Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee

A meeting of the committee will be held on:

Date: Thursday, 13 June 2019
Time: 7.00pm
Venue: Meeting Room 9 - Level 3, Gun Wharf, Dock Road, Chatham ME4 4TR
Membership: Councillors Bhutia (Vice-Chairman), Browne, Carr, Curry, Etheridge (Chairman), Fearn, Steve Iles, Osborne, Paterson, Andy Stamp, Thompson, Tranter and Williams

Agenda

1 Apologies for absence

2 Record of Meeting and Joint Meeting of Committees (Pages 5 - 24)

To approve the Record of the Meeting held on 28 March 2019 and the Record of the Joint Meeting of Committees held on 22 May 2019.

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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests and Whipping (Pages 25 - 26)

Members are invited to disclose any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
or Other Significant Interests in accordance with the Member Code of Conduct. Guidance on this is set out in agenda item 4.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Member’s item: Strood Development Works</strong> (Pages 27 - 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report sets out responses to issues raised by Councillor Hubbard, concerning the impact of the regeneration in Strood, both the Strood Waterfront Project and Strood Town Centre Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Haywood, a resident will be also be in attendance to address the Committee on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Household Waste Recycling Centres: Response to Kent County Council Policy Change</strong> (Pages 43 - 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report updates the Committee on Medway’s response to the introduction of charges for DIY waste at the Kent County Council (KCC) Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Update on CCTV Audit</strong> (Pages 51 - 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report provides information on the progress of the CCTV improvement programme being carried out by Medway Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Petitions</strong> (Pages 61 - 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report advises the Committee of any petitions received by the Council which fall within the remit of this Committee including a summary of the response sent to the petition organisers by officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Work programme</strong> (Pages 65 - 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Date: 5 June 2019

**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

This agenda and reports are available on our website
www.medway.gov.uk

A summary of this information can be made available in other formats from 01634 333333

If you have any questions about this meeting and you want to speak to someone in your own language please ring 01634 335577

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>331785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>331780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>331782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>331783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>331784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>332373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>331841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>331866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>331840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>332374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>332372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medway Council
Meeting of Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee
Thursday, 28 March 2019
6.30pm to 10.36pm

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

Present: Councillors: Bhutia (Vice-Chairman), Etheridge (Chairman), Griffin, Osborne, Paterson, Saroy, Shaw, Stamp, Tejan and Tranter

Substitutes: Councillors: Steve Iles (Substitute for Mrs Josie Iles)

In Attendance: James Brown, Head of Regulatory Services  
Laura Caiels, Legal Advisor  
Councillor Jane Chitty, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation  
Ruth Du-Lieu, Assistant Director, Front Line Services  
Dave Harris, Head of Planning  
Anna Marie Lawrence, Head of Business Intelligence  
Andrew Mann, Partnership Director, Medway Norse  
Carrie McKenzie, Assistant Director - Transformation  
Kim Savill, Contracts Manager, Veolia  
Councillor Rupert Turpin, Portfolio Holder for Business Management  
Sarah Valdus, Head of Environmental Services  
David Warner, Acting Road Safety Manager  
Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

943 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hicks and Josie Iles and the Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation and Deputy Chief Executive and the Assistant Director, Physical and Cultural Regeneration.

944 Record of Meeting

The record of the meeting held on 22 January 2019 was agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.
945 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

946 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Significant Interests and Whipping

Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

Other significant interests (OSIs)

The Chairman, Councillor Etheridge declared an interest in item 8 (Gateway 5 Report: Annual Review of Waste Contracts Contract Year: October 2017 to September 2018) and left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this item. In his absence, the Vice Chairman chaired the meeting.

Councillor Stamp declared an interest in item 5 (Petitions) on the basis that his sister was the lead petitioner for the petition referred to the committee. He left the meeting for the consideration and determination of this item.

Other interests

Councillor Tejan referred to item 7 (Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation) concerning any reference to the Innovation Centre on the basis that he has a registered business at that address and in any reference to the Chatham Centre Forum as he serves on the Forum. He advised that he would remain and take part in the debate on this item.

947 Petitions

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out a summary of petitions received by the Council which fell within the remit of this Committee.

Paragraph 3.1 of the report set out a summary of the responses to petitions that had been accepted by the petition organisers.

In accordance with the Council’s petitions scheme, one petition had been referred for discussion by the Committee and the lead petitioner was in attendance and invited to address the Committee.

The Committee welcomed Ms Stamp to the meeting and she set out her reasons for requesting a review and the concerns of petitioners. She advised that Albany Road, Gillingham was a narrow road and visibility was restricted owing to a bend in the road. This often resulted in confrontation when one or both drivers refused to reverse to give way to oncoming vehicles. Such
confrontations had on occasion turned aggressive and been witnessed by children. In addition, residents were subjected to noise from running engines when cars were unable to move. Residents had therefore petitioned for Albany Road to be made one way to alleviate these problems and it was considered that this low cost proposal would make a difference to the quality of life for those living in Albany Road.

Ms Stamp confirmed that all but 2 residents had signed the petition and the 2 that had not signed lived at one end of the road and were therefore not affected by the problem.

The Acting Road Safety Manager advised that the Council’s Highway Designers had produced a scheme design as part of previous investigative work and the cost of making the road one way would be £31,860 at 2018/2019 prices. Such costs included the provision of signs which would require illumination and therefore an energy supply would need to be provided.

He advised that no personal injury collisions had been recorded at Albany Road during the last 5 years of available police records and therefore the scheme could not be considered a priority for investment on casualty reduction grounds. Albany Road did not form part of the local distributor road network and was not considered strategic in nature and for these reasons, the scheme had not been prioritised for available funding streams in terms of reducing road casualties or improving journey times.

It was also stressed that it was possible that the speed of traffic using the road could increase should it be made one way and the costs quoted did not include traffic calming measures.

As a way forward, it was possible for alternative options to be investigated such as the provision of passing places along the road. This would result in the introduction of parking restrictions but these might not need to be in operation for 24 hours.

The Committee discussed the petition and noted that this issue had been the subject of previous concerns expressed by residents and therefore warranted further investigation as to possible ways of alleviating the problem.

The Assistant Director Front Line Services suggested that the possible provision of passing places in Albany Road, Gillingham be placed on the 2019/20 parking programme and she explained the process by which the scheme would then be progressed which would likely involve consultation with residents.

**Decision:**

The Committee:

a) noted the petition response and appropriate officer action as set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

This record is available on our website – [www.medway.gov.uk](http://www.medway.gov.uk)
b) thanked Ms Stamp for attending the meeting and noted that the possible provision of passing places in Albany Road, Gillingham would be placed on the 2019/20 parking programme for consideration as a matter of priority.

948 Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Business Management

Discussion:

Members received an overview of progress on the areas within the terms of reference of this Committee covered by Councillor Turpin, Portfolio Holder for Business Management as set out below:

- Community Officers
- Emergency Planning
- Registration
- Bereavement.

Councillor Turpin paid tribute to the various teams within his Portfolio, in particular the Community Wardens and his praise was supported by Members of the Committee.

Councillor Turpin responded to Members’ questions as follows:

- **Spring Clean Campaign** - In response to questions, the Portfolio Holder advised that the recent Spring Clean had been very successful attracting more participants than in 2018 and the event was still ongoing. Should residents wish to undertake more regular litter picks, this could be arranged via the Community Warden Team and Ward Councillors. The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the benefits of using social media to promote community events such as the annual Spring Clean.

- **Preparations for Brexit including information on the Council’s website** - A Member referred to Emergency Planning and sought information as to what plans had been put in place to respond to Brexit. In addition, he asked whether the Council had utilised any of the £210,000 allocated to all local authorities by the Government to prepare for Brexit and if so, what this money had been spent on.

In response, the Portfolio Holder advised that the Council was actively involved in Kent Resilience Forum Groups and he referred to paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 of his report which provided more detail. He stated that much work was going on behind the scenes in preparation for Brexit but Medway had not established a standalone Forum.

The Portfolio Holder advised that he was unable to provide information as to the use of the £210,000 funding and the Chairman suggested that this information be provided to Members via a briefing note.
Another Member referred to the availability of basic Brexit information and weblinks on a number of local authority websites and asked whether Medway would be prepared to consider including similar information on its website. In response, the Portfolio Holder stated that if such information was easily available, he would raise this with the Leader and officers.

- **Community Wardens - Welfare** – A Member referred to the difficult job undertaken by the Community Wardens which often bought them into conflict and asked what welfare measures were put in place to support these officers. In response, the Portfolio Holder outlined work being undertaken to encourage citizenship so that members of the public could provide help and support to the wardens in their day to day activities. The Assistant Director Front Line Services reassured the Committee that the Council takes the welfare of all staff seriously and that staff undergo regular 1:1’s and Performance Review sessions along with regular team meetings and away days. In addition, staff were able to access Care First and Occupational Health if they required additional support.

- **Surface water flooding** – A Member asked for a Briefing Note providing an update on the flooding incident in Luton.

- **Crematorium** - In response to a question, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that all works at Medway Crematorium had now been completed and the mercury abatement project was in place.

- **Dog walking in parks** – In response to concerns as to irresponsible behaviour of dog walkers when letting their dogs loose in parks, the Portfolio Holder drew attention to the Council’s Canine Code and agreed that this could benefit from further promotion.

- **Flytipping** – Although flytipping was not within his portfolio, in response to a question about flytipping, the recent decision to reduce the bulky waste charge and whether such decision correlated to the level of flytipping in Medway, the Portfolio Holder advised that a substantial level of flytipped rubbish was not bulky waste.

