

Medway Council
Meeting of Regeneration, Culture and Environment
Overview And Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 25 October 2016

6.30pm to 9.45pm

Record of the meeting

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

Present: Councillors: Bhutia (Vice-Chairman), Carr, Craven, Etheridge, Gilry, Griffin, Osborne, Saroy, Stamp and Tejan

Substitutes: Councillors:
Williams (Substitute for Clarke)
Howard (Substitute for Hicks)

In Attendance: Richard Hicks, Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation
Laura Caiels, Legal Advisor
Councillor Jane Chitty, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation
Councillor Pat Cooper
Bob Dimond, Head of Sport Leisure and Tourism
Councillor Adrian Gulvin, Portfolio Holder for Resources
Rubena Hafizi, Parking Services Manager
Priscilla Haselhurst, Flood Drainage and Special Projects Officer
Tomasz Kozlowski, Assistant Director Physical and Cultural Regeneration
Anna Marie Lawrence-Lovell, Performance Manager
Councillor Vince Maple, Leader of the Labour Group
Stuart Pickard, Engineer Responsive Maintenance
Martin Swann, Senior Planned Maintenance Engineer
Simon Swift, Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services
Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

384 Tribute to Councillor O'Brien

At the commencement of the meeting, at the invitation of the Chairman, the Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation paid tribute to Councillor O'Brien who had sadly passed away since the last meeting of the Committee in August.

There followed a minute's silence in memory of Councillor O'Brien.

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

385 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from the Chairman, Councillor Clarke and Councillor Hicks. In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Bhutia chaired the meeting.

386 Record of Meeting

The record of the meeting held on 18 August 2016 was approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

387 Urgent matters by reason of special circumstances

There were none.

388 Declaration of interest and whipping

Disclosable pecuniary interests

Councillor Tejan declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Item 6 (Attendance by the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation) insofar as he is a Director of a company based at the Innovation Centre. However, under this particular item, there was no discussion on the Innovation Centre and therefore Councillor Tejan was not required to leave the meeting.

Other interests

There were none.

389 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 responses to petitions that had been accepted by the petition organisers.

In accordance with the Council's petitions scheme, four petitions had been referred for discussion by the Committee and the lead petitioners were in attendance and invited to address the Committee.

A summary of the points raised for each petition and the Committee's discussion is set out as follows:

**Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25
October 2016**

A) Petition regarding reduced opening hours for the Strand Swimming Pool.

Mr Wright on behalf of the Friends of the Strand Pool outlined the basis of both the paper and on-line petitions and the concerns of the petitioners as they related to:

- The reduced opening hours of the pool both in terms of the hours and days when the pool is open to the public.
- The lack of consultation on the reduced opening hours/days.
- The last entry time of 4pm at the pool precludes people from using the pool after work.
- The condition of the pool and the maintenance of the pool filtration equipment which had led to silt in the base of the pool and the formation of algae. This had resulted in negative publicity both in the local press and on social media which had affected numbers of visitors using the pool in 2016.
- The lack of data recording the number of users of the pool.
- The inadequate staffing levels at the pool, although it was recognised that the new Manager had had a positive influence at the facility.
- Queries regarding the Director's response and the figures quoted as to the salary expenses for staffing the Pool.
- No separate budget existing for the operation of the Strand Pool.
- The reduction in opening hours at the Strand Pool is denying people the opportunity to use the pool for outdoor swimming in saltwater which has positive health benefits.
- Whilst the Friends of Strand Pool commended the Council on allowing under 16's and over 60's to swim free of charge, this was only of benefit if the Pool was open for use.
- The Council should be taking the opportunity to benefit from the national resurgence in the popularity of outdoor swimming by increasing marketing the pool.
- If the pool is to only open when the outside temperature is 24 degrees, the Council does not have membership information or a user database so is unable to contact people to inform them when the pool is to be open.
- The Friends of Strand Pool are happy to assist the Council in cleaning and painting the pool before the 2017 season and would like to work with the Council on widening marketing of the pool so that it can be open between the months of May – September.

With the agreement of the Chairman, a leaflet produced by the Friends of the Strand Pool was circulated prior to the meeting.

