14-Jan-2015 Surveys are asked at our leisure centres on a rolling programme for Q3 direct user surveys were completed at Strood Sports Centre and Medway Park with 124 surveys being completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRCC1</td>
<td>Number of visitors to tourist attractions in Medway (cumulative)</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>697472</td>
<td>223295</td>
<td>481514</td>
<td>630398</td>
<td>525000</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>16-Jan-2015 Q3 of 2014 has been a strong quarter for attractions generally, with a 7% increase on last year (Q3 13/14 589,512).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>User satisfaction with events</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td>99.23</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>16-Jan-2015 In Q3 the Dickensian Christmas and Rochester Christmas Markets were held in Medway. Direct user surveys were conducted at the events and performance for Q3 was 99.23% (518/522 answering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIB4
**Satisfaction with libraries (tracker)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Short Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
09-Jan-2015 This indicator is monitored through Tracker Survey data. In 14/15 the Tracker Survey changed from being run quarterly to every 6 months. Data for this indicator will therefore be reported in Q4 of the financial year.

### MCV1
**How satisfied are residents with the way Medway Council runs its services (Citizens Panel)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Short Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
16-Jan-2015 738 residents completed the survey in November. 63.1% were very or fairly satisfied with the way the Council runs its services; 12.3% being very satisfied. Only 8.9% of residents were very or fairly dissatisfied; with 4.1% being very dissatisfied. 24.7% were neither satisfied or dissatisfied. There has been a significant increase in satisfaction (from 57.1% in Q2 to 63.1% in Q3), the overall rate of satisfaction is now the same as the Q1 survey.
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CHATHAM WATERFRONT UPDATE

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture

Author: Sunny Ee, Chatham Regeneration Manager

Summary

This report provides an update on the acquisition of land interests at Chatham Waterfront, which was the subject of a Cabinet report considered on the 10 March 2015.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

1.1 The decision to make compulsory purchase orders is a matter for Cabinet. As the disposal value of the site could be more than £1,000,000 then approving the disposal of the site is a matter for Council.

2. Background

2.1 The Chatham Waterfront site is located at a key gateway to Chatham town centre, facing onto the River Medway, Medway Street, the bus station and the Pentagon Shopping Centre. The acquisition and development of the site is a major regeneration focus, and will be supported by funding from the Growing Places Fund.

2.2 Officers have been negotiating with the current landowners with the intention of acquiring the site by agreement. Significant progress has been made in negotiations and work continues to prepare a case for a compulsory purchase order if needed.

2.3 Additional information is set out within the attached Cabinet Report.
3. **Options**

3.1 This report is for information only.

4. **Advice and analysis**

4.1 A report will be submitted to Cabinet and possibly Full Council later in the year with options that will be dependent on the outcome of current negotiations.

4.2 If the land interests can be acquired by agreement without the use of a compulsory purchase order, a report will be submitted to Cabinet and Full Council seeking authority to market and dispose of the site for development and regeneration\(^1\). The final Design Brief will be used as the basis for the marketing brief, for the site to ensure that the Council’s aspirations can be met where viable.

4.3 If the land interests cannot be acquired by agreement within a reasonable timeframe, a compulsory purchase order will be required. If that is the case, a report requesting a formal resolution to use the Council’s compulsory purchase powers will be submitted to Cabinet.

3.1 Acquisition by agreement would be the preferred approach. However, if this is not possible within the Council’s timescales, a formal resolution to use compulsory purchase order powers will be requested.