**Decision:**

The Committee:

a) thanked the Portfolio Holder for attending the meeting and answering questions.

b) requested that a briefing note be supplied on the expenditure of the £210,000 Brexit related funding allocated to the Council by the Government.
c) noted that the Portfolio Holder has offered to discuss with the Leader of the Council and officers, the inclusion of information on the Council’s website signposting people to relevant Brexit weblinks

d) requested that all Luton and Wayfield Ward Councillors be provided with an update as to the current position concerning the area of Luton which was subject of a flood in 2018.

949 Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation

Discussion:

Members received an overview of progress made on the areas within the scope of Councillor Chitty, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation which fell within the remit of this Committee as set out below:

- Economic Development
- Employment
- Local Plan
- Markets
- Planning Policy
- Regulation – Environmental Health/Trading Standards/Enforcement and Licensing (executive functions only)
- Social Regeneration
- South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership

The Portfolio Holder responded to Members’ questions and comments as follows:

- **Innovation Studios Medway** – A Member asked whether the lower level take up of the ground floor innovation studio units was attributed to the potential flood risk of the site on which the units were located. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the location of the site had dictated the design of the units and the ground floor units were being used for storage. Tenants of the units were fully aware of the limitations of the site before taking on the units.

- **Gillingham and Chatham Town Centre vacant shop rates** – A Member asked the Portfolio Holder what was being done to reduce the level of vacant shops in town centres. In response, the Portfolio Holder agreed that the vacancy rates were unacceptable but stated that major regeneration plans were underway for Chatham which may help. In addition, the Chatham Town Forum was continuing to work to reduce the number of vacant shops. In Gillingham, works had been undertaken to improve Gillingham Railway Station and a long term masterplan was in place for the regeneration of Britton Farm.
• **Local Growth Fund (LGF) Bids** – A Member referred to the list of LGF bids detailed in the report and asked why the Britton Farm LGF bid had not been included. The Portfolio Holder advised that she was unable to provide information on this bid at the current time but confirmed that if funding was not available, the Council would pursue funding for Gillingham in the next round of High Street funding allocations.

• **Jobs fair** – In response to a suggestion that the Jobs Fair be extended to take place twice a year, the Portfolio Holder stated that the Jobs Fair was very successful and attracted many businesses and she considered that to increase the event more than once a year may dilute the effectiveness of the event and reduce the numbers of businesses taking part.

• **Medway Local Plan - next steps** – The Portfolio Holder and Head of Planning outlined the current position concerning the Medway Local Plan and the next steps to be followed. The outcome of the Housing Infrastructure Bid was awaited and it was anticipated that the draft Plan would be produced in the Summer of 2019 with the final Plan being submitted to Cabinet in the Spring of 2020.

  In response to a question as to whether the Local Plan would include provision for one or more new recycling centres in Medway, the Portfolio Holder stated that this was an issue that could be investigated but in the meantime, the Council needed to maximise the use of the three existing centres. She also gave a reassurance that recycling would continue.

• **Annual Monitoring Report** – It was confirmed that this was available on the Council’s website.

• **Economic development in Medway** – A Member referred to the Centre for Cities Independent Report for the South East Region and stated that from the statistics provided, Medway was not performing as well as other areas such as Swindon and Brighton. In response, the Portfolio Holder stated that she was not in a position to comment upon the statistics quoted but would respond direct to the Member concerned if he put the question in writing to her. The Head of Business Intelligence stated that the Centre for Cities Independent Report used a different methodology and therefore was not comparable to Medway’s statistics.

• **Appeals performance** – A Member asked whether the level of upheld planning appeals was a direct response to the Council not having a Local Plan. In response, the Head of Planning advised that the level of upheld appeals in Medway at 21% fell well below the national average of 30%.

• **Air Quality** - In response to a question as to action being taken to improve air quality in Medway, the Portfolio Holder advised that this issue was actively promoted by the Local Government Association but
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Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 28 March 2019

Local authorities were dependent upon legislation to take action. She referred to the Council’s Air Quality Strategy and the work being undertaken to promote and educate the importance of air quality.

- **Illegal tobacco** – The Portfolio Holder advised upon the work undertaken by officers to intercept the sale of illegal tobacco.

- **Income from markets** – In response to a question about the income generated from markets, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that whilst Gillingham’s market was flourishing, the Strood market had required support through the offer of preferential rates. She advised that market traders determined which markets they attended based on commercial decisions. An independent market review had been commissioned to guide the future direction of Medway’s markets and the outcome of this was due in July 2019.

- **Loss of ATM’s in Rochester** – A Member referred to the loss of a free use ATM in Rochester High Street and whilst noting that an ATM was available in the Visitor Information Centre and the Railway Station, he considered that being a major tourist destination, an 24 hour ATM machine should be available for use in the High Street so that people had access to cash during events such as the Farmers Market. In response, the Portfolio Holder assured the Member that she was happy to support any representations for provision of a free to use ATM in Rochester High Street.

**Decision:**

The Committee:

a) thanked the Portfolio Holder for attending the meeting and answering questions.

b) noted that the Portfolio Holder was happy to investigate alternative uses of the ground floor units at the Innovation Studios Medway.

c) requested that a briefing note be provided on the outcome of the Local Growth Fund bid for Britton Farm, Gillingham.

d) noted that the final Medway Local Plan was anticipated to be ready in Spring 2020.

e) noted that the Portfolio Holder had offered to support Members in any representations for a free to use ATM machine in Rochester High Street.
Discussion:

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman took the Chair for this item.

The Committee received a comprehensive report and presentations providing an update on the activities carried out by Veolia Environmental Services on the provision of waste and recycling collection, waste disposal and street cleansing services and Medway Norse providing management of the three household waste recycling centres.

Kim Savill, Contracts Manager Medway – Veolia and Andy Mann, Partnership Director from Medway NORSE were in attendance at the meeting to answer questions.

The Committee discussed the following issues:

- **Removal of asbestos**  It was confirmed that staff were trained in asbestos awareness and that asbestos materials were not accepted at the transfer stations.

- **Transfer of contract to Medway Norse**  – It was confirmed that the waste and recycling collection would transfer to Medway Norse on 1 October 2019 but that Medway Norse would continue to use Veolia’s transfer stations.

- **The total tonnage waste collected**  – The Head of Environmental Services informed the Member concerned that information on the tonnage of waste was included in Appendix 3 and she was happy to meet with him to discuss this if he wished.

- **Recycling rates**  – The Head of Environmental Services referred to changes to the markets for recycled items over recent years and confirmed that a new contract had been entered into for the disposal of mattresses on a cost neutral basis. This prevented mattresses going to landfill.

- **Provision of leaf blowers**  – It was hoped that leaf blowers would be available for use in 2019 and these would be used in parks in Medway.

- **Christmas waste collections**  – It was noted that household waste collections had operated well over the Christmas/New Year period.

- **Street Cleansing**  -  In response to concerns that residents had commented that there appeared to be less street cleaning, it was confirmed that street cleansing was continuing and Veolia had taken on more employees. Mechanical sweepers were also used and those areas...
which could not be accessed by the mechanical sweeper were swept manually. However, it was always possible that areas may get missed and both Members and residents were encouraged to report areas of concern.

- **Street Cleaning Inspections** – A Member referred to paragraph 3.6.3 of the report and suggested that it would have been useful to have received information as to the outcome of the 2,066 street inspections carried out between October 2017 – September 2018. The Head of Environmental Services advised that this information had previously been included in a Briefing Note on Performance Indicator NI 195 (Improved street and environmental cleanliness:Litter).

- **Increasing communications concerning street cleansing and recycling** - In response to a suggestion that the level of publicity concerning street cleansing and recycling be increased, the Head of Environmental Services advised that work was underway with the Council’s Communications Team to refresh publicity covering all areas of the Environmental Services remit.

- **Refuse bags left out overnight** – In response to concerns that refuse bags left out overnight were often ripped open by foxes, the Head of Environmental Services commented that foxes were attracted by food waste and therefore she encouraged food waste to be place in brown bins rather than in plastic sacks.

- **The introduction of charges by Kent County Council at Household Waste Recycling Centres and how this could affect Medway** – The Head of Environmental Services confirmed that in response to the decision by Kent County Council to implement a charge for use of its household waste recycling centres, work was underway to ensure that this would not have a detrimental impact upon Medway’s sites. She confirmed that there were no plans to implement a charge at Medway’s sites for Medway residents. Members requested that a report be submitted to the next meeting on this issue

**Decision:**

The Committee:

a) thanked Kim Savill from Veolia, Andrew Mann from Medway Norse and the Head of Environmental Services for their presentations and comprehensive response to Member’s questions.

b) noted that work was underway with the Council’s Communications Team to refresh publicity covering all areas of the Environmental Services.

c) agreed that a report be included on the agenda for the June meeting of the Committee providing an update concerning the Council’s response
951 Update on CCTV Review

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out progress on work streams 1, 2 and 3 of the CCTV improvement programme and the Head of Regulatory Services provided a brief update on further progress since the report had been written.

In response to a question as to progress on replacing CCTV cameras in Strood, Rainham and the Peninsula, the Head of Regulatory Services advised that under work streams 1, 2 and 3, Gillingham, Rochester and Chatham had been identified as priority areas to address the number of non-working cameras in those areas and being areas with the highest number of cameras and footfall. However, other areas would be addressed under a later phase.

In addition, he confirmed that as a means of ensuring economies of scale and re-siting of cameras, no expenditure had been incurred to date other than on network costs.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director Front Line Services confirmed that the total budget available for the CCTV improvement programme was £105,000 made up of £80,000 from the Council’s budget and £25,000 from Section 106 funding required to be spent in Chatham. Whilst it was not possible at this stage to confirm that this funding would be sufficient to provide CCTV improvements in Strood, Rainham and the Peninsula, it would be sufficient to cover the full improvement programme in Gillingham, Rochester and Chatham. The maintenance budget would continue to be held by the Council. She confirmed that a further update on works and costs could be provided to the Committee in June.