In response, the Assistant Director Physical and Cultural Regeneration thanked the lead petitioner for his comments and gave an assurance that when officers were alerted to the filtration issues at the pool, immediate action was taken to alleviate the problem. The water had been tested and declared safe. A

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

survey had since been undertaken on the filtration system and results were awaited. He stressed that as the Strand Pool was a saltwater pool which drew water from the river it was prone to silting whereas this would not occur in a non saltwater pool.

He confirmed that evidence from previous years indicated that usage of the pool reduced when the outside temperature fell below 24 degrees. When the pool was open to the public, a specific number of staff were required to be on duty. As the outside temperature had a direct effect on the numbers of visitors using the facility and the subsequent income received, the Council had to have regard to the cost of opening the pool when usage figures were very low. He confirmed that he was willing to work with the Friends of Strand Pool to assess whether there were opportunities that had not yet been explored to increase usage.

The Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage also thanked the lead petitioner for the help and support that officers had received from the Friends of Strand Pool and he reassured the lead petitioner that the Council was committed to provision of the outdoor pool and continuing to work with the Friends of Strand Pool. He advised the Committee that the Council had supported the Group by part-funding a website to help the Group increase membership.

The Committee then discussed the issues raised and a summary of the discussion and officers' responses as follows:

- The Committee congratulated the Friends of Strand Pool on the professional way in which they had conducted themselves in their engagement with the Council and the support they had provided at the Pool.
- A Member expressed concern that public perception was that the future of the Pool was at risk and, the reduction in hours and days of opening would result in a reduction in visitor numbers which could affect the viability of the facility. In response, the Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage confirmed that the Council was committed to the provision of the Strand Pool as part of its leisure and sports provision.
- A Member suggested that consideration be given to amending the opening hours from 11am - 5pm to 1pm – 7pm so that people were able to use the pool after work. In response, the Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage stated that current usage data indicated the busiest hours of use at the Pool were between 11 – 12 noon. Therefore to change the opening hours as suggested could affect the current busiest opening period.
- In response to suggestions that there be a separate budget for the operation of the Pool, the Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage agreed to investigate this possibility but commented that when the Pool was open but not busy, pool staff were often re-directed to work elsewhere at the Leisure Park and therefore this may prove difficult in attempting to split the budgets.

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

- A Member suggested that consideration be given to whether the operation of the Strand Café could come back to the Council so that any profits could be re-invested at the Strand Leisure Park. In response, the Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage advised that the café lease was due for renewal in 2017 and would progress through contract procedures as part of the Council's wider catering facility contracts.
- The Head of Sport, Leisure, Tourism and Heritage acknowledged that the Council had not undertaken consultation on the reduced hours of operation of the Pool and apologised for this. However, he confirmed that officers were now working closely with the Friends of Strand Pool on matters concerning the Pool.
- A Member referred to the Council's e-petition facility as compared with the change.org website which was increasingly being used as an alternative by people setting up e-petitions. The Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation commented that whilst the Council had a comprehensive petitions scheme in place, officers were always happy to consider feedback and review the arrangements to see whether improvements could be made.

The Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation explained that the Council was operating in a constrained financial environment. In recent years, funds had been invested in the Pool, its changing rooms and in the Strand Leisure Park as a whole but it was necessary to recognise that local authorities were now faced with restricted budgets. Therefore, future investment at the Strand would have to be considered alongside other funding priorities. However, he reiterated that the Council had no plans to close the Strand Pool.

Decision:

The Committee:

- a) noted the petition response and the officer actions set out in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.7 of the report;
- b) thanked the Friends of Strand Pool for their petition and the work that they have undertaken with officers recognising their involvement and interest in the Strand Pool, and noted that officers are actively involved in working with them on a defined programme reviewing cleanliness of the Pool, demand for the facility, temperature triggers for opening the Pool to the public, increasing income from the facility to aid the cost of running the Pool, methods of recording visitors and decoration and physical conditions of the Pool.

B) Petition for a speed camera on Walderslade Road

Mr Jones outlined the basis of his petition seeking the installation of a speed camera in Walderslade Road between the Poacher's Pocket Pub/Restaurant and the junction of Weedswood Road. He explained that when temporary cameras had been in place, drivers slowed their vehicles but when the temporary cameras had been removed traffic speed had increased.

**Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25
October 2016**

The Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services advised that the enforcement of speed limits was the responsibility of Kent Police and Police records indicate that no serious or fatal collisions have been recorded at this location in the last 7 years. In response to the concerns raised by the Lead Petitioner, the Road Safety Team would undertake further liaison with the Police and ask if they could increase enforcement at this particular site and keep the area under review.

Decision:

The Committee:

- a) noted the petition response and the officer actions set out in paragraphs 4.10 and 4.12 of the report;
- b) noted that officers will liaise with Kent Police regarding the possibility of increasing the frequency of siting mobile cameras at this location and requesting that this be kept under review.

C) Petition to make the crossing on Rochester Road, Halling safe

Ms Catlin outlined the basis of her petition seeking the installation of a new central island crossing in a safer position, in addition to the existing one located by Elm Haven Marina layby and for a reduction in the speed limit on Rochester Road.

She explained that whilst she had received a response from the Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation that a speed limit review would be undertaken of the section of road between the White Hart Public House to St Andrews Park, this did not provide a guarantee that this would produce a positive outcome.

Ms Catlin outlined the problems experienced by residents in trying to cross the road without a central refuge.

Prior to the meeting, at the request of Ms Catlin an email from Ms Catlin on 8 August to the Director had been circulated to all Members of the Committee, along with the Director's response dated 2 September 2016.

The Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services confirmed that officers were working with the lead petitioner on this issue and that traffic counter assessments were in the process of being undertaken within the next 2 weeks. In addition, a site review would be undertaken in the next six weeks in response to the request for a central island refuge. Once these assessments had been completed, the outcome would be reported to the lead petitioner. It was however stressed that any works that may result arising from the assessments would have to be considered along with other funding priorities when the Council set its budget for 2017/18.

Decision:

The Committee noted the petition response and the officer actions set out in paragraphs 4.15 and 4.17 of the report and thanked officers for their quick response in taking action in response to this petition.

**D) Petition objecting to the new pavements of Williams Street,
Rainham**

Mrs Lee outlined the basis of her petition and expressed dissatisfaction with the newly constructed footpaths in William Street in that they sloped at varying angles towards the road surface, thus putting children in pushchairs, elderly, disabled and those in mobility scooters at risk. She requested that new footpaths be constructed to provide a continuous level surface between the garden wall and the kerb from end to end of William Street with vehicular crossings having a dropped kerb.

With the agreement of the Chairman, additional information supplied by Mrs Lee from an Engineer was circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting.

The Council's Responsive Maintenance Engineer responded and confirmed that the 1:40 gradient was a standard design for a footpath and was used by all local authorities. Such gradient was required as a minimum so as to ensure the discharge of rainwater towards the road and to prevent the formation of algae on the footpath.

He confirmed that the footpath in William Street was particularly narrow and was generally 1.2m wide along most of its length with the levels at the back of the pavement and of the road surface being fixed. These constraints had been fully considered and taken into account for these resurfacing works and the engineer had spoken to a number of residents, including the lead petitioner, and had made specific alterations to the pavement outside a number of properties as a result.

Decision:

The Committee noted the petition response and the officer actions already undertaken as set out in paragraphs 4.20 and 4.22 of the report.

**390 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 the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation which fell within the remit of this Committee as set out below:

- Economic Development
- Local Plan

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

- 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:

- **Rochester Airport** - A Member asked for an update on Rochester Airport. In response, the Portfolio Holder stated that development opportunities at Rochester Airport were a vital element for plans to provide a modern, commercial workspace in Medway supporting Gross Value Added (GVA) jobs.
- **Dickens World** – A Member referred to the sudden closure of Dickens World and sought information on whether those members of staff who had lost their jobs were receiving support in securing future employment. He also enquired as to whether there were any plans for the future of the building. In response, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that officers were on hand to provide assistance to employees in such circumstances but it was not always possible to ensure participation by a private commercial organisation. She provided an assurance that any former employee of Dickens World would receive support from officers if they requested help. As to the future of the building, the Portfolio Holder advised that she was not aware of any future plans for the building at this stage.
- **Operation of the Environmental Protection/Noise Nuisance/Out of Hours Service**