5. **Risk management**

5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action to avoid or mitigate risk</th>
<th>Risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing negotiations with landowners without success.</td>
<td>Negotiations with landowners fall through.</td>
<td>Finalise the design brief and confirm market interest for the site. Resolve to use compulsory purchase powers if negotiations are not successful.</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) Technically it’s not “surplus” in these circumstances – it’s being used for the purpose for which it was acquired.
Poor market conditions, slow progress of development. | Once the site is acquired and is put on the market potential developers may not consider it as a viable development. | Ensure the final design brief and marketing particulars reflect feedback given by potential developers in the soft marketing process and are also adaptable to changing markets. | C2

Delay in negotiations to acquire by agreement. | Acquisition by agreement could be prolonged and delay the acquisition and regeneration of the site. | Set a reasonable deadline to complete legal agreements and if this isn't met resolve to use compulsory purchase powers | C2

6. Consultation

6.1 Details of consultation are in the Cabinet report.

7. Financial implications

7.1 Details of the financial implications are in the Cabinet report.

8. Legal implications

8.1 Details of the legal implications are in the Cabinet report.

9. Recommendations

9.1 This report is for information.

Lead officer contact

Sunny Ee: Chatham Regeneration Manager: 01634 331030 sunny.ee@medway.gov.uk

Background papers

Report to Cabinet 5 August 2014

Report to Cabinet 12 February 2013

Report to Cabinet report 10 March 2015 – Appendix to this report
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Summary

This report:

- Informs and updates Members in respect of the acquisition of land at the Chatham Waterfront Development Site.

- Informs Members that negotiations with landowners to date have been satisfactory and that, provided this continues and acquisitions are completed promptly, it may not be necessary to use a compulsory purchase order to acquire the land.

- Informs Members that if the land is acquired by agreement, a report will be submitted to Cabinet and Council later in the year seeking permission to dispose of the site for development.

- Informs Members that if agreement with the landowners for the acquisition of their land cannot be reached at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable timeframe, it will be necessary for the Council to use its compulsory purchase powers to acquire the land and if necessary a report will be submitted later in the year to seek this approval.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

1.1 The decision to make compulsory purchase orders is a matter for Cabinet. As the disposal value of the site could be more than £1,000,000 then approving the disposal of the site is a matter for Council.
2 Background

2.1 This report concerns the proposed development of the Chatham Waterfront development site as shown edged black, hatched black and cross hatched black on the attached plan (area approximately 0.9 hectares (2.22 acres). The site is located at a key gateway to Chatham town centre, facing onto the River Medway, Medway Street, the bus station and the Pentagon Shopping Centre. The acquisition and development of the site is a major regeneration focus, and will be supported by funding from the Growing Places Fund.

2.2 The main current use of the site is for pay and display parking, including the Council owned Globe Lane Car park and the Medway Street Car park, which the Council leases from a third party. Additional ancillary uses include part of the Chatham river walk, soft landscaping, the site of some demolished shops and a pub and public amenity land.

2.3 The location of the site facing onto the river, the main retail offer of the Pentagon Shopping Centre, the bus station and significant public amenity land in the form of the Paddock, provide the potential for a high impact mixed use development.

2.4 The Council’s aspirations for the site:

2.4.1 The Council has regeneration aspirations for the wider area as a destination and gateway to Chatham and the wider Medway area. As part of creating this gateway and destination, the Council has installed the 'Big Screen' on the Chatham Waterfront Pumping Station. This is a 9m by 6m digital outdoor screen which shows local news and services, interacting with the local community and town centre users/visitors.

2.4.2 The site when developed will significantly contribute to the regeneration of the area, particularly if the ground floor of the development includes a leisure or restaurant use providing active frontage to the river walk and also facing out to the location of the Big Screen, the bus station and the Pentagon Shopping Centre. This will complement and support emerging plans for the civic space, which will begin to crystallise by 2015-16.

2.4.3 In addition, there are potential development sites further up the river towards Rochester that could be available in the fullness of time. A successful development of this site could be the catalyst for viable developments elsewhere in the area in conjunction with the phased development of Rochester Riverside.

2.4.4 It is proposed that the site be redeveloped for a residential led mixed-use development, including public realm and open space use.

2.5 Planning policy support

2.5.1 Chatham Centre and Waterfront is one of several major regeneration projects in the wider Medway area, to enhance the character and economy of the sub-region and contribute to the wider regeneration of the Thames Gateway.
2.5.2 The Chatham Centre and Waterfront Development Framework 2004 and the Chatham Centre and Waterfront Development Brief 2008 Supplementary Planning Guidance promote unlocking potential at the site and encourage development to boost Medway’s economy and deliver opportunities for further investment.

