

**Full Council 26 April 2018 – Schedule of Written Responses to public and Members’ questions**

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<b>Public questions not answered at the meeting</b>	
7B	<p>Christopher Rainbow of St. Mary's Island submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“Please can you confirm the additional income that the Council will receive initially and in 5 years’ time after the introduction of a parking permit scheme on St Mary’s Island?”</p> <p>As Christopher Rainbow was not present at the meeting, he would receive a written response to his question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Mr Rainbow.</p> <p>It is not possible to confirm what income could have been expected to have been generated from a Controlled Parking Zone on St Mary’s Island as this would be dependent upon the size of the zone and the sale of permits, netted off against the cost of enforcement and the capital cost of implementation.</p> <p>As you are aware, we are not currently proposing to implement a Controlled Parking Zone on St. Mary’s Island.</p>
7C	<p>Jackie Gammage of St. Mary's Island submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“Can the Portfolio Holder please explain how parking schemes are considered, including what methods are used to identify parking need, the scope of each scheme and available options, consultation arrangements and the determination of the most appropriate solution to address the issues identified?”</p> <p>As Jackie Gammage was not present at the meeting, she would receive a written response to her question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Ms Gammage.</p> <p>Parking schemes can range from single yellow lines through to resident permit zones. The issue and location defines the solution. Many factors are taken into account when considering a request for parking restrictions, including the impact on residents and the road safety implications.</p> <p>Once a solution is proposed anyone who is likely to be affected is consulted. A final decision is then made, based on analysis of the consultation responses added to the professional advice from officers.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
7F	<p>Agnieszka Tryburska of Chatham submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“I moved in July 2017 to the Horsted area of Chatham and since then no improvements have been made. Footpaths and roads are in a terrible condition. The crossing between Barberrry Avenue and Watson Avenue is dangerous with limited visibility. After each rubbish collection there is plenty of rubbish “flying” on the streets. There are basic things that the council can do to improve the above but it seems as if there is no willingness. The situation is quite appalling.</p> <p>Can the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services please tell me what the Council is doing to invest in this area?”</p> <p>As Agnieszka Tryburska was not present at the meeting, she would receive a written response to her question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Mrs Tryburska.</p> <p>In the last 2 years, we have invested in the resurfacing of carriageways, large carriageway patching, new cycle corridors and pavement reconstruction to a value of £180K; a further £63K is being invested in part carriageway resurfacing of City Way this year.</p> <p>We also undertook winter service salting of principal and secondary routes to ensure the network remained open during the recent snow event.</p> <p>In 2017/18, 108 minor works orders were raised for repairs to the carriageway and 83 for repairs to the pavements in the Rochester South and Horsted Ward. I do acknowledge the comment in relation to the crossing between Barberrry Avenue and Watson Avenue. Officers will investigate this and look into the potential for improvements.</p> <p>If there are specific roads where you have concerns do please let me know.</p> <p>Our Waste Services team does a terrific job across Medway, and we follow up on any shortfalls very speedily. Again, if there are any particular issues you are experiencing, please do report them.</p>
7H	<p>Kay Haggis of St. Mary's Island submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“With regards to recent and ambiguous correspondence relating to parking on St Mary’s Island, including an email note stating that there is no intention to respond to questions about parking in general, which is not helpful, and in a separate letter advising that specific areas of the island will be reviewed as they may benefit from restricted parking, such as the placement</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Ms Haggis.</p> <p>At present there are no plans for an ongoing review. However, we will be looking at isolated areas that have been brought to our attention, if there are specific areas of concern, details can be sent to <a href="mailto:parkingdesign@medway.gov.uk">parkingdesign@medway.gov.uk</a></p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>of double or single yellow lines. I am left confused as to where to now go to get answers.</p> <p>Would you please advise the scope of any ongoing review including full details of the Council's process and procedures which are required to be followed prior to the placement of yellow lines."</p> <p>As Kay Haggis was not present at the meeting, she would receive a written response to her question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	
