

# **REGENERATION, COMMUNITY AND CULTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**10 AUGUST 2011**

## **WORK PROGRAMME**

Report from: Neil Davies, Chief Executive

Author: Caroline Salisbury, 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 – Rules, paragraph 22.1 (v) General terms of reference, each overview and scrutiny committee has the responsibility for setting its own work programme.

#### **2. Background**

2.1. Appendix A to this report sets out the existing work programme for the 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 27 July 2011.

3.2 The Chairman was advised that an update report on Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment was available following further consultation with the Rural Liaison Committee and others. The Chairman agreed to add it to the agenda for this meeting.

3.3 Officers also informed the Chairman that the relevant Portfolio Holders had been contacted to arrange suitable dates for attending a meeting in order to be held to account and these would be added to the work programme when finalised.

#### **4. Future work programme**

##### **4.1 Cabinet's Forward Plan**

There are no new items that have been added to the Forward Plan within the remit of this committee since the last meeting.

#### **5. Overview and Scrutiny in-depth reviews 2011/12**

- 5.1 The Chairman and Spokespersons of this committee met on 18 July 2011 and discussed items on the current work programme together with possible topics for in-depth review.
- 5.2 Members were also informed of a topic being put forward by the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the provision of adequate and appropriate supported accommodation (housing) in Medway, and the Chairman and Spokespersons agreed to support this review particularly with regard to it looking into aspects for ex-offenders and drug takers.
- 5.3 The reasoning for the choice of reviews to be put forward for selection is detailed in Appendix B.
- 5.4 In early September, all Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen and Opposition spokespersons will be invited to a meeting to review the long list of suggested in-depth review topics with the aim of reaching agreement on a recommended priority order using the feasibility criteria as a guide.
- 5.5 At the next meeting of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20 September, Members will be asked formally to discuss the suggested topics and decide how the reviews should be prioritised and timetabled.

#### **6. Financial and legal implications**

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

#### **7. Recommendations**

- 7.1 The committee is asked to:
  - (a) consider whether any changes or additions need to be made to the current work programme shown at Appendix A;
  - (b) agree the topics for in-depth review (shown at Appendix B) suggested by the Chairman and Spokespersons which will then be considered alongside other proposals from all the overview and scrutiny committees at the next meeting of the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20 September 2011.

**Background papers.** None.

**Lead officer contact**

Caroline Salisbury, Democratic Services Officer

Telephone: 01634 332013 Email: [caroline.salisbury@medway.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.salisbury@medway.gov.uk)



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

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Work type</b>	<b>Responsible officer</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Council Plan – 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	Scrutiny of performance/budget	Anna-Marie Lawrence-Lovell, Performance Manager	To consider the Council Plan – 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	10 August 2011
Review of the Winter Services Task Group report	Scrutiny	Phil Moore, Head of Highways and Parking Services	To review the Winter Services Policy and Winter Service Plan arrangements following the task group report in November 2010.	10 August 2011
Local Development Framework (LDF) – Core Strategy	Policy development	Brian McCutcheon, Regional and Local Planning Manager	This report will set out details of the LDF Core Strategy (publication version) and request comments from the committee as part of the consultation process.	4 October 2011
Council Plan – 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	Scrutiny of performance/budget	Anna-Marie Lawrence-Lovell, Performance Manager	To consider the Council Plan – 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	13 December 2011
Review of the waste contracts	Scrutiny of performance/budget	Sarah Dagwell, Head of waste services	To review the first year's performance for each of the waste contracts	13 December 2011
Kent Fire and Rescue Service – update	Service information	Steve Griffiths, Kent Fire and Rescue	Update on what has changed in the provision of services and the improvements achieved.	13 December/ 31 January 2012

Item	Work type	Responsible officer	Objectives	Timescale
Probation service – prevention of future generations offending	Service information	Maurice O'Reilly, Kent Probation	Report on the work undertaken with families to prevent future generations offending.	13 December/ 31 January 2012
Council Plan – 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	Scrutiny of performance/budget	Anna-Marie Lawrence-Lovell, Performance Manager	To consider the Council Plan – 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	3 April 2012
End of year performance report 2011/2012	Scrutiny of performance/budget	Anna-Marie Lawrence-Lovell, Performance Manager	To consider the Council Plan – 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter monitoring 2011/2012	To be confirmed
Increase in powers for Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs)	Service information	Neil Howlett, Community Safety Partnership Manager and Kent Police	This report will detail an increase in powers for PCSOs.	To be confirmed
Medway Housing Design Standards	Policy development	Frances Madders, Senior Urban Design Officer	To consider the guide produced to advise on the main principles, minimum layout and space standards that will be expected in the design of new housing, prior to decision by Cabinet.	To be confirmed

**Future meeting dates:**

2011: 10 August; 4 October; 13 December

2012: 31 January; 3 April

**Work completed in 2011/12:**16 June 2011

- End of year performance report 2010/2011
- Petition referral
- Six month update on progress of the recommendations of the PACT review
- Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Plan
- Annual scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP)
- Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Water Regulations 2009