A Member referred to the current operation of the environmental protection/noise nuisance out of hours service and asked whether it was possible for the service to operate on Thursday/Friday and Saturday evenings as opposed to Friday/Saturday and Sunday. In response, the Portfolio Holder advised that she would have further discussions with officers to assess whether the statistics indicated there was a requirement for the operation of the service to be adjusted.
- **Gillingham Market** - A Member advised that a number of market stallholders who paid for their stalls on an annual basis at Gillingham Market had expressed concern that casual stallholders who attended the market on an occasional basis were often allocated pitches located in more favourable locations than those allocated to regular traders. The market traders considered this to be unfair. In response, the Portfolio Holder stated that this was the first time this had been drawn to her attention and she agreed to investigate and respond to the Member direct.

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

- **Employment statistics and employment in rural areas** – A Member sought information on the trend in employment in Medway and in particular how this was affecting the rural areas. In response, the Portfolio Holder advised that overall there had been a steady rise in employment in Medway and she referred in particular to the success of the Employ Medway Service.

The Portfolio Holder stated that she wished to see continued employment and sustainability in rural areas but stressed that it was important to recognise that rural businesses were not solely limited to agricultural and horticultural employment. She recognised the importance of understanding how rural businesses could be supported and one example of this was the expansion of broadband into rural areas.

- **Local Growth Fund (LGF)** – In response to a question on the Local Growth Fund (LGF) and, in particular, proposed works in Chatham, the Portfolio Holder explained the LGF and how works were prioritised. She confirmed that funding was currently available and further funding was being sought for works between Chatham Station and Military Road in Chatham, both of which would improve the area. She stated that £1 million was available for improvement works in the area of Luton Arches, but she was unable to confirm detail for these works as the options available would be the subject of consultation.
- **Rochester Airport Enterprise Zone status** – A Member referred to the current position concerning the Rochester Airport planning application and sought an assurance that the delays in determination of the planning application would not threaten the Enterprise Zone. In response, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that there were certain legal obligations that had to be completed with the planning application but she gave an assurance that there was funding available to ensure that the regeneration plans would proceed.
- **Environmental Enforcement** - In response to a question about untidy land, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Environmental Enforcement Team had pursued a number of successful prosecutions. However, if the Member considered that there were elements of the service that could be improved then information should be supplied that could be investigated.
- **Development Management** - A Member referred to the change to the threshold for a development to trigger provision of affordable housing and whether this had resulted in a reduction in the provision of affordable housing in Medway. The Portfolio Holder advised that as the housing market in Medway was more affordable than other areas in the South East, many people relocated to Medway from outside the area. She recognised the need for there to be a wide range of accommodation to be available of varying types including that suited to young people.

**Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25
October 2016**

- **Planning applications relating to establishments selling alcohol and takeaway food** – A Member referred to action by other local authorities to make it difficult for applicants to set up establishments that sell alcohol and takeaway food in certain areas and he referred to the proliferation of such establishments in the Luton area. In response, the Portfolio Holder advised that the Planning Committee was the responsible body for determining planning applications and Members of the Planning Committee were fully aware of the issues surrounding establishments selling alcohol and takeaway food.
- **Apprenticeships** – In response to a question on the operation of the apprenticeship scheme, the Portfolio Holder advised that officers set up apprenticeship schemes with local businesses and then matched apprentices to the various schemes on offer. Much of this work involved close liaison with the local colleges and universities.
- **Local Growth Fund Strood Civic Site Flood Mitigation Works** – A Member asked why flood mitigation works were required at the former Civic Centre Site in Strood. The Portfolio Holder advised that such works were necessary, owing to the development plans for the site.
- **Local Plan** – In response to a question on the Local Plan consultation process, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that officers undertook consultation through various methods, including staffed displays at community and village halls and in schools.

Decision:

The Committee:

- a) thanked the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation for attending the meeting and answering questions.
- b) noted that the Portfolio Holder will discuss with officers whether the level of noise nuisance complaints justified amendments to the Environmental Protection Team out of hours service to operate on Thursday/Friday and Saturday as opposed to Friday/Saturday and Sunday with the outcome of such discussions being notified to all Members of the Committee.
- c) noted that the Portfolio Holder will discuss with officers the issue of the allocation of stalls at Gillingham Market in the light of the concerns raised by regular traders.
- d) noted that there will be full engagement with residents as part of the consultation process for the Local Plan encouraging written responses and that there will also be full consultation with all Members of the Council.