7J	<p>Aimee Geraghty of Gillingham submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer, the following:</p> <p>"I'm grateful to both the Leader and Portfolio Holder for meeting with me after I submitted my petition of over 3700 signatures regarding the unhelpful parking permit policy changes.</p> <p>Do you have an update on the issues we discussed?"</p> <p>As Aimee Geraghty was not present at the meeting, she would receive a written response to her question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>Thank you for your petition and for taking the time to speak with Cllr Jarrett and me, it was very constructive. You effectively highlighted the issues faced by vulnerable members of our community. In response, the Council has decided to change the criteria for Residents Permits so that a maximum of 2 'Resident Support Permits' can be purchased in addition or instead of Residents Permits at the same cost as the residents permit.</p> <p>This will allow residents to nominate two vehicles that are not registered to the resident's address. This is to facilitate care and support from friends and family. Details of when this permit will be available and the criteria for applying will be advertised on the Council's website and on social media.</p>
7K	<p>Simon Glover of Chatham asked the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>"It is becoming increasingly difficult and sometimes dangerous to get around some areas of Medway on foot. The general deterioration of many of the pavements is an issue, as are bushes obstructing them, but the main problem is cars, vans and</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Mr Glover.</p> <p>The Council takes road safety very seriously and investigates indiscriminate pavement parking where there is a clear risk to pedestrians and other road users. If Mr Glover would like to let us know where this pavement parking is taking place, we will investigate further.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>occasionally lorries parking on the pavement, often reducing them to a single track but sometimes blocking the path completely. It can be very frightening to have a vehicle leave the road and come towards one.</p> <p>Could the Council therefore make a concerted effort to reclaim paths for pedestrians by increasing the protection where possible and by strictly regulating the areas in which some use of pavement space is now essential? Bearing in mind that signs and lines without enforcement are a waste of time.”</p> <p>As Simon Glover was not present at the meeting, he would receive a written response to his question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	
7M	<p>Mark Prenter of Gillingham asked the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe, the following:</p> <p>“Local families in Twydall have raised concerns about the poor condition and inadequate cleansing and maintenance of the children’s play area at Beechings Playing Fields.</p> <p>How often is the play area currently inspected by Medway Norse and what funding - if any - has been allocated for making improvements to the play area in the current financial year?”</p>	<p>At the meeting, Councillor Doe stated that the improvement needs of Beechings Playing Fields had been reviewed to provide an evidence base for future potential section 106 contributions. These improvements included additional seating in the play area estimated at £4,500 and an increase in the equipment within the older children’s play area, which was estimated at around £70,000.</p> <p>He stated that Medway Norse, the Council’s agent, ensured the maintenance and cleanliness of Medway’s play areas. All play areas received a daily inspection each morning, including the sweeping and blowing of paths, the emptying of bins and removal of litter from the rest of the fenced play area. Daily litter clearance outside of the play area was restricted to a 10 metre zone around an individual bin. In 2017-18, Medway Norse’s site maintenance budget funded a new children’s roundabout and a youth shelter.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
		<p><b>Note:</b> Following the meeting, Councillor Doe was asked to clarify the response he gave at the meeting and he has provided the following as a revised response: Thank you for your question, Mr Prenter.</p> <p>The improvement needs of Beechings Playing Fields have been reviewed to provide an evidence base for future, potential s106 contributions. These improvements include additional seating in the play area (estimated £4,500) and an increase in the equipment within the older children’s play area (estimated £70,000).</p> <p>Medway Norse is our agent, ensuring the maintenance and cleanliness of our play areas. All play areas receive a daily (morning) inspection, including the sweeping and blowing of paths, the emptying of bins and removal of litter from the rest of the fenced play area. Daily litter clearance outside of the play area is restricted to a 10 metre zone around an individual bin.</p> <p>In 2017-18, Medway Norse’s maintenance budget replaced the children’s roundabout (that was originally installed in 2012 using Member Priority Funding and Ward Improvement Funds) and also repainted the existing youth shelter (installed using the same funding sources).</p>
70	<p>Bryan Fowler of Chatham submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“The Portfolio Holder should be aware of the financial impact on families living in Central Chatham, who may be £654 a year worse off, as a result of the decision to abolish visitor car parking and replace them with daily vouchers.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Mr Fowler.</p> <p>The change to parking permits was introduced to reduce misuse and to help free up capacity for residents. We tried to minimise the impact on residents as far as possible, but these changes were necessary to deter non-residents from using up spaces meant for residents.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>Can the Portfolio Holder explain what impacts on Medway's residents were taken into account when Councillors considered this decision at the budget setting Council meeting in February 2018?"</p> <p>As Bryan Fowler was not present at the meeting, he would receive a written response to his question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	