The Assistant Director Front Line Services also advised that work was underway with Medway Commercial Group (MCG) to establish a new Business Plan and identify priorities and asset investment going forward. This was supported by the Assistant Director Transformation who confirmed that MCG had been operating under a new Chairman since December 2018 and, under his instruction, she was undertaking a review of MCG and was personally overseeing the MCG element of the CCTV improvement programme whilst the Assistant Director Front Line Services had an oversight from the Council’s perspective. She gave an assurance that they were both working closely to ensure that the CCTV improvement programme priorities were being taken forward and were working in partnership to set up the Business Plan. The Business Plan would be a transparent plan and set out options going forward and the costs involved, including capital costs over a 3, 5 and 10 year period.

In response to a question as to whether the Business Plan would be publically available, the Assistant Director Transformation advised that as MCG was a
commercial company some of the information would be commercially sensitive and therefore whether the Business Plan could be publically available would be for the CCTV Partnership to determine. She confirmed that the partnership involved three other local authorities. The Chairman suggested that the Committee be supplied with the section of the Business Plan relating to Medway’s element of the contract.

A Member expressed concern that the CCTV service was continuing to be run by MCG and he expressed a view that this service should be bought back in house and operated by the Council. Other Members expressed concern regarding the lack of accountability concerning the work of MCG.

In response, the Assistant Director Transformation advised that CCTV was only one element of the Company’s contract with the Council as MCG was also involved in recruitment, the provision of education services and Telecare in addition to CCTV. However, CCTV was the top priority for a review and she confirmed that officers had increased engagement and transparency around what was being done along with accountability, cost effectiveness and performance information.

A Member expressed appreciation as to the work that had been undertaken to resolve issues in the CCTV service covering Rochester and he commented upon the excellent quality of the cameras that were now in place.

The Head of Regulatory Services outlined the future phases of the CCTV Improvement Programme. The latter work stream would involve a larger piece of work involving a strategic requirement for CCTV provision throughout Medway and the underlying infrastructure.

**Decision:**

The Committee:

a) agreed that a report updating progress on the current CCTV improvement programme be included on the Committee’s work programme.

b) agreed that a report be submitted to the Committee in June 2019 setting out expenditure to date on the current CCTV Improvement Programme.

c) agreed that a report also be included on the Committee’s work programme enabling the Committee to have an oversight of future programmes of CCTV provision in Medway.

d) requested that details of the Medway Council element of the MCG Business Plan be provided to Members of this Committee when available.
952 Transformation Update

Discussion:

The Committee received a report providing an update on the implementation of digital channels and the take up of these processes by residents.

The Assistant Director Transformation drew attention to various elements of the transformation programme and stressed that assisted digital support was available through the Community Hubs and Adult Education Centres for those who did not have access to or, were not comfortable with using digital services.

Decision:

The Committee noted the significant progress made in the transformation and digital journey for the Council.

953 Council Plan Monitoring 2018/19 Quarter 3

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out performance in Quarter 3 for 2018/19 for the key measures of success and projects relevant to this Committee.

A Member referred to NI 154 (Net additional homes provided) and asked why data was not yet available for 2017/18. In response, the Head of Business Intelligence advised that statistics for this performance indicator were produced by the Government and were not yet available but this data was included within the Council’s Authority Monitoring Report and was available on the website.

Decision:

The Committee noted the Quarter 3 performance of measures used to monitor progress against the Council’s priorities.

954 Work programme

Discussion:

The Committee considered its work programme.

Decision:

The Committee noted the current work programme and agreed that the following reports be added to the Committee’s work programme arising from discussions at this meeting:

- For June 2019 - a report providing an update concerning the Council’s response to the introduction of charges by Kent County Council at its
household waste recycling centres so as to protect use of Medway’s sites for Medway residents.

- A report updating progress on the current CCTV improvement programme.
- For June 2019 a report setting out expenditure to date on the CCTV Improvement Programme.
- A report enabling the Committee to have an oversight of future programmes of CCTV provision in Medway.

955 Chairman's Announcements

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman expressed his appreciation to those Members serving on the Committee but who would not be standing for re-election to the Council on 2 May 2019.

Chairman

Date:

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Telephone: 01634 332012
Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk
Medway Council
Meeting of Joint Meeting of Committees
Wednesday, 22 May 2019
8.19pm to 8.20pm

Record of the meeting
Subject to approval as an accurate record at the next meeting of the committees set out at the end of this document

Present: Councillors: Adeoye, Ahmed, Aldous, Barrett, Bhutia, Bowler, Brake, Browne, Buckwell, Carr, Chitty, Clarke, Cooper, Curry, Doe, Etheridge, Fearn, Filmer, Sylvia Griffin, Gulvin, Hackwell, Howcroft-Scott, Hubbard, Mrs Josie Iles, Steve Iles, Jarrett, Johnson, Kemp, Khan, Lloyd, Mahil, Maple, McDonald, Murray, Opara, Osborne, Paterson, Pendergast, Potter, Prenter, Price, Purdy, Sands, Chrissy Stamp, Tejan, Thompson, Thorne, Mrs Elizabeth Turpin, Rupert Turpin, Wildey and Williams

In Attendance: Neil Davies, Chief Executive
Wayne Hemingway, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Richard Hicks, Director Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation and Deputy Chief Executive
Perry Holmes, Chief Legal Officer/Monitoring Officer
Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services
Ian Sutherland, Director of People - Children and Adults Services
Phil Watts, Chief Finance Officer

10 Election of Chairman
The Worshipful the Mayor of Medway, Councillor Tejan, was elected to chair the meeting.

11 Apologies for absence
Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Diane Chambers, Rodney Chambers OBE, Stamp and Tranter.

Apologies for absence were received from Fay Cordingley and Clive Mailing (voting coopted Members of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee).
12 **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests**

**Disclosable pecuniary interests**

There were none.

**Other significant interests (OSIs)**

There were none.

**Other interests**

There were none.

13 **The appointment of Committee Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen as set out in Appendix B to item 8 on the Annual Meeting of Medway Council agenda**

**Discussion:**

The report on the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council on 22 May 2019 set out the recommendations for the appointment of Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of Committees excluding the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Mayor proposed the recommendations as set out in paragraph 6.2(i) of agenda item 8 (Establishment of Committees, Appointments and Schedule of Meetings 2019/2020) on the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council.

**Decision:**

The Joint Meeting of Committees agreed the appointment of Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of Committees as set out in Appendix B of item 8 of the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council.

14 **The establishment, their size, the allocation of seats to political groups and membership of Sub-Committees, as set out in Appendix B to agenda item 8 on the Annual Meeting of Medway Council agenda**

**Discussion:**

The report on the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council on 22 May 2019 set out the recommendations for the establishment, their size, the allocation of seats to political groups and membership of Sub-Committees and their membership.

The Mayor proposed the recommendations as set out in paragraph 6.2 (ii) and (iii) of agenda item 8 (Establishment of Committees, Appointments and Schedule of Meetings 2019/2020) on the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council.
Decision:

a) The Joint Meeting of Committees agreed the establishment of Sub-Committees (with terms of reference as set out in the Council’s Constitution), their size, the allocation of seats to political groups and memberships as set out in paragraph 3.9 and Appendix B of item 8 of the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council.

b) The Joint Meeting of Committees agreed that the requirement for political balance should be waived in respect of Licensing Hearing Panels and Licensing 1982 Act Hearing Panels and that the process for selection of the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Panel Members for these Panels should be as set out in Appendix B of item 8 of the agenda for the Annual Meeting of Medway Council.

Chairman

Date:

Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services
Telephone: 01634 332760
Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk

Chairman of the Audit Committee

Date

Chairman of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date

This record is available on our website – www.medway.gov.uk
Joint Meeting of Committees, 22 May 2019

Chairman of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date

Chairman of the Councillor Conduct Committee
Date

Chairman of the Employment Matters Committee
Date

Chairman of the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date

Chairman of the Licensing and Safety Committee
Date
Joint Meeting of Committees, 22 May 2019

Chairman of the Planning Committee

Date

Chairman of the Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date

Chairman of the School Transport and Curriculum Appeals Committee

Date
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Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Significant Interests

a) Disclosure at meetings

If you know you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Significant Interest (OSI) (see below for definitions) in a matter to be considered at a meeting, you must disclose, at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, the existence and nature of the interest.

Even if a DPI has already been registered you must still disclose it at the meeting.

Where you disclose an interest at a meeting which is not entered on the Council’s register of interests, or the subject of a pending notification, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing of that interest within 28 days from the date of disclosure at the meeting.

b) Participation in Meetings

Where you have a DPI or OSI in a matter to be considered at a meeting you must, unless a dispensation has been granted:

I. not take part in any discussion of the matter
II. not take part in any vote on the matter
III. leave the meeting room (including the public gallery).

c) Bias and Pre-Determination

You must also be aware of and act within the rules on predetermination and bias. Avoidance of bias or predetermination is a principle of natural justice. Even if you do not have a DPI or OSI you may cause a decision to be invalid if you participate while predetermined or biased.

You should not participate in decisions where you are actually biased or give the appearance of being biased. The test is whether a fair minded and informed observer, having considered the facts, would conclude that there was a possibility that you as the decision maker are biased.

There is a distinction between predetermination, which rules out participation in decision-making and predisposition, which does not. It is acceptable for you as a Member to be predisposed towards a particular policy or viewpoint and that does not...
prevent you from taking part in decision-making. However, if you take a stance which indicates that you have finally closed your mind on a matter and that nothing that you hear at Committee will alter your position then you will have moved on to becoming predetermined and, in that case, you should not participate.

d) 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.