**PROPOSED TOPICS FOR IN-DEPTH REVIEW AND THEMED MEETINGS**

<p><b>Street access issues – de-cluttering town centres</b> (task group review)</p>	<p><b>Reason for Review</b></p> <p>Members have expressed an interest in understanding and balancing the needs of competing interests of items placed upon the public highway and to make a series of recommendations that can be practically implemented to reduce the street clutter in Medway town centres similar to recent refurbishments to Union Street, Chatham and Corporation Street, Rochester.</p> <p><b>National/local context</b></p> <p><u>Nationally</u>: English Heritage have published a document in 2009 The Public Realm and Historic Areas.</p> <p><u>Locally</u>: Adoption of Public Realm Strategy for Chatham that contains design principles and materials to be used.</p> <p>Historic Rochester Conservation Area appraisal and management plan that contains a set of principles that help guide the management of the conservation area. That includes principles on de-cluttering.</p> <p>When complaints are made about street furniture these are dealt with by Design and Conservation Team.</p> <p>As part of the validation of planning applications and design our planning policies cover the impact on the street scene and accessibility.</p> <p><b>Performance indicators (where relevant)</b></p> <p>There are no directly relevant performance indicators although this will be reviewed at scoping stage</p>
---	---

<p><b>Street access issues – de-cluttering town centres</b> (continued)</p>	<p><b>Public feedback/interest in issue (where known)</b></p> <p>Feedback has been received from a variety of sources relating to street furniture and amenities including:</p> <p>Comments via the <b>Rochester Visitors Survey 2009</b> : –</p> <p>Over 94% of all respondents rated the road signs, pedestrian signs and the display maps and information boards as being ‘good’ or ‘very good’.</p> <p>Road signs and pedestrian signs both received the highest mean scores of all destinations within the ‘All Historic Towns’ group.</p> <p>Comments via the <b>June 2009 Medway Council and NHS Medway Disability Consultation Event</b> : included references to a number of service providers such as the bus service within Medway, poor access to specific shops due to steps, not enough dropped kerbs to assist disabled drivers, disabled toilets not located centrally and stiff doors in public buildings, including Medway hospital. Attendees felt it was important that those with a disability were aware of what facilities were available and where they were located eg disabled parking and disabled toilets. Websites and the Beverly text messaging service were given as good examples of where such information could be found.</p>
<p><b>Impact of European funding</b> (task group review)</p>	<p><b>Reason for Review</b></p> <p>In the current financial climate it is suggested that Overview and Scrutiny could review how effective Medway is at obtaining EU funding for projects and how this funding is used to formulate recommendations on how priorities for future projects should be determined to maximise impact and value for money.</p> <p><b>National/local context</b></p> <p><u>Nationally</u>: in relation to Interreg funding (which is a programme of specific funding involving cross border collaboration between coastal regions of the UK, Belgium, Holland and France), Medway Council is the lead partner for more EU funded projects than any other local authority in the coastal and maritime areas of</p>



<p><b>Impact of European funding</b> (continued)</p>	<p>Southern and Eastern England.</p> <p><u>Locally</u>: by match-funding Government funds, Medway has been able to lever in £15 million of funding from the EU over the past 10 years.</p> <p>Examples of initiatives with support from EU funding are:</p> <p>Through the Flexible New Deal programme, 409 people have found employment and 654 have accessed support since November 2009.</p> <p>The “Employ Medway” shop in Chatham exceeded its target for the number of people assisted into employment (6,000 plus) until March 2011.</p> <p>The employment rate in Medway has increased from 66.8% (September 2010) to 68.3% (December 2010). An extra 2,600 people have found employment during this period. This is the highest increase across Kent and Medway and also amongst our family of similar authorities.</p> <p><b>Performance indicators (where relevant)</b></p> <p>Two of the Council Plan 2011/2012 priorities are: “we will support the building of strong communities where people feel they belong” and “we will work to ensure that people have the skills they need to take up job opportunities created.”</p> <p>NI 1 - % of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area (LAA).  NI 4 - % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality (LAA).  ECD49a – number of people involved in neighbourhood work  ECD49b – number of hours given to neighbourhood work  LRCC3 – number of intensive assists to local businesses  LRCC4 – number of jobs created and safeguarded  ECD7b – new registrations by local people accessing employment support services  ECD8b(ii) – number of jobs taken up in the period (FND)  ECD48c – employment that has lasted 28 weeks</p>
--	---

<b>Impact of European funding</b> (continued)	<b>Public feedback/interest in issue (where known)</b>  As part of NI 1 (% of people who think that people from different backgrounds get on well together) – in a recent citizens panel survey about what influences feelings of community, 88% agreed/strongly agreed that people trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly helps to bring the community together. 16 – 24 year olds were more likely to strongly agree than other age groups.
--	---