7Q	<p>Lindsey Burke of Rochester submitted the following question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Jarrett:</p> <p>"A number of conflicting figures have been circulated on social media about the total cost of the Battle of Medway events last summer following several Freedom of Information requests.</p> <p>Can the Leader of the Council give a definitive breakdown of exactly how taxpayers' money was spent and provide some outcome-based evidence about the tangible lasting benefit of this expenditure to the community?"</p> <p>As Lindsey Burke was not present at the meeting, she would receive a written response to her question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>A budget of £389,000 was allocated and spent on the Battle of Medway, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civic Event - £100,563</li> <li>• Land based activities - £60,054</li> <li>• Medway in Flames - £228,383</li> </ul> <p>The Battle of Medway celebrations took place between 8 and 17 July 2017, and marked its 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary.</p> <p>This historic event included the visit of Prince Maurits of the Netherlands, to Upnor Castle; an official Civic event. This was followed by a parade by both the British Royal Marines and the Marine Band of the Royal Netherlands Navy at the Historic Dockyard at Chatham, and concluded with a spectacular finale on the River Medway.</p> <p>Significant key partners were involved in the development and delivery of the celebrations with the Council and included the Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust, Royal Navy, Peel Ports, Dutch Embassy, and the Kent Lieutenancy, plus many more, including two significant naval vessels being moored in Basin 2 of the Dockyard, which also attracted many visitors.</p> <p>Up to 35,000 people watched the finale, which was also viewed online across the world. This contributed towards making Medway a place to be proud of, and put it</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
		<p>firmly on the map locally, nationally and internationally; a key Council objective.</p> <p>Independent research, using the Cambridge Economic Impact of Tourism Model (a national recognised model), has shown the number of visitors to Medway has reached 4.6m per year, with the local economy benefitting by some £313m. Tourism supports more than 6,000 jobs in Medway, which equates to 7% of the area's total jobs. The Battle of Medway has also contributed to this.</p> <p>In addition, and as part of the Battle of Medway legacy, further links have been forged with the Dutch Ambassador, His Excellency Simon Smits, following a visit on 2 March 2018, when it was agreed to develop further cultural and economic development links, and future inward investment opportunities. These are being explored further to support the delivery of the Council's "Growth For All" agenda.</p>
7S	<p>Harinder Singh of Chatham submitted the following question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Jarrett:</p> <p>"Do you feel that having just 30 minutes to scrutinise the work of the Leader of the Council is adequate and democratic, as was seen for the first time ever at the recent Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting?"</p> <p>As Harinder Singh was not present at the meeting, he would receive a written response to his question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.</p>	<p>Without exception all our Overview and Scrutiny Committees have a record of allowing sufficient time for Members to ask all the questions they have when Cabinet Members appear at these meetings to be held to account.</p> <p>On 12 April the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee sat until 11pm in order to deal with all the items on the agenda and as I understand it the Chairman anticipated this and felt it was appropriate to limit the time allowed for Cabinet Members to be held to account in order to provide time to do justice to other important items of business.</p> <p>From the Agenda of the meeting you will note that there was a petition item and also a Member's item. For the petition item Councillor Stamp spent far too much time making repetitive points that could have been made more succinctly. For the Member's item Councillor Maple brought forward something which occurred over two years ago and which could not be</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
		<p>changed. Both these items wasted an inordinate amount of time which could have allowed more time for questions to myself. My session did not start until after 7.15pm.</p> <p>Under the circumstance I believe that the Chairman handled things as well as he could have done.</p> <p>I have asked that in future we seek to minimise the appearance of more than one Cabinet Member at any one meeting unless there is good reason for doing so and I am sure the Members who are involved in planning the business for Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings will take note and continue to work together to ensure that items are programmed and phased to keep meetings manageable across the year.</p> <p>I have noted that the Leader of the Labour Group has posted a number of questions he was unable to ask me on social media. I have answered each of these as fully as I am able.</p>
7U	<p>Matthew Broadley of Rochester submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation, Councillor Chitty, the following:</p> <p>“Residents and shop owners have expressed concerns over the raising levels of pollution towards the Luton Arches along Luton Road.</p> <p>Given the proximity to two schools and their associated catchment areas, can the Portfolio Holder identify what plans are in place to curb these levels of toxic pollution?”</p> <p>As Matthew Broadley was not present at the meeting, he would receive a written response to his</p>	<p>Thank you for your question, Mr Broadley.</p> <p>Luton Road is in the Central Medway Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). As a result of this the council has produced an Air Quality Action Plan. This contains a range of measures that have been identified to help improve air quality in the AQMA, and more widely across Medway. The 12 measures in the plan range from transport/highways measures through to public education and advice.</p> <p>Since declaration of the Central Medway AQMA, our monitoring has shown that air quality has improved along Luton Road, and is generally below government limits. Pollution levels nearer to the arches junction are higher, but have also improved since the declaration of the AQMA.</p> <p>This indicates that the action we are taking, through the air quality action plan,</p>