Definitions

**Disclosable Pecuniary Interests** - are those interests set out in Schedule One to the Code of Conduct. You will have a DPI in a matter being considered at a meeting where the DPI is closely aligned to the business of the agenda item and where the interest is:

(a) your interest or

(b) an interest of your spouse or civil partner, a person with whom you are living as husband and wife, or a person with whom you are living as if you were civil partners and provided you are aware that the other person has the interest.

**Other Significant Interests** – you will have an OSI where your interest is closely aligned to the business of the Council agenda item and where the business affects the financial position or well being of the following to a greater extent than most inhabitants of the area affected by the decision:

I. you;

II. a member of your family or friends or any person with whom you have a close association;

III. any person or body from whom you have accepted or received any gifts or hospitality as specified in Schedule Two of the Code;

IV. any outside body or group specified in Schedule Two of the Code of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management (as relevant).

And where a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably think that your interest is so significant that it would be likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest.
REGENERATION, CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
13 JUNE 2019
MEMBER’S ITEM: STROOD DEVELOPMENT WORKS

Report from: Richard Hicks, Director of Regeneration, Culture Environment and Transformation and Deputy Chief Executive

Authors: Ruth Du-Lieu, Assistant Director Front Line Services
Dawn Hudd, Assistant Director Physical and Cultural Regeneration

Summary

This report sets out responses to issues raised by Councillor Hubbard, concerning the impact of the Regeneration in Strood, both the Strood Waterfront Project and Strood Town Centre Project.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

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

2. The Issue

2.1 Councillor Hubbard has requested that an item be placed on the agenda and the reasons are set out as follows:

“The council website on Regeneration in Strood clearly demonstrates that the Council sees the Strood Waterfront and the town centre projects as a single matter. https://www.medway.gov.uk/info/200177/regeneration/462/regeneration_in_strood/1

During the run up to, and since, the recent local elections concerns have been raised by Strood residents about the council’s poor decision making and actions in relation to delivery of its regeneration plan for Strood.
The first three matters of concern relate to Strood Waterfront Project’s near year-long works, started with the moving of services last Summer and currently relate to the raising of Canal Road/Station Approach and the large area of adjacent land by some 2 metres, with complete disregard of:

1) the health and wellbeing of residents (Kingswear Gardens, Canal Rd, Cranmere Court, Wingrove Drive, Commissioners Rd) affected by extreme levels of dust & long hours of noise pollution.

2) the health and wellbeing of business employees, in particular the first business units on Commissioners Rd and the Riverside Tavern, from dust & noise pollution.

3) the business health of the Riverside Tavern, involving an almost total cut off from the Public House’s established clientele and any passing trade.

The following two issues of concern relate to Strood Town Centre Project:

4) the year-long road works and closures, coming to head on Saturday, 11 May, when traffic on the town centre’s south side was at a complete standstill/gridlock for in excess of 2 hours.

Why were the lessons learnt during the 6-week long closure of Strood’s Damley Arch back in 2014 not applied? Why, on that day, was there seemingly a total lack of council representatives or the contractors’ representatives on the ground, directing traffic?

5) the unnecessary roadworks. The early roadworks were on Gun Lane getting it ready for that road and Cuxton Rd (A228) to become a two way through road. This proposal had been quietly dropped and thus Cuxton Rd would remain one way and Gun Lane would remain one way at the North Street junction. What was the cost of those works – road & pavement alterations and new pedestrian central reservations?

The outdated map of works is still on the website:

The final concern relates to the Strood Waterfront Project:

6) the total disregard to the residents of Kingswear Gardens/Canal Rd Estate, i.e. that the council’s adopted development brief for Strood Waterfront shows the estate as a development site - the demolition of their homes and replacement housing for others.

This issue was highlighted at the meeting of Council on 25 April 2019 with the following Labour Group amendment to a report on Strood Waterfront – Former Civic Centre:
Medway Council will conduct meaningful consultation with residents of Kingswear Gardens and Moat and Orbit Housing Association, and ensure they are properly informed, before future plans for Kingswear Gardens are finalised.”

2.2 In response to questions from Conservative Members relating to the validity of the amendment, the Mayor ruled it out, following advice from the Chief Legal Officer that the amendment was not relevant to the business contained in the report, as required by Council Rule 11.3.1”.

https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/file/2877/appendix_1_-_strood_development_brief

2.3 At the request of Councillor Hubbard, Mr V Haywood will be in attendance at the meeting to outline the concerns of local residents.

3 Director’s comments

3.1 “The council website on Regeneration in Strood clearly demonstrates that the Council sees the Strood Waterfront and the town centre projects as a single matter’. https://www.medway.gov.uk/info/200177/regeneration/462/regeneration_in_strood/1

These Strood projects form part of the wider programme for the regeneration of Strood, subsequently the 2 projects are shown together on the Strood section of the webpage.

3.2 In response to the first three items relating to the Strood Waterfront Project, the flood defences project involves large amounts of earthworks that require large plant and compacting equipment. Once the works are complete, the sites will be transformed into an area of prime, high quality residential led mixed use development with the potential for premium housing, offering views of Rochester Castle and Rochester Cathedral and access to the River Medway.

As part of the planning application for the flood works, the works contactor submitted a Contractors Environmental Management Plan which sets out how dust will be controlled during the course of the works to protect air quality, and how noise and vibration levels will be minimised to avoid impact on residents and wildlife; this was approved by the Environmental Health Officer.

The noise and vibration levels have been monitored throughout the duration of the project to ensure works remain within the national guidelines. Noise and vibration levels have never exceeded the specified limits, but the team has stopped work on occasions when residents raised concerns. On occasion when dust could become an issue, for example during particularly windy conditions, work has stopped and the area has been sprayed with water from bowsers that are kept on site.

The permitted working hours as agreed in the planning application are 7.30am – 6.00pm, Monday to Friday, and 7:30am-12pm Saturday.
The contractor and Medway Council have sent regular communications to local residents and businesses during the construction period, detailing the forthcoming activities and what could be expected; this team is available for local people to talk to in person or by phone at the works compound on the former Civic Centre site in Strood.

The Riverside Tavern was first approached in 2016 and advised of the forthcoming flood defence works, and subsequent plans for housing development on the site, known as Strood Riverside, on Canal Road. With the Tavern’s approval, Medway investigated purchasing the property, but an agreement was not reached and plans for the works continued with the Tavern remaining.

The Riverside Tavern has stayed open with access maintained for the duration of the project. The Tavern was advised during the design and planning phases that there would be significant disruption in the area, including road closures, as Canal Road was to be realigned, a new 2m sheet pile wall was to be built and the land raised by 2m. The phasing of the works ensured that their access was not blocked at any time. Officers also advised the Tavern on how they could apply to the Valuation Office for hardship relief for business rates.

The team delivering the works has taken significant measures to assist the Tavern since work began in 2018, including creating temporary parking areas for the Tavern’s customers as the project progressed. New permanent parking solutions are being delivered for the Tavern’s customers adjacent to their premises, and parking provision on the new Canal Road will still be used by the public and the Tavern’s customers as previously. Traffic management provided signage advising customers and vehicles of diversions and declaring the Tavern open for business as usual; Canal Road is a no-through road, and as such there is no passing trade. Assistance has also been offered to assist with the Tavern’s refuse collections.

3.3 In response to item 4 relating to the Strood Town Centre project, works to improve Strood Town Centre commenced in February 2018, focusing on the transformation of Commercial Road car park and market space. Further works have included a larger, more accessible island on Commercial Road/High Street and alterations to Commercial Road/Knight Road to improve traffic flow. Works were deliberately reduced across the whole of the area to minimise disruption during the Christmas shopping period and restrictions placed on the contractor in the New Year resulted in the majority of work being undertaken overnight. Recently, sections of the carriageway in the High Street have been reduced to allow kerb realignment works to be carried out safely in preparation for the resurfacing works. Pedestrian access was maintained at all times. It is anticipated that work will be completed by the end of September 2019 as scheduled.

Works started on 10 May to remove the existing block paving in the carriageway on the High Street and replace with asphalt. In order to undertake these works safely, the High Street was closed to traffic from 8pm
Friday 10 May to 5:30am Monday 13 May, with further weekend closures scheduled. Ahead of the first weekend closure an extensive communication plan was established and rolled out to ensure businesses and residents within Strood town centre were aware in advance of the planned closures and diversions, and also to advise that businesses would be open as usual during the closure period.

This communication included:

- VMS signs positioned at key locations across Medway from w/e 26 April;
- Letters distributed on 9 April to all town centre businesses inviting them to attend a drop in session at Strood Community Hub on the evening of 30 April between 15:30 and 17:30;
- 41,000 leaflets (copy attached at Appendix 1) delivered to residents and businesses across Strood in the run up to the closures taking place;
- c.6000 leaflets deposited week commencing 6 May at key retail sites and leisure destinations in the town centre and petrol stations across Medway;
- Additional FAQ sheets were distributed to residents and businesses in the town centre and on Gun Lane and Cuxton Road, providing access details;
- Key businesses in Strood town centre were visited by an officer from Medway Council to confirm that they were aware of the closures and how they may impact access for deliveries over the weekend;
- Adverts placed in the Messenger, providing details of the closure extent and proposed diversion routes.

During the first weekend closure, significant congestion was experienced on Saturday 11 May due to the volume of traffic accessing the diversion route. Key diversion signs were also knocked over, which added to the confusion and congestion. The site team addressed the issue with signage by a regular traffic management patrol, whilst the Contractor also re-organised work in order to open up North Street and Cuxton Road to traffic as early as possible, all of which assisted in alleviating the pressure. Temporary signals were also manned on Commercial Road during the closure period and operatives directed traffic where necessary.