2.5.3 Retained policy C5 of the Medway Local Plan 2003 identifies the site as part of the area for development of a major multi use ‘city’ centre for Medway.

2.5.4 The site is identified for a residential led mixed-use development.

2.5.5 The council is at an early point of preparing a new Local Plan for Medway. The first stage of formal consultation on the emerging plan will take place later in 2015. This will consider options for the development of Medway up to 2035 to promote through the Local Plan process. The plan will seek to continue support for the area’s regeneration, and this is likely to include the Chatham Waterfront, as a key opportunity for investment.

2.5.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes sustainable development, including ensuring that there is sufficient land available in the right places and at the right times to support growth and innovation.

2.5.7 The Council has also been awarded Growing Places Funding for the redevelopment of the site.

2.5.8 The Council and A2 Dominion, one of the landowners of the site, submitted two planning applications for the joint redevelopment of part of the site in 2011. These applications proposed a mixed-use development on the site. The Council as local planning authority resolved to grant permission for the applications. A2 Dominion has a number of different freehold and leasehold interests in that part of the site for which it applied for planning permission. Amongst other things, delivery of the scheme has been frustrated by fragmented ownership. In addition to this, the Council has been advised that the scheme proposed in the applications is not currently viable.

2.6 Proposals for redevelopment

2.6.1 It is now appropriate for the Council in fulfilling its function as a local planning authority to review its policies and proposals for the site. The Council has set out its aspirations for the site in a draft non-statutory planning document, referred to in the Cabinet report of 5 August 2014 as the design brief, which went out to consultation in November 2014. This will assist potential development partners and provide a framework to support the Council’s aspirations for the site to accommodate a residential-led mixed-use development of around 72 apartments and 2,500 sqm of commercial space.

2.6.2 It is also appropriate for the Council to work with its advisors to ascertain developer appetite for the redevelopment of the site and to generate further appetite. The draft non-statutory planning document is currently with a number of developers and the Council is seeking feedback.
2.6.3 The Council's timeframes for the redevelopment of the site is between 30 and 36 months, which would allow for acquisition of the parts of the site not already owned by the Council, marketing of the site, discussions with a preferred developer, determination of a planning application completion of a development agreement/sale of the land and then carrying out the redevelopment.

2.7 Land ownership

2.7.1 The land edged black on the attached plan is currently owned by 3 third parties and part is leased to the Council for use as a temporary car park. The Council owns the area hatched black and has a long leasehold interest in the land cross-hatched black. This complex pattern of ownership means that, without a process of land assembly, the site is unlikely to come forward for regeneration.

2.7.2 Cabinet at its meeting of 12 February 2013, amongst other things agreed to delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Legal & Corporate Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, to acquire third party land in the Chatham Waterfront area.

2.7.3 The Council has powers under Section 226 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Act) to acquire land compulsorily, if it thinks that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement of the land.

2.7.4 Cabinet at its meeting of 5 August 2014:

2.7.4.1 Instructed officers to:

2.7.4.1.1 Continue negotiations with landowners to acquire the land;

2.7.4.1.2 Prepare a design brief for the site;

2.7.4.1.3 Instruct experts to assess developer interest in the site;

2.7.4.1.4 Instruct experts to advise on the regeneration of the site and also the compulsory acquisition process (including the preparation of a draft compulsory purchase order) should negotiations not prove successful;

2.7.4.1.5 Issue landowners with requisitions for information to enable the council to fully understand the nature of their interests and also to assist in the preparation of a CPO.

2.7.4.2 Noted that if negotiations with landowners could not be concluded at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable timeframe, it would be necessary to use the Council's statutory powers of compulsory purchase to acquire the land.