Agenda reference	Question	Response
	question in accordance with Council Rule 8.6.	<p>has helped to improve local air quality on Luton Road.</p> <p>More details on the council's air quality action plan can be found on our website.</p>
	<b>Members' questions not answered at the meeting</b>	
11J	<p>Councillor Paterson submitted the following question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Jarrett:</p> <p>“According to internal documents released under the Freedom of Information Act, in an email titled "Decision Made!!!", Councillor Jarrett reportedly called plans to tarmac Rochester Esplanade Gardens “the only viable option” for the new coach park. However, this folly was hastily reversed in the middle of the Rochester West by-election campaign.</p> <p>Now that he has apparently seen the error of his ways, can he guarantee to residents in my ward that the Esplanade Gardens have not simply had a stay of execution, but will now be protected, cherished and improved in a way which reflects the views of the thousands of people who signed the petition to save them?”</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. The Esplanade Gardens are currently the subject of an improvement project by our Greenspaces Development Team; this project was funded through the Rochester Riverside Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The option to create a coach park next to Rochester Cruising Club has been removed and is no longer an option being explored. Members and officers are looking at other options to provide future coach parking provision.</p>
11K	<p>Councillor Johnson submitted the following question to Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member), Councillor Mackness:</p> <p>“In view of the recent Sutton Trust's 'Stop Start' report, and its endorsement of the importance of adequately funded Children's Centres for all families and their concern over the closure of centres during the past eight years, would the Portfolio Holder</p>	<p>As I have said on repeated occasions, changes in national policy and funding arrangements for local government, including Early Years provision, required the Council to review its offer, including the number of Children's Centres and the scope of services provided. This was not about cuts in funding, rather than funding going directly to early years providers rather than to Local Authorities.</p> <p>To meet its statutory responsibilities for early childhood services and reducing inequality and in the light of funding</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>recognise that Medway Council's strategy of focusing on higher levels of parental need, rather than universal services, is the result of cuts in government funding rather than a real attempt to improve the lives of Medway children?"</p>	<p>changes, it was proposed that the Council refocuses its resources to target children and families in greater need and takes the opportunity to better integrate the range of services available to children and families, and to provide a model that offers more outreach into the community for those who need it the most. This was not about cutting services but to provide more joined up services to those who need them the most. The changes we implemented are allowing us to maximise opportunities for Children's Centres to work collaboratively with Early Help Services in the community and the model was designed after a through consultation with us listening to what residents said.</p> <p>I would suggest that we created integrated teams who are now working in partnership delivering the 'right service, to the right family at the right time'. We are already seeing the integrated teams having an impact in local communities and, at this early stage, the feedback from staff, partners and service users is positive.</p>
11L	<p>Councillor Bowler submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Adults' Services, Councillor Brake:</p> <p>"14th-20th May is national Mental Health Awareness week for 2018. Patients' groups, the voluntary sector and many practitioners are clear that despite the efforts of providers, available funding for community mental health services does not meet the needs of those in Medway who need this support.</p> <p>Will the Portfolio Holder join the Labour Group in writing to the Prime Minister to inform her of this and remind her of the commitment she made to improve funding for mental health services?"</p>	<p>The Council and our partners provide a range of services and support for people with Mental Health issues in Medway and I would like to take this opportunity pay tribute our staff and our partners for the great work that they do in our communities.</p> <p>In order to ensure that we make the best use of our available staff resources, the Adult Social Care Mental Health service is now fully integrated within the Adult Services locality model. This approach will ensure that we address client needs holistically; addressing both physical and mental health needs together. As at November 2017, 487 people were being supported by the service under a section 117 Mental Health after care arrangement.</p> <p>In the 12 months (up to and including September 2017) the Community Mental</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
		<p>Health Team (CMHT) in Medway accepted 2,960 referrals and the Crisis Resolution Home Treatment Team (CRHT) accepted 2,607 referrals.</p> <p>Medway Council also provides services that ensure there is much needed flexible support to people in our communities, including the Community Resources Hub at 147 Nelson Road and the Community Support Outreach Team, which in the last year has delivered over 21,000 direct support hours, across 104 service users.</p> <p>The Council also currently employs 4 dedicated approved mental health professionals as well as 5 additional qualified staff working within the locality teams, which ensures that we have sufficient resources to carry out statutory mental health assessments in co-operation with our partners.</p>