Following an assessment of the impact on traffic during the closure period, changes were made to the London bound diversion route during the most recent weekend closure (17 - 20 May) by keeping Cuxton Road open to traffic turning left (London bound) at the High Street/London Road junction during the peak daytime (6am to 8pm) traffic periods only. Additional signage was also implemented across the diversion routes.

Officers involved with the Darnley Arch scheme were also present for the latest Strood scheme and their experience on how to best carry out the work and the associated problems were evaluated at planning stages with the Contractor and with Medway’s Traffic Management Team.

In response to item 5 relating to the Strood Town Centre project, improvements to Gun Lane, including the construction of two new pedestrian islands with dropped kerbs and tactile paving, were introduced to improve
pedestrian safety and accessibility along this section of Gun Lane. Other works carried out to the islands, resurfacing and revised traffic signal specifications formed an integral part of the scheme irrespective of the subsequent decision to retain the status quo to both Cuxton Road and Gun Lane.

The overall risk and potential issues arising from the introduction of two-way working in Cuxton Road and the remaining sections of Gun Lane were considered to outweigh the perceived benefits from the scheme and it is accepted that this has not yet been widely communicated to residents or businesses in Strood. It is the Project Team’s intent, once the main Strood closures are completed, to distribute further scheme material which confirms the revised proposals. It is considered that by delaying the distribution of this additional material until after the closures have taken place, it will not dilute the important and key information on the programme of the road closures.

Concerning the outdated map of works still on the website; a link to a map showing the Strood Town Centre proposals remains on there as a high level indication of the proposed improvements. The webpage also advises that more information is available at Strood Community Hub. From August 2018 - May 2019, large scale detailed design drawings of the proposed improvements have been on display at the hub for the public to view. This has recently been updated to include information about the road closures and diversions.

Information on the website is being updated regularly to reflect the Strood road closure impacts and as indicated, once the closures have passed, this project information will be updated to reflect the revised proposals that have now been confirmed as progressing to completion.

3.4 Finally, in response to the concerns raised about redevelopment of Kingswear Gardens on Canal Road, Kingswear Gardens is part of the area known as Strood Waterfront and is owned by Moat and Orbit Housing Associations. The other 2 sites on the Waterfront are the adjacent Strood Riverside on Canal Road and the former Civic Centre site, both of which are owned by Medway Council.

Medway Council has been in discussions with Moat and Orbit for several years and all parties are keen for the comprehensive regeneration of the whole waterfront site, not least because Kingswear Gardens alone could deliver an additional 300, much-needed homes. Therefore the Strood Waterfront Development Brief and Illustrative masterplan included the Kingswear Gardens site, in agreement with all 3 parties.

All residents were consulted as part of the development of the masterplan and many attended the 2 public events held in Strood Community Hub in January 2018. Numerous comments about the masterplan were from Kingswear Gardens residents, and Medway’s officers explained clearly that the illustrative masterplan is an aspiration, showing how the whole area could be redeveloped, but at this stage there are no immediate plans to progress this.
Following the consultation, all Kingswear residents were each sent a letter, which clearly stated that there are no immediate plans for the regeneration of Kingswear Gardens. Any concerns that have since been raised by residents to Medway Council and Moat and Orbit Housing Associations have been answered with the same response, as the situation has not changed. Any future plans for development will see all Kingswear Gardens residents consulted.

The flood defence works have progressed on the adjacent Riverside and former Civic Centre sites, and are due to be complete by July 2019.

4  **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>Environmental</td>
<td>Ensure good environmental practice is followed on the construction site</td>
<td>Monitor the Construction Environmental Plan throughout the construction phase and implement suppression measures as required</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Take appropriate measures to ensure minimal disruption to the public during construction works phase</td>
<td>Produce phasing plans and risk assessment method statements to minimise impact to the public; maintain open communications</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational</td>
<td>Moat and Orbit Housing Associations’ potential redevelopment of Kingswear Gardens and displacement of residents</td>
<td>Medway will work with the housing associations, to ensure that all local residents and businesses will be consulted as part of the planning process should any development plans be pursued</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Financial and Legal Implications**

5.1 The above mentioned programme of works have been incorporated within existing Capital & Revenue Schemes and there is no additional expenditure resulting from these.

6. **Recommendations**

6.1 The Committee is requested to note the responses to the items above.
Lead contact:

Dawn Hudd  Assistant Director Physical and Cultural Regeneration
Email: dawn.hudd@medway.gov.uk
Tele no 01634 338121

Ruth Du-Lieu Assistant Director Front Line Services
Email: ruth.dulieu@medway.gov.uk
Tele no 01634 333163

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Leaflet – Strood Road Closures

Background Papers

None
Strood Town Centre Road Improvements

10 May to 29 July 2019
Improvements to Strood Town Centre, funded by the Government’s Local Growth Fund through the South East Local Enterprise Partnership, will continue throughout 2019.

Work starts on 10 May 2019, to remove the existing block paving in the carriageway on High Street and replace with asphalt.

In order to undertake these works safely, the High Street will be closed to all vehicular traffic on a number of weekends. The closures will be put in place from 8pm on the Friday evening, and the road will remain closed until 5.30am on the following Monday morning. A signed diversion will be in place whenever the road is closed, to let drivers know of diversion routes (please see map on page 7). Variable message signs will also be in use, displaying dates and times of the road closure.

Works will be carried out during the day and over-night and the Council’s contractor will use the closure periods to carry out as much work as possible to minimise future disruption. Businesses will remain open as usual.

Further details of the works and closures are included in this leaflet. Assuming there are no delays due to circumstances outside of our control we are aiming for these works to be completed by end of July.
Friday, 10 May 8pm to Monday, 13 May 5.30am
Friday, 17 May 8pm to Monday, 20 May 5.30am

- A2, London Road – eastbound closed from Northcote Road (non-inclusive) to High Street
- High Street – eastbound closed from Gun Lane/Cuxton Road to Station Road
- Commercial Road – westbound closed from Knight Road to High Street
- North Street closed from Friary Place to High Street
- Cuxton Road will also be subject to closures from Priory Road to London Road/High Street

No access to High Street from Gun Lane, Cuxton Road or Commercial Road.

Traffic using Commercial Road will be diverted into Knight Road.

Diversion route map can be found on page 7.
Friday, 24 May 8pm to Monday, 27 May 5.30am

- High Street – eastbound closed from Gun Lane to Station Road
- Commercial Road – westbound closed from Knight Road to High Street
- North Street closed from Friary Place to High Street

No access to High Street from Gun Lane, Cuxton Road or North Street.

Traffic using Commercial Road will be diverted into Knight Road.

Right turn only permitted from Gun Lane onto A2, London Road.

*Diversion route map can be found on page 7.*
Friday, 7 June 8pm to Monday, 10 June 5.30am
Friday, 14 June 8pm to Monday, 17 June 5.30am
Friday, 21 June 8pm to Monday, 24 June 5.30am
Friday, 28 June 8pm to Monday, 1 July 5.30am
Friday, 5 July 8pm and Monday, 8 July 5.30am

• High Street – eastbound closed from Gun Lane to Station Road
• North Street closed from Friary Place to High Street

No access to High Street from Gun Lane, Cuxton Road or North Street.
No access to Commercial Road from Station Road.
Traffic travelling westbound on the A2 along Commercial Road (to Knight Road or A2, London Road) will be unaffected but will be unable to turn right into Station Road.
Traffic travelling southbound along Station Road will only be permitted to turn left onto High Street (towards Rochester Bridge).
Right turn only permitted from Gun Lane onto A2, London Road.

*Diversion route map can be found on page 7.*
Sunday, 14 July 8pm to Monday, 15 July 5.30am
Friday, 26 July 8pm to Monday, 29 July 5.30am

• High Street closed at Station Road in all directions

Traffic heading eastbound along High Street will still be able to access Commercial Road.

There will be no access to Rochester Bridge via High Street or Station Road.

There will be no access to Strood/Commercial Road via Rochester Bridge, Station Road or Canal Road.

Diversion route map can be found on page 7.
Diversion routes

Advance notice and diversion signs will be displayed and updates given on local radio.

**Westbound diversion route on 10-13, 17-20 and 24-27 May.**

**Eastbound diversion route on 10-13, 17-20 May; 7-10, 14-17, 21-24 June, 28 June -1 July and 5-8 July.**

Station Road southbound right turning traffic to use A228 Frindsbury Road/Hill, A289 Wulfere Way, A289 Hasted Road, A226 Gravesend Road, Nothcote Road.

Station Road southbound traffic to use A228, A207, A2 on 14-15 and 26-29 July.

Southbound diversion route on 7-10, 14-17, 21-24 June, 28 June-1 July and 5-8 July.

**Eastbound diversion route on 14-15 July and 26-29 July.**
Slight local alterations to diversion routes may be necessary during the weekend closure periods but all diversions will be signed. Whilst the Cuxton Road closure is in place, access to Tesco and residential properties will be maintained. Local alterations to traffic routes around the Cuxton Road area will be necessary. Businesses and residents will be updated by a separate letter closer to the time.

**Bus services**

Additional services will be provided during the closure periods. Bus routes affected by these works include:

**Arriva** 133, 140, 141, 151 (evenings), 190, 191, 700

[arrivabus.co.uk/medway](http://arrivabus.co.uk/medway) or visit Arriva app

**ASD** 170, 197

[asdtransport.com](http://asdtransport.com)

**Nu-Venture** 151, 172, 173

[nu-venture.co.uk](http://nu-venture.co.uk)

Revised timetables will be available from your bus operator and notices will be displayed at bus stops.

Pedestrian access to traders, shops and homes along the High Street will remain in place during the closure periods.

It is expected that the road closures will result in short term disruption but we hope you appreciate the longer term benefit and bear with us so that we can make these improvements to your area as quickly as possible.

