

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 10 April 2017

Present: Councillor Catherine Rankin (Chair)
Councillors Hills (Vice-Chairman), Dawlings, Hannam, Hill, Huggett, Ms Palmer,
Simmons and Woodward

Officers in Attendance: Adam Chalmers (Head of Communities and Engagement), Jane Clarke (Head of Policy and Governance), Terry Hughes (Community Safety Manager), Michael Josh (Project Manager, Business Delivery Unit), Gary Stevenson (Head of Environment and Street Scene) and Paul Taylor (Director of Change and Communities)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor WeatherlyWeatherly and Hamilton

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

OSC73/15 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chapelard, Gray and Uddin

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

OSC74/15 There were no declarations of interest made, within the provisions of the Code of Conduct for Members.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

OSC75/15 The minutes of the meeting dated 13 February 2017 were submitted.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Committee meeting dated 13 February 2017 be agreed.

ITEMS CALLED IN UNDER OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULE 13

OSC76/15 There were no items which had been called-in under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 12.

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

OSC77/15 The Chair, Councillor Rankin, confirmed the order of the agenda. Prior to consideration of the substantive items on the agenda, Carl Ward, a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) in Tunbridge Wells, spoke to the Committee and outlined some of the key roles undertaken by him in his role:

- Reducing anti-social behaviour; assisting and supporting vulnerable people in the community.
- Helping with crime enquiries and allowing police officers to target specific areas of crime.
- Working with schools to educate and target nuisance youths.
- Reacting to incidents at 'hotspot' areas and dealing with nuisance young people who commit criminal damage.

- Developing the job role further including the tackling of domestic abuse.

Members expressed the following views:

Councillor Woodward wanted to clarify whether PCSOs maintained sufficient cover of their own areas and asked whether, in view of limited resources, the deployment of PCSOs was driven by a requirement to cover areas according to demand, rather than the individual skill-sets of officers. PCSO Ward advised that PCSOs had areas where they primarily worked, but that officers would pool together when required, if particular skills were needed. Councillor Woodward further asked if the PCSOs were deployed on a daily basis, following a morning meeting, or whether more advanced notice was given. PCSO Ward confirmed that, when responding to a large-scale incident, more notice was received, but that on a daily basis it depended on the workload and the PCSOs self-briefed. PCSO Ward added that officers were free to attend Community Safety Unit meetings, but that, again, attendance depended on the workload at the time.

Councillor Huggett asked how the PCSOs divided their time between the various roles they undertook. PCSO Ward advised that this was dictated by events. He added however, that where time allowed, the focus would be on patrolling their designated areas. He further added that, where risk assessments identified a need to support vulnerable people, this would become a priority.

Councillor Simmons asked if PCSO Ward was the only PCSO responsible for his patch and also asked under which circumstances a resident should contact a PCSO, as opposed to a police officer. PCSO Ward advised that he covered his area on his own. However, two additional PCSOs were currently undertaking training, and although ultimately they would be given their own areas, broadly it would reduce the workload for all the PCSOs in the borough. In regard to which area of police force to contact, PCSO Ward said that there would be occasions where an incident could only be dealt with by a police officer; however, the first point of contact when reporting a crime would always be calling 101 or 999. PCSO Ward added that the staff who dealt with these calls were skilled at filtering the incidents to the relevant areas.

Councillor Bill Hills commented that he had had cause to contact the 101 number recently and although the member of staff he eventually spoke to dealt with his enquiry professionally, it had taken some time to get through to the right person. Councillor Hills went on to say that the first point of contact for residents when reporting non-emergencies should be the 101 number and not the PCSOs directly. PCSO Ward confirmed that the 101 number was the appropriate point of contact as it provided an audited trail of the incident. Councillor Hills then asked what the difference in powers was between a PCSO and a police constable. PCSO Ward advised that the main additional power of police officers over PCSOs was that of arrest, whereas as PCSOs adopted a less assertive position. He added that PCSOs had the power to enforce Section 59 of the 2002 Police Reform Act, which was used mainly to enforce incidents of anti-social behaviour and particularly in respect of nuisance vehicle driving, such as loud motorbikes. PCSO Ward further added that PCSOs would not normally attend incidents where their powers were not appropriate. However, if a PCSO did find themselves in this type of situation, support from police officers was normally quick in arriving.