11M	<p>Councillor Murray submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Adults' Services, Councillor Brake:</p> <p>"I welcome the Cabinet's change of heart on the future of the RVS Centre in Chatham.</p> <p>Will the Portfolio Holder commit to a full impact assessment during the year, to demonstrate value for money, and help secure the Centre's future?"</p>	<p>Officers are already working with the Director of Community Action and her team from the Royal Voluntary Service to develop an understanding of the contribution which the Chatham team can make towards delivering benefits for the wider Medway community.</p> <p>This work will agree key performance indicators which will be reported to Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee later in the year and I have requested a progress report to Cabinet in 6 months. In the meantime the Charity will continue to benefit from the additional grant awarded by Cabinet and RVS as well as support in terms of 100% rate relief on the Chatham premises.</p>
11N	<p>Councillor Stamp submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>"Cabinet recently made the decision to transfer the Waste Collection and Cleansing</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. I am very happy to confirm that the new contract will be let on the same basis as the existing contract.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>Contract to Medway Norse from October 2019.</p> <p>Can you confirm that the existing refuse and recycling collection service will continue to be provided to Medway's residents on a weekly basis, for the entirety of the next municipal term (i.e. until at least May 2023)?"</p>	
11O	<p>Councillor Khan submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>"Does the Portfolio Holder recognise the serious impact on residents caused by cutting the Visitors' Permit in Controlled Parking Zones, particularly those with lower incomes, those who are vulnerable and those who require high levels of support from carers and family with their annual parking costs for vital support potentially increasing by over 2,000%?"</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. The new Resident Support Permit I have referred to in an earlier question* will address these concerns for our vulnerable residents. The changes to parking permits were, as I said earlier, introduced to reduce misuse and to help free up capacity for residents.</p> <p>*Public Question 7J refers (see above for details of response)</p>
11P	<p>Councillor Cooper submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>"Residents who use the Chatham Dynamic Bus Facility are becoming frustrated that the real-time bus schedule screens have not functioned for the last few weeks. The totem screens at Chatham Bus Station work intermittently, and can sometimes be difficult to read due to glare, but they are not a sufficient replacement for the other malfunctioning screens. I have been in touch with a Senior Transport Officer at the Council who informed me that the IT system is not working, but the spending moratorium has prevented officers from getting</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. Officers have been working for some time to try to identify the cause of the problems with displaying information on the large screens in the bus station. The problem is not with the screens themselves, but with how the data is transferred to them. Officers intend to engage an independent expert to try to identify and resolve the problem. This will happen as soon as possible.</p> <p>In light of the problems we are experiencing, officers make every effort to ensure that bus information is displayed on screens at the individual stops and that traditional paper timetables are available from the Information Centre. Our local bus operators also have comprehensive bus information available on their website or, in the case of Arriva, via their app, should</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	<p>the screens fixed (please see email below).</p> <p>Considering that the bus station is new and forms part of Medway's regeneration programme, not to mention the inconvenience to passengers, it is not just important but also symbolic that Chatham Dynamic Bus Facility is maintained to a high standard. As this is a new financial year, the moratorium has been lifted, please could the portfolio holder give some indication of when the screens will be fixed?</p> <p><i>Dear Cllr Cooper Thank you for your enquiry re the summary screens at Chatham Bus Station. Unfortunately we have ongoing hardware issues with the screens. We met with Infotec, our screen supplier, last year and discussed the possibility of replacing the screens but due to the spending moratorium being imposed we were unable to pursue that course of action. We have made some advances since, such as repowering the non-responsive screens. We are now working with Medway Council's IT department to try and remedy the data problem that remains. Please be assured we are continuing to work on a solution to the issue, but it is proving to be rather a difficult one to solve. Thankfully the individual totem screens are operating, giving passengers real and scheduled bus time information. Regards Senior Transport Officer"</i></p>	<p>customers have access to smartphone technology.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