More information can be found online at [medway.gov.uk/yournewstrood](http://medway.gov.uk/yournewstrood) and at the Strood Community Hub.

There will be **NO STROOD ROAD CLOSURES** during these events:

**Saturday, 1 - Sunday, 2 June** - Rochester Dickens Festival

**Wednesday, 10 - Saturday, 13 July** - Castle Concerts

**Friday, 19 July** - Medway Mile

**Sunday, 21 July** - National Circuit Championships
Summary

To update the Committee on Medway’s response to the introduction of charges for DIY waste at the Kent County Council (KCC) Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).

1. **Budget and Policy Framework**

1.1 This report impacts on the Council’s core values: putting our customers at the heart of everything we do; giving value for money and providing a clean and green environment.

1.2 The HWRC network supports the Council’s Waste Strategy that, in turn, provides the basis for targets in performance and service plans. The primary objectives are to:

- Ensure compliance with statutory duties
- Meet statutory performance targets
- Ensure continuity of a front line service
- Provide services within agreed budgets
- Meet requirements to achieve efficiency gains
- Provide environmentally sustainable services.
2. **Background**

2.1 Medway Council and KCC have had a cross-border agreement in place for a number of years, meaning KCC residents can use Medway HWRCs. A charge is made to KCC to offset the cost for providing this service.

2.2 In February 2019, KCC cabinet took the decision to restrict quantities of some materials and charge residents to dispose of DIY waste (rubble and hardcore, plasterboard and soil) from 3 June 2019 at all of their HWRCs.

2.3 Medway Council will not be imposing any charges or restrictions on any waste materials disposed of through Medway’s HWRC network.

2.4 Due to the historic cross-boundary agreement, changes or restrictions of usage at KCC sites have had a significant financial and operational impact on Medway’s HWRC network with Cuxton being the most affected. This was clearly evidenced through the impact of Pepperhill closure due to fire for 16 weeks during Spring/Summer 2018 where Medway’s sites saw:

- A 15% increase in operational and disposal costs for this period
- A 13% increase in waste tonnages through sites
- Overall KCC resident usage surveyed at 35% averaged across all three sites (up from 18% during a standard survey)
- Significant pressure at Cuxton HWRC where KCC usage was surveyed at 53% (up from 36% during standard survey)
- 17 occasions of site closure at Cuxton due to insufficient bin capacity and safety concerns on the A228 from customers driving into oncoming traffic to bypass queues.

2.5 Following KCC’s decision to charge; a new cross-boundary payment has been agreed for 2019/20. KCC residents will now be allowed to continue to use Medway’s sites free of charge, with all costs for KCC waste being paid to Medway Council by KCC; Medway will not be subsiding Kent usage of Medway’s HWRC sites.

2.6 The new fee negotiated with KCC is in place for the current financial year 2019/20. Negotiations will begin in November for any extension of the cross border agreement for 2020/21.

2.7 The 2019/20 fee has been charged to KCC in advance and includes:

- Disposal costs at 28% average KCC usage threshold
- Operational costs at 28% average KCC usage threshold (previously operational costs have not been part of the cross border charge)

2.8 KCC resident usage will be closely monitored through the new on site ID check. Should usage or tonnages increase above the 28% throughput threshold in place or the impact on the sites become unsustainable then this will be re-negotiated with KCC.

2.9 KCC have agreed to an increase in cross border charge should the throughput thresholds be exceeded.
3. **Options**

3.1 The following options were considered:

3.2 **Option 1 – Do nothing**
Continue to allow all residents from Medway and KCC into sites and tolerate the burden of additional throughput from KCC residents avoiding charges.

3.3 **Option 2 – Implement a Medway Council tax payers residents only scheme**
Restrict Medway HWRCs to Medway residents only in line with KCC go live of 3 June 2019, requiring residents to provide proof of residency at every visit to gain entry (such as a recent council tax bill or photo card drivers licence).

3.4 **Option 3 – Charge KCC residents to use Medway sites**
Allow KCC residents to use Medway HWRCs for a charge, which is applied to the resident at point of access.

3.5 **Option 4 – Renegotiate the KCC cross-boundary agreement**
Continue with the KCC cross boundary agreement and ensure Medway is fully compensated for use of facilities by Kent residents.

4. **Advice and analysis**

4.1 **Option 1 – Do nothing**
From analysis of the Pepperhill closure impact there is evidence of significant financial and operational risks for Medway. Doing nothing was not an option.

4.2 **Option 2 – Implement a Medway council tax payers residents only scheme**
This option would entail:
- Work to be carried out on the entrances of all three HWRC’s to include traffic management, meet and greet shelters and automatic barriers.
- Staff to check residents are from Medway and allow access to the sites.
- Refusing access to any non-Medway residents and put in place a turning circle to enable these users to be removed from site with minimum impact on traffic flow.

4.3 **Option 3 – Charge Kent residents to use Medway sites**
For this option to be viable, alongside all the changes in option 2, a remote payment system would also be needed. Due to the limited space at the HWRCs, the tight timeframe and the additional queuing that would be caused by taking a payment, it was not possible at this time to offer a payment option to Kent residents. This option could be explored in the future but the sites would need extensive redevelopment to accommodate the high KCC resident throughputs we have seen in the past.

4.4 **Option 4 – Renegotiate the KCC cross-boundary agreement**
This option would still require the works detailed in option 2, but KCC would recompense Medway for the use of the facilities by its residents. All site users would still be stopped at the entrance and records taken of postcode and house number. This will enable Medway to monitor usage by non-Medway
residents and ensure full recompense is given for site usage. This was the most pragmatic way forward.

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>
</table>
| Financial | Non-Medway residents use Medway's free, unrestricted services to avoid the KCC charges. | Implement a direct charge to Non-Medway residents.  
Prevent Non-Medway residents using Medway sites. | B2          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | C2          |
| Operational | The sites have to close more frequently to handle increased tonnages from non-Medway residents avoiding KCC charges. | Extend operational working hours to manage waste volumes.  
Implement a direct charge to Non-Medway residents.  
Prevent non-Medway residents using Medway sites. | C3          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | B2          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | C2          |
| Reputational | Long delays and traffic queuing from directly charging KCC residents.  
Medway residents dissatisfied at longer waits due to ID check. | Prevent non-Medway residents using Medway sites.  
Additional staff to manage ID checks.  
Thorough communications campaign.  
Implement an ‘E-Permit scheme’ giving automatic access to residents through ANPR system. | C2          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | D2          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | D2          |
|           |                                                                              |                                                                                                  | E3          |
**Flytipping**

Disgruntled residents from either Medway or KCC flytip around site entrances after being refused access.

- Thorough communications campaign.
- Working closely with Enforcement team to manage flytipping incidents.
- Ensure flytipping is responded to and removed quickly.

**Staff harassment**

Disgruntled residents become abusive to meet and greet staff.

- Security guards with body-worn CCTV cameras to be deployed for initial 3 month period to manage incidents of aggression.
- Future meet and greet staff to be trained to deal with aggressive behaviour.
- Incidents of aggression to be monitored and appropriate action taken.

### 6. Consultation

**6.1.** The changes required on site are operational, not service delivery related, so there is no change to the service and hence no requirement to consult residents. The requirement to provide ID for each visit is an indirect impact on the sites in relation to an imposed KCC policy change and is there to protect assets and service offered to Medway council tax payers.

**6.2** A comprehensive communications campaign has been implemented to ensure residents are aware of changes to accessing the site. This includes site signage, leaflets, social media, web pages, radio adverts, posters in local access points and more.

**6.3** KCC have been kept informed about our response to their changes throughout the process.
7. Financial implications

7.1 To ensure Medway can manage the potential impact of KCC policy change a number of site infrastructure works have been necessary.

7.2 In his Budget Speech to Full Council on 21 February, the Leader allocated funding for these works with £133,000 of capital funding and £122,000 of revenue for Civic Amenity Site Improvements added to the 2019/20 budget. In addition £88,000 of funding has been secured through Section 106 Agreements.

7.3 Capital site infrastructure ground works have been identified including:
   • Traffic management at main entrances to allow vehicles to exit
   • Removal of grass banks and verges at Capstone and Gillingham to provide additional storage space due to traffic management
   • Meet and greet cabins.

7.4 Additional staffing and a communications campaign include:
   • Temporary meet and greet security staff for an initial 3 month period while service changes bed in
   • Permanent meet and greet staff
   • Communications campaign.

7.5 Based on 28% usage of the sites by KCC residents, the recharge value has been calculated at £675,000. This figure will be reviewed as per section 2.8 above.

8. Legal implications

8.1 There is no legal duty on Medway Council to provide HWRCs to KCC residents.

8.2 Section 51 (1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 places a duty on the waste disposal authority to provide a place for the deposit of household waste, free of charge, for residents of its area.

8.3 Section 51 (3) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 states that the waste disposal authority may also take waste (household, commercial or industrial) from persons outside of the area for a charge as determined by the authority.

9. Recommendations

9.1 The Committee is requested to note that no charges will be made to Medway residents for using Medway HWRCs. Our sites will continue to be accessible to all Kent resident from 3 June 2019 as detailed in option 4 of this report, until such a time as KCC have built their new facility; likely to be within a period of 12-18 months.

Lead officer contact

Sarah Valdus – Head of Environmental Services
Telephone no. 01634 331597
sarah.valdus@medway.gov.uk
Appendices
None

Background papers
None
UPDATE ON CCTV AUDIT

Report from: Richard Hicks, Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation and Deputy Chief Executive

Author: James Brown, Head of Regulatory Services

Summary

This report provides information on the progress of the CCTV improvement programme being carried out by Medway Council.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

1.1 In November 2015, Cabinet agreed to commence and establish the Alternative Delivery Model for the Medway Council Control Centre (MCCC), being a Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo), with Medway Council being the Majority Shareholder; MCG commenced trading from 1 April 2016.