Councillor Dianne Hill said that, historically, Southborough and High Brooms had maintained a good rapport with PCSOs, however, due to an inconsistency with the level of support provided; she did not feel this reflected the current situation. PCSO Ward said that he was keen to re-establish a working relationship with residents in Southborough and High Brooms and was working hard towards this. Councillor Hill said that councillors in Southborough and High Brooms needed to work more closely with PCSOs.

Councillor Rankin suggested that, through the Community Safety Unit, an event could be held allowing Councillors to meet the PCSOs in their areas. The Community Safety Manager, Terry Hughes, felt this would be a useful event. He added that a community event was being planned for 2017, in the town centre, which he hoped PCSOs would be able to attend. He further suggested that it would be beneficial if borough councillors were provided with contact details for the PCSOs who covered their areas.

RESOLVED to note the update.

PORTFOLIO HOLDER PLANS AND PROGRESS - COMMUNITIES AND WELLBEING

OSC78/15 Councillor Lynne Weatherly, Portfolio Holder for Communities and Wellbeing, outlined the achievements within her portfolio over the last year and her ambitions for year ahead. Councillor Weatherly referred Members to her Portfolio Holder Statement - appendix A to the report and highlighted the following areas:

- Good progress had been made with community hubs – a model was in place for the Southborough Hub to deliver a new facility and work on plans for Cranbrook and Paddock Wood was ongoing. A long-term solution was being sought for the TN2 building in Sherwood including potential for a health hub
- A new Health Inequalities Action Plan had been produced which would help address some of the health inequalities in the borough. Work had also started towards health devolution which would see a new approach to health being delivered across West Kent.
- A new Housing and Homelessness Strategy was being developed and work had been completed with the new Better Care Funding Scheme - allowing a hospital discharge service to be put in place for older and vulnerable residents. The scheme had already assisted 46 residents in returning to their homes.
- The Dowding House project was a scheme which would see the council implementing a new solution for temporary accommodation – providing improved accommodation for vulnerable families and at the same time saving the Council money.
- Looking ahead the Council would aim to secure planning permission and external funding for the Cultural and Learning Hub. Work would start on-site with the Southborough Hub and detailed plans would be worked up for community hubs in Cranbrook and Paddock Wood.
- The Health Devolution agenda would move forward and work undertaken to establish a West Kent Community Safety Partnership (CSP), ensuring

that West Kent had the appropriate partners involved with regard to community safety.

- There were pockets of deprivation in Tunbridge Wells and it was vital that these areas were included when looking forward, and that families who struggled financially, did not find it difficult living in a town considered to be relatively wealthy. The Council would be working closely with the Town and Country Housing Group as part of the Sherwood Partnership to address issues such as job finding and skills learning.

Councillor Weatherly also updated Members on the work of the West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group Health and Wellbeing Board which included: the appointment of task and finish groups; reviews of policies and strategies such as safeguarding; presentations from groups such as Healthwatch; and reports from other Kent health and wellbeing boards.

Members expressed the following views:

Councillor Woodward expressed concern at the level of resources available for community safety and particularly in respect of PCSO numbers. Councillor Woodward questioned whether the already scarce resources would be reduced further as a result of devolution to a West Kent CSP. Councillor Woodward also asked whether the police were using PCSOs in an expanding role that prevented them from undertaking their traditional duties.

Councillor Weatherly did not consider that the plans for a West Kent CSP had progressed to a level involving finer detail. The Head of Communities and Engagement, Adam Chalmers, said that a West Kent CSP would not directly affect the numbers of PCSO's as these were determined by Kent Police's resource and recruiting policies. He added, however, that the Council did receive regular updates on PCSO numbers. He further added that, a West Kent CSP would be focused around the partner organisations, including Kent Police. Mr Chalmers said that part of the devolution agenda would involve Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council and Sevenoaks District Council. Mr Chalmers went on to say that the advantages of the arrangement would be the involvement of more senior police officers, senior health representatives, senior borough councillors, and importantly, senior Kent County Council representatives – providing a more strategic view of the issues faced by a CSP.