2.7.5 Negotiations with the three landowners have progressed significantly, since the report to Cabinet on the 5 August 2014. Two of the landowners have agreed heads of terms and the drafting of legal agreements has begun. The third landowner is currently considering proposed heads of terms and is in regular contact with Council officers.
2.7.6 Good progress in preparing the case for a compulsory purchase order (if it is required) has also been made. Requisitions for information have been made and received by all known parties with interests in the site. Expert legal advice on the key steps and actions in preparing a compulsory purchase order has been received and the Council is progressing a programme of delivery.

2.7.7 The Council will continue to seek to acquire the land by agreement. However, in case negotiations are not successful, the Council will continue to promote a compulsory purchase order in parallel with further negotiations to allow redevelopment to take place within a reasonable timeframe to meet the Council's aspirations for the site.

2.7.8 The complex nature of the land ownership at the site means that it would be more likely that the redevelopment aspirations of the Council for the site (in the interests of the proper planning of Chatham) would be realised with intervention by the Council, together with an approach demonstrating strategic leadership for the site.

2.7.9 If negotiations to acquire the land by private treaty at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable timeframe are not successful, the Council could use its powers of compulsory acquisition to acquire the interests in the site within a reasonable timeframe.

3. Options

3.1 This report is for information only, however potential options in a decision paper later in the year are outlined in the below section; Advice and analysis.

4. Advice and analysis

4.1 There will be a paper submitted to Cabinet and possibly Full Council later in the year with options that will be dependent on the outcome of current negotiations.

4.2 Assuming that the land is acquired by agreement without the use of a compulsory purchase order a report will go to Cabinet and Full Council seeking authority to declare the recently acquired site as surplus and market for development. The final Design Brief will be used as the basis for the marketing brief for the site to ensure that the Council's aspirations can be met where viable.

4.3 Assuming that the land cannot be acquired by agreement within a reasonable timeframe a compulsory purchase order will be needed. Therefore a report requesting a formal resolution to use the Council’s compulsory purchase powers will be submitted.

4.4 Of the two potential options it is clear that acquisition by agreement would be the preferred approach. However, if this is not possible a formal resolution to use compulsory purchase order powers will be requested.
5. Risk management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action to avoid or mitigate risk</th>
<th>Risk rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing negotiations with landowners without success.</td>
<td>Negotiations with landowners fall through.</td>
<td>Finalise the design brief and confirm market interest for the site. Resolve to use compulsory purchase powers if negotiations are not successful.</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor market conditions, slow progress of development.</td>
<td>Once the site is acquired and is put on the market potential developers may not consider it as a viable development.</td>
<td>Ensure the final design brief and marketing particulars reflect feedback given by potential developers in the soft marketing process and are also adaptable to changing markets.</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in negotiations to acquire by agreement.</td>
<td>Acquisition by agreement could be prolonged and delay the acquisition and regeneration of the site.</td>
<td>Set a reasonable deadline to complete legal agreements and if this isn’t met resolve to use compulsory purchase powers</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Consultation

6.1 Consultation has taken place with the public, developers and landowners on the first draft of the Design Brief.

7. Financial implications

7.1 If agreement can be reached with the landowners, the Council will need to pay the landowner the purchase price for the acquisition of the land, and pay stamp duty land tax to HMRC. The applicable rate of this tax on properties with a purchase price of over £500,000 is 4% of the purchase price. The terms of the agreement may also require the Council to pay the landowners' legal and surveyor's costs.

7.2 If agreement cannot be reached and the Council decides to use a compulsory purchase order to acquire the land, then the Council will need to pay for the costs of obtaining the compulsory purchase order and for any land compensation and professional fees etc. The Council will need to make a resolution to make the compulsory purchase order before it can proceed with the compulsory purchase order. This would be a decision for Cabinet. If required, further reports will be submitted to Cabinet and if appropriate Full Council concerning this. These reports will set out full details of the likely the costs involved.
7.3 The Council was awarded funding by the Local Enterprise Partnership Growing Places Funding (GPF). This funding was granted for the acquisition and marketing of the Chatham Waterfront Development Site and improvements on the waterfront. The GPF will also be used to improve the wider area including the river walk, central civic space, surrounding public realm and key feature points in the town centre such as the Brook Theatre to improve the visitor experience and encourage viable development and retail.