1.2 Medway Commercial Group Ltd (MCG) is now responsible for delivering CCTV.

1.3 Whilst the CCTV hardware remains in the ownership of Medway Council, the repair and maintenance responsibility rests with MCG.

1.4 If hardware is considered beyond economical repair it is the responsibility of Medway Council to take appropriate action.

2. Background

2.1 Following the meeting of Regeneration, Culture, and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Thursday, 6 December 2018 on the results of the CCTV audit, work commenced on the CCTV improvement programme.

2.2 The CCTV improvement programme is focusing on cameras in public spaces, specifically retail environments, transport hubs and areas of the night time economy. This totals 175 cameras that were reviewed. Not included in the programme are cameras specific to areas such as waste recycling sites, multi-storey car parks, individual buildings and Medway Tunnel.
2.3 The improvement plan is intended not only to repair or replace faulty hardware, but also to rationalise the placement of cameras in order to comply with the Information Commissioner’s Office code of practice, whilst offering the best value for money.

2.4 The update on the progress of the programme is attached as Appendix 1.

3. **Advice and analysis**

3.1 The Regeneration, Culture, and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested that a full report be provided on work stream 1, 2 and 3 of the CCTV improvement programme. It should be noted that the review is ongoing.

4. **Risk management**

4.1 There are reputational risks to the Council for not pro-actively ensuring an appropriately functioning CCTV estate. This report reflects the importance of constructive dialogue with MCG and also the importance of a coordinated and collaborative approach.

<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>Legislation</td>
<td>Ensure that the CCTV Code of Practice is followed</td>
<td>Ensure that CCTV cameras are annually reviewed as to their effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>Reduction in cameras could increase fear of crime and lessen chances of identifying offenders</td>
<td>Thorough annual reviews to ensure that CCTV is located in the most high risk areas</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Consultation**

5.1 CCTV is discussed at quarterly meetings of the Community Safety Partnership.

5.2 Kent Police have been consulted on the list of cameras to be reviewed and the sites for rationalisation.

6. **Financial implications**

6.1 A capital allocation of £80,000 has been assigned, along with £25,000 from the Section 106 fund for Chatham town centre improvements. This totals £105,000 available budget for the project.
7. **Legal implications**

7.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

7.2 The Council has no statutory duty to provide CCTV.

8. **Recommendations**

8.1 The Committee is requested to note the positive progress that has been made on the CCTV improvement programme as it draws to a close.

**Lead Officer**

James Brown, Head of Regulatory Services  
Email: james.brown@medway.gov.uk  
Tele no: 01634 338901

**Appendices**

Appendix 1 – CCTV Improvement Programme Update May 19

**Background papers**

Surveillance Camera Code of Practice (Home Office)
This page is intentionally left blank
Appendix 1

Town Centre
CCTV improvement programme

RCE Overview and Scrutiny Committee June 2019

James K Brown
Head of Regulatory Services
May 2019 v1
Work Stream 1

“Using surveillance systems can be privacy intrusive. They are capable of placing large numbers of law-abiding people under surveillance and recording their movements as they go about their day-to-day activities. You should therefore carefully consider whether or not to use a surveillance system. The fact that it is possible, affordable or has public support should not be the justification for processing personal data. You should also take into account the nature of the problem you are seeking to address; whether a surveillance system would be a justified and an effective solution, whether better solutions exist, what effect its use may have on individuals, and whether in the light of this, its use is a proportionate response to the problem. If you are already using a surveillance system, you should regularly evaluate whether it is necessary and proportionate to continue using it.”

Information Commissioner’s office

As part of the review of the Medway CCTV estate it was found that an unacceptable number of cameras were not operating, and that there was also an excessive coverage of public spaces. It was then decided to rationalise the stock to ensure the most effective coverage of priority spaces, whilst offering the best value for money.

Priority cameras were considered to be (after consultation with our Police colleagues)

1. High Streets
2. Areas of high “night-time economy”
3. Main transport hubs

The initial intention, as indicated in December’s brief, was to address individual cameras based on their specific priority.

For example, all of the Red cameras (the highest priority) across the towns first, followed by the Amber cameras.

Due to the dependency of some cameras on other cameras for network connectivity it was decided that it would be more efficient and cost effective to deal with geographical groups in order of priority.
Work stream 2

Priority 1

Following the review of the Medway CCTV infrastructure, it was found that Gillingham had the highest density of non-functioning priority cameras, and was therefore considered a logical starting point for the improvement project.

Gillingham town centre phase was completed on 21/01/2019

Gillingham now has 16 fully functioning cameras, 9 of which are new High Definition “useful evidence quality” units.

The number of cameras covering Gillingham was reduced by 14

The rationale for removing these cameras are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera 1</td>
<td>Low use car park camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 3</td>
<td>Low use car park camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 4</td>
<td>Field of view covered by higher traffic camera 5 and camera 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 10</td>
<td>Field of view covered by camera 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 11</td>
<td>Required field of view covered by camera 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 18</td>
<td>No justified activity camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 21</td>
<td>Unacceptable privacy intrusion due to new development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 24</td>
<td>No longer required due to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 46</td>
<td>Not a town centre camera, area covered by camera 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 60</td>
<td>Not a town centre camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 61</td>
<td>Not a town centre camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 1304</td>
<td>Not a town centre camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 1308</td>
<td>Not a town centre camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 1309</td>
<td>Unacceptable balance of privacy intrusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that these cameras have been removed to avoid any breach in the Information Commissioner’s code of practice. However, the infrastructure supporting the position has been maintained. Therefore, if there is a recorded increase in activity in the locality, the camera can easily be recommissioned if deemed appropriate, following a period of monitoring by rapid deployment camera.

Gillingham was particularly problematic due to the Virgin Fibre cables, which are unfortunately no longer supported. This required the purchase of specialist equipment in order to connect to the network cost-effectively.

The forecast cost of works for Priority 1 was £28,350.00, the actual cost was £28,231.92
Priority 2

Due to the high footfall created by festival days, and the associated security risks, Rochester was considered the next highest priority.

Rochester town centre phase was completed on 11/03/2019

Rochester now has 23 fully functioning cameras, 13 of which are new High Definition “useful evidence quality” units.

The number of cameras covering Rochester was reduced by 7

The rationale for removing these cameras are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera 8</td>
<td>No longer required (development area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 17</td>
<td>No longer required (development area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 18</td>
<td>No longer required (development area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 19</td>
<td>No longer required (development area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 22</td>
<td>Camera removed, No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 59</td>
<td>Camera removed (required field of view covered by cameras 58 and 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera 1315</td>
<td>No longer required (development area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also worth noting, not all of the cameras that were replaced were non-functioning, but were so near end of life that the decision was made to replace them to benefit from the cost efficiency of having a team of engineers already deployed. In addition, 4 of the cameras removed were due to the Rochester Riverside development.

Rochester was problematic due to dependency issues related to a faulty camera in the Chatham area. In brief, all cameras are connected to the control room by data lines, which enables officers to tell the camera where to look. On some data lines there are several cameras connected to each other. In Rochester’s case a faulty camera on the network was sending “rogue data” down the line that the new camera interpreted as “turn left”, but without the command to “stop”. The rogue camera has been identified and isolated, resolving the issue.

The forecast cost of works for Priority 1 was £23,250.00, the actual cost was £23,550.00
Priority 3

Chatham town centre commenced earlier than planned due to the issues with the Rochester network, and (at the time of writing) is now 98% complete (it is anticipated works will be complete by mid May). All cameras have been replaced or removed; the only delay in completion is power supply issues created by the street light replacement project, and the construction works on the former Riverside 1 site. Once completed Chatham Town Centre will have:

- 100% Coverage of the High Street
- Full Coverage of Bus and Railway Stations
- Appropriate coverage of Railway Street nightspots
- Appropriate coverage of The Brook.

Chatham Town Centre is now covered by 36 cameras, 17 of which are new units.

14 cameras have been removed to comply with the information Commissioner’s guidance, the majority of which were located in low activity carparks (from reported offence perspectives).

The rationale for removing these cameras are as follows:

Camera 13  Useful field of view covered by camera 80
Camera 23  Unacceptable privacy intrusion
Camera 77  No justified activity camera
Camera 78  Required field of view covered by camera 68
Camera 79  required field of view covered by camera 84
Camera 96  Not a town centre camera, no justified activity
Camera 107 No justified activity camera
Camera 108 Not a town centre camera, no justified activity
Camera 1301 No justified activity camera
Camera 1303 Unacceptable privacy intrusion
Camera 1320 No justified activity camera
Camera 1321 No justified activity camera
Camera 1327 No justified activity camera
Camera 2305 No justified activity camera

7 cameras have been removed from the scope of this project. These cameras are currently not functioning, and were covering the Globe Lane carpark / Sun Pier area.

The rationale for removing them from scope is due to riverside camera coverage being dealt with as a separate project and to avoid double spend.

The forecast cost of works for Priority 3 was £26,150.00, the actual cost was £26,650.00
Priority 4
Work on priority 4 is now due to commence on the week commencing 23 May 2019. This will cover areas including Rainham, Strood, Luton, Parkwood and the Peninsula.

The highest priority cameras will be dealt with in order of overall coverage and available Budget.

The network infrastructure around Rainham is known to be high risk, so will be tackled first. There will then be a review of the scope against the remaining budget.

The forecast cost of works for Priority 4 is £24,150.00, bringing the total cost to 102,581.92 against a budget of 105,000.00

Summary
The town centre element continues to proceed well.

The project is currently on budget and it is anticipated that it can be completed within the current budget.