Councillor Woodward expressed concern about the number of PCSO's across the borough and whether the current procurement process for officers provided sufficient cover across the borough and the resources needed. He asked additionally, to what extent the council was able to influence the situation. Terry Hughes, the Community Safety Manager, confirmed that the number of PCSOs in was an issue and the borough was understaffed when compared to the number the police considered appropriate. Mr Hughes added that, the borough being statistically the safest place to live in Kent was a factor in determining numbers. Mr Chalmers advised that, Kent Police could be contacted to provide a detailed response, which would include the number of PCSOs considered necessary and the actual number currently designated to the borough.

Councillor Hills referred to the Council's Housing Policy and asked to what degree the Council influenced the mix of tenures and whether the Council

was concerned about the lack of new homes for rent provided by Housing Associations (HAs). He also asked whether the government's instructions for HAs to reduce rent levels had impacted on their ability to invest in providing new rental properties. Councillor Weatherly advised that the Council had a housing officer who, as well as working with the private rental sector, worked to increase the availability of social housing. Councillor Weatherly confirmed that the Council's aim was to support the building of 70 social housing units each year. Councillor Weatherly further advised that the housing policy was government led, with the criteria changing frequently and the Council could only hope that, at some point, social housing would be made a priority. Councillor Weatherly went on to say that the Council helped to make the most of the social housing available by encouraging occupiers to downsize. She said financial support was also given to residents where private rental was the best option, through providing bonds. Councillor Weatherly also said the Government policies – a reduction in rent by one percent and encouraging individuals to own, or part own property, had impacted on the ability of Councils to support the provision of social housing. Councillor Weatherly added that the high property and rental prices in the borough made the situation difficult.

Councillor Rankin asked if the Better Care fund was part of the Government's Sustainable Transformation Plan and what involvement the Council had in the government's agenda to integrate health and social care. Councillor Weatherly said the Sustainability and Transformation Plan was at an early stage, and was an ongoing process, but would look at the way care was provided and how people could be supported in receiving care at home, as well as focusing on measures that would prevent hospitalisation in the first place. She added that the Plan was being reviewed by health and wellbeing boards, and district councils were working closely with Kent County Council, particularly with regards to public health. Councillor Weatherly said the key aims were for people to stay well, to receive the best treatment when they became ill, and to have as short a stay in hospital as necessary. Councillor Weatherly said the Better Care Fund would provide the necessary facilities in people's homes to aid recovery.

Councillor Rankin asked what the time frame was for the West Kent Health and Wellbeing Board was to complete its work towards the Sustainability and Transformation Plan. The Head of Environment and Street Scene, Gary Stevenson advised that the Plan was included on the agenda for the next meeting of the West Kent Health and Wellbeing Board. Mr Stevenson also confirmed that the Chief Executive, William Benson, had been invited to a meeting of the Sustainability and Transformation Board.

Councillor Rankin asked if, as a result of new powers, local housing associations in the borough had agreed to provide fixed term¹ tenancies instead of tenancies for life. Councillor Weatherly advised that some of the new tenancies in the Sherwood Ward were for three year periods and were subject to close monitoring in the initial period, for anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Dianne Hill asked how the Better Care Fund fitted in with enablement teams in hospitals. Councillor Weatherly advised that the Council employed a member of staff to work specifically on the Better Care Fund and they worked with the enablement teams as part of that role. Councillor Rankin expressed concern that the budget and role for the Fund would be subsumed at county level.

RESOLVED to note the Portfolio Holder's update.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

OSC79/15 The Chair, Councillor Rankin, introduced the report which detailed the work of the Community Safety Unit over the previous year. The Community Safety Manager, Terry Hughes, highlighted the following areas:

- Tunbridge Wells remained the safest place in Kent, with an increase the previous year of 245 crimes in a twelve month period (the smallest increase in the 12 Kent areas).
- Most of the crime recorded had been in the town centre and residential areas such as Broadwater, Southborough and High Brooms; much of the CSP's work was focused in these areas.
- There was no discernible increase in anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the twelve month period although there were places where ASB was a persistent problem and these were being targeted.
- Loud and nuisance motorbikes had been an issue, although one instance could generate several crime reports, which sometimes exaggerated the depth of the issue.
- Groups of 13-20 year olds congregating in the evenings in certain areas resulted in the generation of crime reports. Larger groups of (slightly older) youths congregated in the town centre, and in and around car parks, with some anti-social behaviour taking place.
- There had been a reduction in burglaries although outbuildings still remained a target; there would be more focus on encouraging householders to lock up sheds and garages.
- There had been a sharp rise in sexual offences (after a consistently low number in previous years) although this included a number of historic cases.
- There had been a 50 percent reduction in drug trafficking, with Chief Inspector Dave Pate's zero tolerance policy and focus on tackling London drug gangs who dealt in the town, having an effect. However, drug possession offences had only reduced by 3 percent over the same twelve month period.
- Vehicle crime was low in Tunbridge Wells when compared to other Kent areas and had reduced steadily over a four year period.