8. Legal implications

8.1 Human Rights Act considerations apply to any use of compulsory purchase powers. Landowners should only have their interests taken, if compensation is to be provided and they also have a right to a fair hearing. If the Council decides that compulsory purchase powers should be fully considered and a compulsory purchase order promoted, it will first have to consider the human rights implications of it making a compulsory purchase order. This would be fully explained to Cabinet if a report proposing a compulsory purchase order were brought forward in due course.

8.2 The Council’s powers to acquire land for regeneration are set out in Section 226 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Council may acquire land compulsorily, if it thinks that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement of the land. Section 227 of the same Act gives the Council power to acquire land by agreement for the same purposes. This means that the Council may proceed to acquire the land compulsorily, if it is not able to do so by agreement. The exercise of these powers would be a decision for Cabinet in due course.

9. Recommendations

9.1 That Cabinet notes the report.

10. Suggested reasons for decision(s)

10.1 To allow the Council's aspirations for the site to be realised within a reasonable timeframe.

Lead officer contact

Sunny Ee: Chatham Regeneration Manager: 01634 331030 sunny.ee@medway.gov.uk

Noel Filmer, Valuation and Asset Management Manager: 01634 332415 noel.filmer@medway.gov.uk

Background papers
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Summary

This report sets out a response to a request from Councillor Griffiths for information relating to the impact of the decision by Tesco to close its Chatham store.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

1.1 Under Medway Constitution Overview and Scrutiny rules (Chapter 4, Part 5, Paragraph 9.1) Councillor Griffiths has requested that an item on this matter be included on the agenda for this meeting.

2. The Issue

2.1 The issue raised by Councillor Griffiths is the impact of the decision by Tesco to close its Chatham store, including the impact of redundancy for the staff and the impact on the economic offer in Chatham alongside the potential for regeneration.

3 Director’s comments

3.1 Council officers have been in contact with Tesco and are providing support where they can. The store will be closed as of the 5 April 2015 and Tesco is currently discussing the possibility of redeploying 121 employees, which is the equivalent of 63 full time posts. Tesco has stated that it will continue discussing alternative opportunities with its staff throughout the consultation.
period, to understand their individual circumstances, right up to the point of closing the store.

3.2 Job Centre Plus (JCP) have been very proactive and, in partnership with Tesco and the National Careers Service (NCS) are currently delivering redundancy talks to staff in advance and beyond the official redundancy confirmation date 19 March 2015.

3.3 JCP/NCS services that can be used by staff including advice on training/employability skills, drafting CVs/covering letters, interview techniques, 1-2-1 careers advice and available benefits, if there is a gap in employment. In addition Go-train courses will be offered to Tesco staff, which include money advice and additional support for literacy and numeracy needs.

3.4 Once the store closes, any staff who have an employment gap and begin to claim benefits will immediately be taken on by JCP who will attempt to match them to suitable vacancies. Claimants will be seeing their allocated coach every 1 to 2 weeks, alongside being messaged suitable vacancies inbetween.

3.5 Tesco have assigned agents Morgan Williams to begin marketing the store for either disposal or letting from the 5th April. They are currently considering all options including letting to other supermarkets and discount food shops.

3.6 Tesco’s willingness to look at all options for the store is positive and encouraging. Subject to the success of Tesco’s marketing exercise this could mean a minimum amount of disruption to the town centre’s offer. Taking into account the poor performance of the store that led to its closure, this could provide the opportunity for a more successful business with a greater contribution to the town centre in both offer and employment.

3.7 Tesco have told Council officers that the closure of the store will have no immediate effect on the tenure of the adjoining business; Coslo Homeplus which is a direct tenant of Tesco. The medium to long term future of the business’ tenure will be dependent on the outcome of Tesco’s marketing exercise.