11Q	<p>Councillor Maple submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Inward Investment, Strategic Regeneration and Partnerships, Councillor Rodney Chambers OBE:</p> <p>“Channel 4 have announced they are looking to relocate and create creative hubs outside of London. This would be a fantastic opportunity for Medway.</p> <p>Would the Portfolio Holder be prepared to support a bid by Medway, based on our new broadcast capabilities at the University of Kent and our expanding creative industries in Medway?”</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. Channel 4 does indeed have plans to establish a new headquarters in 2019 outside of London, with additional creative hubs also set to be created.</p> <p>The University of Kent has made an approach to Channel 4, and we are working at the highest levels with them and with the Dockyard to seek to secure this potential inward investment into Medway. This would indeed represent an excellent opportunity for Medway, building on the qualities of our Universities, the strengths of our creative industries and Medway’s reputation as one of the most promising growth areas in the UK.</p>
11R	<p>Councillor Shaw submitted the following question to the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe:</p> <p>“A close reading of the Medway Messenger article ‘Game’s up for golf course as closure is supported again’ (Thursday April 5th, 2018) revealed a significant error. It is important that the people of Medway are aware that, despite the words of Councillor Howard Doe, libraries are in fact a statutory service. I am concerned that the Tory Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services seems unaware of this fundamental policy that falls under his remit, and am concerned that Councillor Doe has been operating under this falsehood during his time managing Community Services.</p> <p>Can the Portfolio Holder confirm that they are aware that libraries are a statutory service, and that he has been treating them as</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. I am very clear on the provisions of The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, placing on local authorities a statutory duty to provide ‘a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons in the area that want to make use thereof’.</p> <p>There is no definition of what constitutes a comprehensive service, and of course a number of authorities elsewhere in the county have closed Libraries and scaled back their activities.</p> <p>But that is not a situation that Medway need fear of course, with fifteen libraries and 2 mobile libraries we are indeed providing a comprehensive and excellent service. With over 930,000 issues in 2017-18; over a million visits to libraries; and 70,000 people attending our events, we seem to be getting it right for the people of Medway. Indeed, the minister has said “It’s always good to hear about council’s such as Medway working in support of its local library services in innovative ways.</p> <p>I’d like to congratulate the Council on all the hard work that has gone into making these community hubs such a success.</p>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	such in his capacity as Portfolio Holder?"	
11S	<p>Councillor Craven submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member), Councillor Mackness:</p> <p>"I was pleased to hear at my recent visit to Abbey Court Primary School that they will by September this year have their excellent new school at maximum capacity, ensuring the most vulnerable children in Medway develop and thrive.</p> <p>In order to ensure that children who need these facilities can continue to develop at secondary level, will the Portfolio Holder co-sign a letter with the Labour Spokesperson for Children's Services, writing to the Secretary of State for Education calling for funding to be made available to complete the original plan to build new secondary school facilities at Abbey Court school?"</p>	<p>I agree that Abbey Court School provides excellent education for the children who attend it. It has been acknowledged widely that the new primary building provides superb facilities which have impacted very positively on teaching and learning for the pupils. There is, however, absolutely no evidence that there is a shortfall of secondary places at Abbey Court and therefore it is not a priority for this Council to seek funding to build secondary facilities.</p> <p>Officers are currently undertaking a detailed exercise to assess the overall special educational need and capacity across Medway so that a robust delivery plan can be determined. Then and only when priorities for SEND are determined across the authority will we be able to comment or make any representation on capital funding requirements in general and for any specific school.</p> <p>Whilst I thank Councillor Craven for her question, a letter is unnecessary.</p>
11T	<p>Councillor Osborne submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Councillor Gulvin:</p> <p>"The Luton Millennium Green has recently been bought back into Council ownership and is now a highly popular community resource with a recent event held on the 14th April securing over 500 people.</p> <p>Will the Council support the anticipated bid from the community for the Green to become an Asset of Community Value (ACV), as well as organise a meeting with the Arches Local Project and Ward Members to</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. It would not be appropriate for me to comment on an anticipated application as we would need to see the detail in the formal application. We can therefore only really provide a summary of the process and related timescales at this stage.</p> <p>As such, when a nomination is received the following processes apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the application valid and complete? If not we will request the information required in order for the application to be complete.</li> <li>• When all relevant information is received, officers will notify the applicant that the nomination has been accepted and a decision will</li> </ul>

Agenda reference	Question	Response