**391 Member's item - relocation of the disability mobility service at the
Pentagon Centre, Chatham**

Discussion:

Councillor Osborne outlined the background to his Member's item.

He expressed concern that there was no advance warning given to service users that the disability mobility service would be relocated to a new site in the Pentagon Centre, nor was any consultation undertaken before the service was relocated, despite the Council having contact details for those registered to use the service. He pointed out that service users now had to travel further to use the service at its new location.

At the request of Councillor Osborne and, with the agreement of the Committee, Sue Groves MBE addressed the Committee and expressed concern regarding the way in which the change to the service had been handled. She advised that there were 146 registered users of the mobility scheme who were reliant on the service and to receive less than one weeks notice of the change of location for the pick up of a mobility scooter or wheelchair was unacceptable.

She advised that this service had previously been located in close proximity to the area of the car park where blue badge parking was located but that the new location for the facility was on the other side of the shopping centre. Many of the service users were unable to use public transport.

The Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services fully accepted that the service had failed to adequately consult on the relocation of the disability mobility service and he apologised for the distress that may have been caused to service users.

Attention was drawn to the contents of the written report which set out the reasons why the service had been relocated and the benefits that had resulted from the change to the way in which the service was delivered as follows:

- Additional operating hours – 9.00am – 5.00pm Monday to Saturday
- No closure during the lunch period
- No advance booking required
- The availability of holiday hire of scooters
- Other disability services available that may be of interest to the service user.

The Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation stated that whilst it was accepted that the consultation on the relocation of the disability mobility service could have been better handled, this would be addressed by undertaking consultation on the new location for the service once the service had had an opportunity to bed in. He stated that lessons had been

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

learnt from this and reassured the Committee that officers would always seek to improve and learn from any mistakes.

Sue Groves MBE also drew attention to a correction on the Diversity Impact Assessment attached at Appendix 1 to the report in that the legislation quoted should be the Equalities Act 2010. The Director of Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation confirmed that this had been noted.

Decision:

The Committee:

- a) thanked Sue Groves MBE for attending the meeting and representing service users on this item.
- b) noted that after the consultation has been undertaken on the relocation of the disability mobility service, the outcome of the consultation will be reported to this Committee with such report to include information as to the range of those consulted and the date upon which the consultation took place.
- c) noted that officers have given an undertaking to review the legislation quoted in the diversity impact assessment for any future reports on this issue.
- d) requested that officers liaise with Members of the Committee on the proposed consultation plan before it commences.

392 Annual Action Plan reviewing the progress of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out progress on the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy adopted and published in Autumn 2014 and presenting an Annual Action Plan for 2016/17 for its continued implementation.

The Committee was also advised of the progress in the setting up of the North Kent Marshes Internal Drainage Board which was being administered by Medway Council.

Decision:

The Committee noted the progress of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and the 2016/17 Annual Action Plan and the progress in the setting up of the North Kent Marshes Internal Drainage Board.

393 Council Plan Monitoring 2016/17 - Quarter 1

Discussion:

The Committee received a report setting out the performance summary for Quarter 1 2016/17 against the Council's priorities for the Committee:

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

- Medway: A place to be proud of.
- Maximising regeneration and economic growth.

The Committee raised the following issues:

- **Standards at Shawsted Tip and Riverside Country Park** - A Member commented that following recent visits to Shawstead Tip and Riverside Country Park, she was dissatisfied with the standards at both sites. In particular, she referred to the level of dog excrement at Riverside Country Park. The Director for Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation commented that customer satisfaction levels were usually very high at both sites and gave an assurance that these comments would be taken on board for both sites and action would be taken to reinforce the message at Riverside Country Park that dog walkers should observe regulations requiring them to remove their dogs excrement and dispose of it in the bins provided.
- **Performance Indicator NI 195a – Improved street and environment cleanliness: Litter** – A Member sought clarification as to whether the 96% satisfaction target was intended to be public opinion or the opinion of contract monitoring teams. In response, the Performance Manager clarified that the target was not a satisfaction level but related to the contract monitoring teams carrying out regular street cleansing inspections across Medway to ensure that the contractor was meeting their contractual obligations.
- **Public realm and street scene** – A Member referred to issues in River Ward where private landlords were not providing adequate refuse facilities in buildings and he asked whether any action could be taken to remedy this. The Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services agreed to investigate this and respond to the Member direct.
- **Performance indicator NI 167 – Average journey time along 5 routes across Medway** – A Member sought further information as to the systems used to measure average journey times along the 5 identified routes in Medway. The Performance Manager confirmed that the Head of Integrated Transport had investigated alternative options for obtaining this data having regard to the systems used by other local authorities and it was hoped that data would be available by the end of Quarter 3. The new system could be used to obtain a large range of date including journey times for any date or time period.
- **Performance Indicator GH6 CP – Satisfaction with parks and open spaces** - A Member referred to Gillingham Park and sought clarification as to whether there was an appeal process for this Park to regain Green Flag status and she sought information as to whether action was being undertaken to encourage volunteers to help at this particular park. The Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services confirmed that unfortunately the appeal for Green Flag status for Gillingham Park had been unsuccessful and he agreed to share the Green Flag Judging Report for Gillingham Park. He advised that there had been a Friends Group for Gillingham Park but this was no longer operational. However,

Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25 October 2016

he was happy to revisit re-establishment of the Friends Group as part of the work to secure the Green Flag status for Gillingham Park.

- **Battle of Medway** – A Member sought information on the proposed commemoration the 350th anniversary of the Battle of Medway in 2017. The Assistant Director Physical and Cultural Regeneration briefly outlined the types of events being planned as part of the commemorative event.
- **Gun Wharf Marina**– A Member asked for an update on plans to have mooring facilities at Gun Wharf. The Director for Regeneration, Culture, Environment and Transformation advised that work was currently in hand on this proposed development as part of the plans for the regeneration of Chatham and it would be marketed shortly.
- **Medway Mile** - A Member congratulated Officers on the successful organisation of the Medway Mile. She added that this event, which was free of charge, was well supported by participants. Another Member added that she had a number of friends who were not Medway residents who had expressed to her that they were impressed with events staged in Medway, many of which were free of charge.

Decision:

The Committee agreed to:

- a) note the Quarter 1 2016/17 performance against the key measures of success used to monitor progress against the Council Plan 2016/17.
- b) note that the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources has approved the adjustment of Quarter 1 target for performance measure LRCC 4a (Jobs created and safeguarded), from 75 to 35 to reflect the delayed receipt of Locate in Kent data, in accordance with the authority delegated to them at Full Council in February 2016.
- c) note that the Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services will discuss the issue of private landlords and the provision of refuse facilities with the relevant Councillor direct outside of the meeting.
- d) note that Officers have agreed to take the necessary action to reinforce to dog walkers at Riverside Country Park the requirement for them to dispose of dog excrement in a responsible manner using the bins provided.
- e) note that the Acting Assistant Director Front Line Services will discuss with the relevant Member concerned outside of the meeting the possibility of reviving the Friends of Gillingham Park as part of work to regain Green Flag status for this park.

394 Work Programme

Discussion:

The Committee discussed its work programme and noted the suggestion that the Annual Review of Waste Contracts currently scheduled for report in January 2017 be rescheduled to March 2017.

**Regeneration, Culture and Environment Overview And Scrutiny Committee, 25
October 2016**

Attention was also drawn to the publication of a new Forward Plan on 24 October 2016 and those new items relevant to the work of this Committee.

In response to discussion on the possible expansion of the scope of the report on the 20splenty scheme to include roads in school zones, it was suggested that the Committee receive a report based on the original brief and any possible expansion to include roads in school zones be considered at a later date.

Decision:

The Committee:

- a) noted the work programme and agreed that the Annual Review of Waste Contracts currently scheduled for January 2017 be rescheduled for March 2017.
- b) noted that the request for the report on the 20splenty scheme on residential roads will be brought forward to committee.
- c) noted that a report will be submitted to the Committee at a future date on the outcome of the consultation of the relocation of the shop mobility service at Chatham Pentagon Centre.

Chairman

Date:

Ellen Wright, Democratic Services Officer

Telephone: 01634 332012

Email: democratic.services@medway.gov.uk