The priorities over the year ahead were:

- Although increasing across the county, Tunbridge Wells had the lowest rates of domestic abuse in Kent. However, the repeat rates (42 percent) were higher than other areas and would be a focus for providers over the next twelve months.
- There had been a low take-up of the Community Domestic Abuse

Programme and this would be looked at as part of the Partnership's work. Domestic Abuse continued to be a priority for all authorities in West Kent and the Partnership would continue to support the Programme and the Domestic Abuse Volunteer Support Services.

- There had been a good reduction in most categories of road safety (including children). Injured and slightly injured figures had reduced by half. There had, however, been an increase in the killed or seriously injured figures for cyclists from five to ten. There had also been a small increase in the slightly injured figure for over 65s. The CSP had invested in two speed indication devices, one of which had gone to the St John's area to support the work being done by the 20's Plenty programme. KCC wardens would continue their work with the public in towns, villages and schools on road safety education.
- Violent crime had previously been a priority and the CSP would continue working with the Tunbridge Wells Safe Town Partnership in tackling incidents of violent crime in the town centre. The Safe Town Partnership had a number of exclusions in place.
- Arrests for drunkenness had halved from 119 to 56 and the number of incidents of multiple arrests had reduced from 55 to 25. This was due to work done by the Safe Town Partnership in collaboration with the Council's Licensing Team in highlighting to night-time establishments the incidents that took place on their doors, as people moved from one venue to another. The funding of street pastors continued – allowing them to continue their work in engaging with the night-time economy. The Street Pastors provided a positive presence and liaised with the police when assistance was needed.
- There had been a significant increase in hate crime nationally but only a small increase locally. Police data for the weeks before and after the EU referendum reflected an increase in religious and faith based crime. However, the levels decreased to normal levels several weeks after. Tunbridge Wells borough had the fifth highest number of gender and sexual identity related hate-crimes with an increase from 53 to 89 incidents. A community liaison officer was based with the Community Safety Unit (CSU) in the Town Hall and was managing 102 cases where hate-crime was a primary or secondary factor.
- Hospital admissions due to the affect of alcohol or psycho-active substances had continued to reduce from the previous year with a reduction of 94 admissions over the twelve month reporting period. The highest overall levels of admissions came from the town centre, Pembury and Sherwood. Reports of cannabis use by young people in open spaces in the borough continued to be received. Kenwood Trust outreach workers, street pastors, the Street Cruiser, and police operations continued to be deployed to engage with these groups.
- The CSP introduced a pilot scheme in 2016/17, to look at common crime types and different themes, and evaluate how these matched with the priorities already identified by the Partnership. The scheme supported those priorities already identified, but also highlighted the victimisation of vulnerable people as a result of criminal activity, as an area of focus. Child sexual exploitation, gangs, organised crime and modern slavery

were all areas where individuals were coerced into criminal activity. These areas should be considered by organisations when producing safeguarding policies or strategies.

Members expressed the following views:

Councillor Rankin queried the reduction in the number of arrests and asked whether the figures reflected a reduction in actual crime or other factors such as a reduction in resources (both police officers and PCSOs), or the availability of the 101 number. Factors which she said could impact on the ability of the police to make arrests. Mr Hughes said the CSP compared figures from year-to-year and there was an increased confidence in town centre safety. He added, however, that Councillor Rankin had a valid point and the factors she referred to would be considered when looking at the same figures the following year.

Councillor Dianne Hill felt that hate-crime was under reported and as a borough councillor she had been made aware of incidents by residents who were too scared to contact the police. Mr Hughes acknowledged this as an issue.

Councillor Woodward asked how the CSP would gauge its impact on issues involving vulnerable victims if traditional methods of measuring results were not used. Mr Hughes said the CSP would need to start with a base line and looking nationally, there were already plans in place, with statutory requirements for a number of agencies (particularly with regard to PREVENT) and Tunbridge Wells Borough's CSP would utilise the work already undertaken. He added that there would be measurable outcomes through the CSP's action plans that would provide an understanding of how agencies such as Caregivers, the YMCA and Chapter 1 monitored the support they provided to vulnerable people.