Communication between Medway Council, MCG and the private contractors is excellent with weekly project meetings and regular site visits. Statistical data is received monthly on all cameras which reports on activity levels witnessed by the operators and information requested by Police colleagues. Used in conjunction with the crime level statistics, and the Police call records, this will allow Medway Council to ensure there continues to be appropriate coverage by the CCTV network.
REGENERATION, CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

13 JUNE 2019

PETITIONS

Report from: Richard Hicks, Director, Regeneration, Culture, Environment
and Transformation and Deputy Chief Executive

Author: Steve Platt, Democratic Services Officer

Summary

To advise the Committee of any petitions received by the Council which fall
within the remit of this Committee including a summary of the response sent to
the petition organisers by officers.

1. Budget and policy framework

1.1 In summary, the Council’s Petition Scheme requires the relevant Director to
respond to the petition organiser, usually within 10 working days of the receipt
of the petition by the Council. Overview and Scrutiny Committees 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:

1.3 Any budget or policy 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.

2.3 For petitions where the petition organiser is not satisfied with the response provided by the Director there is provision for the petition organiser to request that the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee review the steps the Council has taken, or is proposing to take, in response to the petition.

3 Completed petitions

3.1 A summary of the response to petitions relevant to this Committee that have been accepted by the petition organisers are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of petition</th>
<th>Summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to introduce a safe crossing on Ordnance Street, Chatham recognising particularly the number of schools on and around this busy road. 42 signatures (e-petition)</td>
<td>The Road Safety Team have conducted pedestrian/vehicle counts to coincide with the morning drop-off and the end of the main school day. In the vast majority of cases primary school children were accompanied by an adult and were able to safely cross Ordnance Street. In addition, pedestrians that chose to cross within the count area were able to do so with good visibility and within a relatively low wait time (up to one minute) between traffic. Ordnance Street is within a Controlled Parking Zone and vehicle speeds were not noted as presenting a concern to pedestrians travelling in the vicinity, where drivers adhered to the limit. The result of these assessments, which took into account the traffic flows, vehicle speeds, road user visibility, waiting time and the number of pedestrians crossing, concluded that a pedestrian crossing facility is unable to be considered at this time. The Safer Journeys Team will encourage the schools in the area to revisit their School Travel Plans, serving as a means for the school community to voice their feedback in relation to the school journey and form a series of objectives and action plan of measures to help address any issues put forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to review the parking restrictions in and around Middle Street, Brompton. 20 signatures (paper petition)</td>
<td>The Parking Design Team will give the request consideration as part of the Brompton Controlled Parking Zone Review which will take place during the current financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of petition</td>
<td>Summary of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to take immediate action to secure Beechings Playing fields, Gillingham to prevent access to unauthorised vehicles.</td>
<td>Preventing traveller access onto the Council’s open green spaces is a serious issue for the Council. All options for the site have been reviewed and metal hoop railings have been installed around the playing field. This will allow public use of the site, but prevent unauthorised vehicular access, whilst retaining a gateway for the cleaning and grounds maintenance crew to access the field. This method of prevention has proved successful in other green space areas, such as Jackson’s Field, Rochester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to extend the double yellow lines further down Mierscourt Road near junction of Oastview, Rainham</td>
<td>The Parking Design Team has considered the reasons for the request, which are ‘that one particular van is parking in a manner which is affecting visibility, and if this vehicle was a car the problem would not be as bad’, and has had confirmation from the Road Safety Team that there have been no injury collisions recorded in this location during the last 5 years. Therefore, on this basis, the Council will not be progressing the request at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Petitions not yet concluded:**

4.1 Initial responses have been sent to the petition organiser for the following petitions. If a request is received to refer either petition to this Committee for review, it may be referred to the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of petition</th>
<th>Summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to improve road safety around Lambourn Way, Knole Road and the surrounding roads in Chatham, in particular recognising the road safety pressures of the local school.</td>
<td>During May the Road Safety Team will carry out traffic surveys and observations in the area, and will examine any police accident reports where someone has been injured. Consideration can then be given to the speed of traffic and any road safety issues. If appropriate, suitable options to reduce the problem will be examined and the team will provide feedback to the Lead Petitioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition the Council to implement traffic studies, due to a substantial increase in through traffic</td>
<td>During May the Road Safety Team will carry out traffic surveys and observations on Rochester Avenue, and will examine any police accident reports where someone has been injured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject of petition

between Maidstone Road and Delce Road, which has made Rochester Avenue a 'rat run'. Introduce further traffic calming measures and signage to reduce traffic volumes and deter speeding, thus increasing pedestrian safety.

205 signatures (paper petition)

### Summary of response

Consideration will be given to the level of through traffic and any road safety issues. If appropriate, suitable options to reduce the problem will be examined and the team will provide feedback to the Lead Petitioner.

---

#### 5. Risk Management

5.1 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.

#### 6. Financial and Legal Implications

6.1 Any financial implications arising from the issues raised by the petitions will be taken into account as part of the review of these matters.

6.2 Overview and Scrutiny Rule 21.1 (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.

#### 7. Recommendations

7.1 The Committee is requested to note the petition responses and appropriate officer action in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report.

**Lead officer contact**

Steve Platt, Democratic Services Officer, (01634) 332011  
stephen.platt@medway.gov.uk

**Appendices:**

None

**Background papers:**

None
REGENERATION, CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
13 JUNE 2019
WORK PROGRAMME

Report from: Neil Davies, Chief Executive
Author: Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Summary
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, Part 5 of the Constitution – Overview and Scrutiny Rules, paragraph 21.1 (xv) 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 30 May 2019.

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 13 May 2019. Set out below is a list of items featuring on the Forward Plan that fall within the terms of reference of the Regeneration, Culture and Environment 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>Innovation Park Medway Delivery and Investment Plan</td>
<td>11 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Performance Monitoring Report – Quarter 4 and End of Year 2918/19 – <em>This is on the RCE O&amp;S Committee work programme for 15 August 2019</em></td>
<td>9 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway Commercial Group Ltd – Six Monthly Report and Business Plan Progress and Updates</td>
<td>9 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference from Council: Climate Change Motion</td>
<td>9 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring and Risk Register Review – Quarter 1 2019/20 - <em>This is on the RCE O&amp;S Committee work programme for 17 October 2019</em></td>
<td>24 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Park Medway Local Development Order – Request to Adopt</td>
<td>24 September 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Financial and legal implications**

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

6. **Recommendations**

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

**Lead officer contact**

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

**Appendices**

Appendix A – Work programme

**Background papers**

None.


## Work Programme

**Regeneration, Culture and Environment 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>15 AUGUST 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring 2018/19 – Final Quarter</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Head of RCET Business Intelligence Hub</td>
<td>To consider performance against the Council’s key measures of success for the final quarter of 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Filmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 OCTOBER 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring and Risk Register Review 2019/20 Quarter 1</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Head of RCET Business Intelligence Hub</td>
<td>To consider performance against the Council’s key measures of success for the 1st quarter of 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG Ltd to be invited for further scrutiny</td>
<td>Service review</td>
<td>Assistant Director Front Line Services/Head of Regulatory Services</td>
<td>MCG to be invited to the Committee for further scrutiny of the CCTV function (Minute 599 of 6/12/18 refers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regeneration</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 DECEMBER 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring and Risk Register Review 2019/20 Quarter 2</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Head of RCET Business Intelligence Hub</td>
<td>To consider performance against the Council’s key measures of success for the 2nd quarter of 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital and Revenue Budget</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Chief Finance Officer</td>
<td>To consider the Council’s draft capital and revenue budgets for 2020/21</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>Annual Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Scrutiny of External organisations</td>
<td>Assistant Director Frontline Services</td>
<td>Annual scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Resources</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Gulvin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 JANUARY 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Resources</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Doe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 MARCH 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Plan Monitoring and Risk Register Review 2019/20 Quarter 3</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Head of RCET Business Intelligence Hub</td>
<td>To consider performance against the Council’s key measures of success for the 3rd quarter of 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Waste Contracts</td>
<td>Council Performance and Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>Head of Waste Services</td>
<td>The annual review of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Inward Investment, Strategic Regeneration and Partnerships</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Rodney Chambers OBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Business Management</td>
<td>Holding to account</td>
<td>Councillor Turpin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATES TO BE DETERMINED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Four Elms Hill Air Quality Management Area – Action Plan</td>
<td>Pre-decision scrutiny</td>
<td>Assistant Director Frontline Services/Environmental Protection Team Leader</td>
<td>To consider the Four Elms Hill Air Quality Management Area – Action Plan (Minute 230 – August 2017 refers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled for January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placing Objects on the Highway – Finalised scheme and plans for expansion to other areas of Medway</td>
<td>Information item</td>
<td>Assistant Director Front Line Services</td>
<td>Subject to the scheme being approved by Cabinet, to receive a report outlining the finalised scheme and plans for expansion to other areas of Medway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifecycle Report on the Highways Network Investment</td>
<td>Information item</td>
<td>Assistant Director Front Line Services</td>
<td>Further report on Highways Network Investment (agreed 16 August 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV Improvement Programme</td>
<td>Service review</td>
<td>Assistant Director Front Line Services</td>
<td>Report to provide an oversight of future programmes of CCTV provision in Medway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual reports and reviews considered by this committee are:

1. Annual Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership (December)
2. Annual Review of the Waste Contracts (March)
3. Cultural Activities Programme (January) – *Usually produced initially as a briefing note*
4. Annual Action Plan reviewing the progress of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (January/March) - *Usually produced initially a briefing note*

Note: The Annual South Thames Gateway Building Control Partnership Business Plan is circulated via a Briefing Note prior to consideration by the Cabinet.

Future meeting dates:

15 August 2019
17 October 2019
5 December 2019
21 January 2020
26 March 2020