	secure additional play facilities for the community?"	<p>be made within eight weeks of the date of acceptance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers will identify the land owner by way of searches of the Land Registry and inform the land owner along with any relevant parish council of the accepted nomination along with the timescale for a decision to be made.</li> <li>• The register will be updated with information relating to the new nomination</li> <li>• Any responses received along with the content of the nomination will be taken into account when writing the recommendation report to ensure the decision made is based on all relevant information provided.</li> <li>• All interested parties will be informed of the decision and the register updated.</li> <li>• If the nomination is successful, Local Land Charges will be informed and a Miscellaneous Charge placed on the Local Land Charges register for a period of up to 5 years to this effect. The Land Registry will also be notified by legal and an entry of restriction placed against the title.</li> </ul>
11U	<p>Councillor Gilry submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:</p> <p>“Can the Portfolio Holder provide for each year between 2007-2017, the following three sets of figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the number of people convicted or sanctioned as a result of parking permit fraud in Medway</li> <li>(b) the percentage increase in parking permit charges</li> <li>(c) the related CPI inflation rate?”</li> </ul>	<p>(a) There are over 10 thousand permits in circulation not including daily visitor vouchers. Concerns from residents on misuse of permits are dealt with straight away and where proven a note made on the individual’s record. We are investigating how we can pull the figures out to give an accurate response but this will be a manual process and is taking a considerable amount of time. Where parking permit fraud or misuse is alleged we always take appropriate sanctions and where possible are taking steps to eliminate or reduce the risk.</p>



Agenda reference	Question	Response																																																					
		<p><b>(b) Visitor Permit Increase percentages</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Price</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007/08</td> <td>£15.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008/09</td> <td>£20.00</td> <td>33.35% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009/10</td> <td>£25.00</td> <td>25.00% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010/11</td> <td>£26.00</td> <td>04.00% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011/12</td> <td>£28.00</td> <td>07.07% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012/13</td> <td>£29.00</td> <td>03.57% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>£30.00</td> <td>03.5% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>£31.00</td> <td>03.5% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>£32.00</td> <td>03.23% increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>£33.00</td> <td>03.15% increase</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>(c) CPI inflation rates</b></p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2007/08</td> <td>2.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008/09</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009/10</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010/11</td> <td>2.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011/12</td> <td>3.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012/13</td> <td>2.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>2.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>1.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Price		2007/08	£15.00		2008/09	£20.00	33.35% increase	2009/10	£25.00	25.00% increase	2010/11	£26.00	04.00% increase	2011/12	£28.00	07.07% increase	2012/13	£29.00	03.57% increase	2013/14	£30.00	03.5% increase	2014/15	£31.00	03.5% increase	2015/16	£32.00	03.23% increase	2016/17	£33.00	03.15% increase	2007/08	2.7%	2008/09	3%	2009/10	2.3%	2010/11	2.7%	2011/12	3.8%	2012/13	2.8%	2013/14	2.2%	2014/15	1.7%	2015/16	0.3%	2016/17	0.7%
Year	Price																																																						
2007/08	£15.00																																																						
2008/09	£20.00	33.35% increase																																																					
2009/10	£25.00	25.00% increase																																																					
2010/11	£26.00	04.00% increase																																																					
2011/12	£28.00	07.07% increase																																																					
2012/13	£29.00	03.57% increase																																																					
2013/14	£30.00	03.5% increase																																																					
2014/15	£31.00	03.5% increase																																																					
2015/16	£32.00	03.23% increase																																																					
2016/17	£33.00	03.15% increase																																																					
2007/08	2.7%																																																						
2008/09	3%																																																						
2009/10	2.3%																																																						
2010/11	2.7%																																																						
2011/12	3.8%																																																						
2012/13	2.8%																																																						
2013/14	2.2%																																																						
2014/15	1.7%																																																						
2015/16	0.3%																																																						
2016/17	0.7%																																																						
11V	<p>Councillor Godwin submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Adults' Services, Councillor Brake:</p> <p>“Does the Portfolio Holder share my concern that the retrograde step of scrapping visitor permits, and the inhibitive price increase for daily tickets, will lead to an increase in social isolation?”</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. The new Resident Support Permit referred to by Cllr Filmer (public question 7J*), will address these concerns for our vulnerable residents. The changes to parking permits were of course introduced to reduce misuse and to help free up capacity for residents.</p> <p>*Public Question 7J refers (see above for details of response)</p>																																																					

Democratic Services

9 May 2018