Councillor Simmons asked what level of funding was available to the CSP. Mr Hughes confirmed that £28,484 was made available by the Police and Crime Commissioner and £10,000 was received from the borough council. Mr Hughes confirmed that a funding spreadsheet with the detail was available to Members. Councillor Simmons also asked for clarification on how domestic abuse had become a top priority. Mr Hughes confirmed that the priorities identified were not listed in terms of importance.

Councillor Bill Hills asked what measures would be taken to deal with drug related crime, which he said was commonly witnessed in his ward. He also asked how this type of crime, as well as violent crime would be dealt with, should the Council make a decision to go over to passive CCTV monitoring. Mr Hughes said it was difficult to get intelligence from the police following the reporting of a drug related incident resulting from work done by the CSP. Mr Hughes confirmed that the police were reluctant to feedback in case it impacted on the overall intelligence picture. Mr Hughes added that, should Members wish, he would make efforts to provide more detail where the CSU had reported instances of drug dealing to the police. With regard to CCTV, the Head of Communities and Engagement, Adam Chalmers, confirmed that, subject to Cabinet approval, the proposals for moving to passive monitoring would not be implemented until April 2018. He also confirmed that, although it worked closely with the Council, the Safe Town Partnership was a separate entity and would continue with its Safe Town Radio Scheme. Mr Chalmers

went on to say that studies demonstrated that CCTV did not instigate a large number of arrests or necessarily prevent crime taking place. Councillor Hills said that he believed that the use of active monitoring of CCTV acted as a strong deterrent, but also accepted that it sometimes only displaced crime and wholly prevent it.

Councillor Rankin noted that the Council's road safety vehicle was not referred to in the report and asked if it was having an impact on road safety in the borough. Mr Hughes did not have details to hand and agreed to report back to Councillor Rankin.

Councillor Bill Hills asked if neighbourhood watch schemes were still active in the borough. Mr Hughes confirmed that West Kent Neighbourhood Watch was still active although it struggled occasionally in getting volunteers. Mr Hughes offered to provide contact details after the meeting.

Councillor Rankin referred to a massage parlour in the town and asked if, through the work of the Licensing Team, it had been closed down. The Head of Environment and Street Scene, Gary Stevenson, advised that the establishment was still there, however, using environmental health powers the police had been assisted in its work and an application had been made for special treatment. Councillor Rankin said it was a good example of the local authority working alongside the police.

RESOLVED to endorse the Community Safety Partnership Plan for 2017/18.

CIVIC COMPLEX DEVELOPMENT

OSC80/15 The Chair, Councillor Rankin, introduced the report which updated Members on the civic development. The Head of Economic Development, David Candlin, highlighted the following points:

- The report focused on highlighting the information made available by the Council including previous reports. Information was also available on the Council's website together with links to redacted reports. A number of questions had been received from residents and responses from the Council signposted the enquiries to the reports that held the relevant information.
- The Council was due to move forward with a significant element of consultation (including an all-member briefing the following day) which would highlight some of the key elements of the framework and broaden out the significance of the project in terms of planning.
- Members would be updated on the massing and scale of the development as well as the impact on Calverley Grounds. There would also be engagement with stakeholders such as the Friends of Calverley Grounds.
- The Development Framework consultation would start on 20 June 2017; however, the Planning Policy Working Group had already been consulted on the development framework by the Head of Planning Policy.
- The consultation was high level but would include a section focusing on the design and vision for the complex. The consultation would be open to the public for a six week period and would include staffed events to

encourage public engagement.

- An online petition had been received and accepted by the Council which asked for reconsideration of the proposals and cited, in part, the potential damage to Calverley Grounds. The member briefing would detail the actual impact on part of Calverley Grounds during any construction phase and the overall impact post-development.
- Looking ahead, there would be a more intense communications framework; with a continuing open door policy for Members should they have questions.

Members expressed the following views:

Councillor Woodward felt the Council membership had been well informed throughout the process. He went on to ask whether those Members on the Planning Committee would fetter their discretion when considering a future application. Mr Candlin said he would contact the Legal Team and ask them to provide a broader comment for Planning Committee members.