4. Risk Management

4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action to avoid or mitigate risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store is empty for an extended period.</td>
<td>Subject to the success of the marketing there may not be an immediate demand for letting the store.</td>
<td>Tesco are keen to find a solution as quickly as possible business rates will be payable regardless of whether the store is occupied or not. They are also very flexible in who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The store is let for a use that would be considered inappropriate for the town centre.

In attempting to let or dispose of the store as quickly as possible Tesco may consider tenants/owners for inappropriate uses.

The Council will continue to liaise with Tesco to ensure we are up to date on potential lets and are in a position to flag any issues with potential tenants early on in the process. The Council will be as flexible as possible to ensure as many options and potential uses can be applied to the site where appropriate. Certain changes of use will require planning permission.

### 5. Financial and Legal Implications

5.1 Rule 9.1 of the Overview and Scrutiny rules in the Council’s Constitution provides that any member of an Overview and Scrutiny Committee is entitled to give notice that he/she wishes an item relevant to the functions of the Committee to be included on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Committee. This is to comply with the requirements of section 9FC Local Government Act 2000. The consideration of this item is therefore a proper matter for this Committee.

### 6. Recommendation

That:

6.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the context of the report.
6.2 Council officers continue to liaise with Tesco and provide support where possible and appropriate to minimise the disruption to the town centre’s offer. This will include Property, and Planning Teams and where necessary employment support through JCP in conjunction with Employ Medway.

**Lead contact:**

Name: Sunny Ee  
Tel. No: 01634 331 030  
Email: sunny.ee@medway.gov.uk

**Background Papers**

None
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This item advises Members of the current work programme and allows them to adjust it in the light of latest priorities, issues and circumstances. It gives Members the opportunity to shape and direct the Committee’s activities over the year.

1. **Budget and Policy Framework**

   1.1 Under Chapter 4 – Rules, paragraph 22.1 (v) General terms of reference, each overview and scrutiny committee has the responsibility for setting its own work programme.

2. **Background**

   2.1. Appendix A to this report sets out the existing work programme for this committee.

3. **Agenda planning meeting**

   3.1 Members will be aware that Overview and Scrutiny Committees hold agenda planning meetings on a regular basis. These give officers guidance on information Members wish them to provide when scrutinising an issue. An agenda planning meeting was held on 18 March 2015.

   3.2 The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Spokespersons were updated on the committee’s current work programme and advised on the reports to be submitted to this meeting.

4. **Cabinet Forward Plan**

   4.1 The latest Forward Plan of forthcoming Cabinet decisions was published on 16 March 2015. Set out below is a list of items featuring on the Forward Plan that fall within the terms of reference of the Regeneration,
Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Committee is asked to identify any items it wishes to consider before the Cabinet decision is taken (where dates permit), other than those already programmed in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Decision</th>
<th>Anticipated Decision Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East Local Enterprise Partnership – Delivery Review</td>
<td>14 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thames Gateway Building Control Joint Committee – Administrative Arrangements</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thames Gateway Building Control Joint Committee – Final Outturn and Statement of Accounts</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thames Gateway Building Control Joint Committee – Annual Report</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Thames Gateway Building Control Joint Committee – Partnership Business Plan</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Advisory Groups</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Other proposed changes**

5.1 None

6. **Financial and legal implications**

6.1 There are no financial or legal implications arising from this report.

7. **Recommendations**

7.1 The Committee is asked to note the current work programme and identify any additional items for inclusion in the work programme.

**Background papers**

None.

**Lead officer contact**

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer
Telephone: 01634 332012   Email: ellen.wright@medway.gov.uk
## Work Programme

**Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Policy framework documents: Community Safety Plan, Local Transport Plan and plans and other strategies which together comprise the Development Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Work type</th>
<th>Responsible officer</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 APRIL 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>Community issues</td>
<td>Democratic Services Officers</td>
<td>Regular report on petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>Community issues</td>
<td>Democratic Services Officers</td>
<td>Regular report on petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2014/15 – Quarter 3</td>
<td>Scrutiny of Performance</td>
<td>Performance Manager</td>
<td>Consider performance against the Council’s Key Measures of Success for the third quarter of 2014/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Waterfront</td>
<td>Pre Decision Scrutiny</td>
<td>Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration</td>
<td>To consider a report setting out proposals for the acquisition of land at Medway Street, Chatham and a Planning Brief for the site for consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member’s Item on the impact of the decision by Tesco to close their store in Chatham,</td>
<td>Community Issues</td>
<td>Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration</td>
<td>To receive a report on the impact of the decision by Tesco to close their store in Chatham including the impact of redundancy for the staff and the impact on the economic offer in Chatham alongside the potential for regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 JUNE 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 AUGUST 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2014/15 – Quarter 4</td>
<td>Scrutiny of Performance</td>
<td>Performance Manager</td>
<td>Consider performance against the Council’s Key Measures of Success for the final quarter of 2014/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29 SEPTEMBER 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2015/16</td>
<td>Scrutiny of Performance</td>
<td>Performance Manager</td>
<td>Consider performance against the Council’s Key Measures of Success for the first quarter of 2015/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 DECEMBER 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2015/16</td>
<td>Scrutiny of Performance</td>
<td>Performance Manager</td>
<td>Consider performance against the Council’s Key Measures of Success for the second quarter of 2015/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28 JANUARY 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29 MARCH 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Work type</td>
<td>Responsible officer</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2015/16</td>
<td>Scrutiny of Performance</td>
<td>Performance Manager</td>
<td>Consider performance against the Council’s Key Measures of Success for the third quarter of 2015/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATES TO BE DETERMINED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Work type</th>
<th>Responsible officer</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent and Medway Growth Deal</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration</td>
<td>To receive a presentation on the Kent and Medway Growth Deal (requested at meeting on 10 April 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of average journey times across Medway</td>
<td>Policy Development</td>
<td>Head of Integrated Transport</td>
<td>Update reviewing changes to measuring average journey times across Medway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Officers plans for expansion of markets</td>
<td>Community issues</td>
<td>Assistant Director Housing and Regeneration</td>
<td>To receive a report setting out any ideas from the newly recruited market staff for the possible expansion of markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual reports and reviews considered by this committee are the Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership (December) an annual strategic assessment of the Community Safety Plan’s Action Plan (December), Annual Review of the Waste Contracts (January), Cultural Activities Programme (January) and Annual Action Plan reviewing the progress of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (date tbc). The annual South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership Business Plan is circulated via a Briefing Note prior to consideration by the Cabinet.

**Provisional future meeting dates:**

2015/2016

18 June 2015  
6 August 2015  
29 September 2015  
10 December 2015  
28 January 2016  
29 March 2015

**Work completed in 2014/15:**

26 June 2014

Annual Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership  
Flood and Water Management Act 2010 – Roles and Responsibilities and the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy  
Rochester Riverside Management Plan  
De-cluttering Strood High Street – Update  
Update on Guide to Developer Contributions  
Petitions  
Work Programme

21 August 2014
Petitions
Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services held to account
2013/2014 Year End Performance Monitoring
Member’s Item – Wi-fi access across Medway
Food Safety Presentation
Medway Statement of Community Involvement
Work Programme

2 October 2014

Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth held to account
2014/2015 Quarter 1 Performance Monitoring
Draft Medway Cultural Strategy 2015 – 2019
Member’s Item – Protocol for communication/engagement with elected members on major transport issues
Petitions
Work Programme

18 December 2014

Annual Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership, including the findings of the Annual Strategic Assessment and refreshed Community Safety Partnership Action Plan
Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Customer Contact held to account
Council Plan – 2014/15 Quarter 2 Performance Monitoring
Capital and Revenue Budget 2015/16
Community Wardens
Local Plan: Authority Monitoring Report
Petitions
Work Programme

29 January 2015

Petitions
Attendance of the Leader
Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services
Annual Review of Waste Contracts
An assessment of the cost of bus travel in Medway
Timing of bus routes and bus punctuality
Member’s item – Town Centre Markets
Provision of a Neighbourhood Community Hub in Twydall
Work Programme