Councillor Bill Hills asked when residents in the borough would be consulted on the cost of the development and the potential impact on Council services. Mr Candlin clarified that a report would be presented to Full Council that dealt with cost. Mr Candlin advised that Members had already been briefed by the Council's Director of Finance, Policy and Development on the budget for the development. Mr Candlin added that the Council would need to make two key decisions based on an overall package of information that would be included in the RIBA stage 3 report on the development – funding and affordability. Mr Candlin said the work included in Stage 3 would provide significantly more detail and a level of information that offered greater assurance to Members in terms of the estimated development costs. Mr Candlin further added that, as the Council approached the point where a decision was needed, the levels of risk within the cost figures would have been reduced. Mr Candlin added that, the decision making process was expected to start in November 2017 and prior to this, there would be a 10-11 week period during which discussions would be held with Members. Mr Candlin clarified that there would not be a separate public consultation on the development costs and that the decision as to whether the project would proceed or not was for borough councillors alone.

Councillor Rankin asked what would happen if the majority of public responses rejected the Development Framework. Mr Candlin said the Framework referred to policies that were already included in the Council's Local Plan and set out key elements such as mix of uses, how the civic site would be treated going forward and how any impact on Calverley Grounds could be minimised.

Councillor Hannam felt that residents in the borough should be consulted as to whether or not they wished to pay for a large development in the town. Mr Candlin reiterated that the Framework document linked into the planning process and set out the parameters within which the existing civic complex and the proposed development could be brought forward. He added that the final decision on the Development was for Full Council to make.

The Director of Change and Communities, Paul Taylor, reminded Members

that the proposals were included in the Council's Five Year Plan, which was also subject to public consultation.

Councillor Huggett felt there was a degree of disinformation and expressed concern that the final decision would not reflect the views of residents.

Councillor Bill Hills felt that a fact sheet, provided to members for distribution to residents, would be a useful means of keeping the public accurately informed on the development. The Head of Communities and Engagement, Adam Chalmers, advised that, alongside the proposals, a communications plan was being developed which would include the provision of briefing/FAQ documents to Members, highlighting the key elements of the Development. He added that items would also be included in the next two Local magazine issues, as well as regular briefings to the press.

Councillor Rankin expressed concern that, by including articles in 'Local magazine', a positive spin was being placed on a decision which had not yet been made by the Council. Mr Chalmers said the intention was to both clearly present the proposals, the components of the project and the costs.

Councillor Palmer said the Council would need to provide a large amount of information to the public and she felt that, in view of the costs and the momentous nature of the decision, the only way to get a view from the public was through a referendum. Councillor Rankin asked if a referendum had been considered at all. Mr Candlin advised that it had not.

Councillor Simmons referred to the communications plan, as part of the Development and said it was important to remember that, the development of new offices and a new theatre linked into the civic complex, and the public would want to be advised as to the future of the civic site as well as the Development proposals. He added that, there were two financial costs to consider – the capital costs and the running costs, and they both had a possible impact. Mr Chalmers advised that both these issues would be included in the communication plan. Mr Chalmers advised that a referendum was entirely within the gift of the Council but would have a cost attached.

Councillor Huggett said the cost of a referendum, although much less than that projected for the development, should be considered against the cost to the borough of not developing the town for the benefit of future generations.

RESOLVED to note the report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

OSC81/15 The chair, Councillor Rankin, introduced the draft report and advised Members that they should contact the Scrutiny and Performance Officer, Nick Peeters, should there be any amendments they wished to be considered. Councillor Rankin confirmed that, subject to any further amendments, the report would be considered by Full Council on 26 July 2017.

RESOLVED to note the report.

TAKING A COORDINATED APPROACH TO PROJECT PLANNING

OSC82/15 The Chair, Councillor Rankin, introduced the report which detailed the work

undertaken by the Council towards project planning. The Business Development Unit Project Manager, Michael Josh, highlighted the following points from the report:

- The Programme Management Office (PMO) was a standard approach within many local authorities and businesses towards project planning, ensuring a consistent view of projects across the organisation.
- Through the PMO, dependencies are known and managed, the risks of combined delivery of projects are understood and security is provided for the delivery of those projects.
- A report is produced every month for each project and the reports are made available to the Council's Management Board regularly. The PMO ensures that an independent assessment of the status for each project and how it links to other projects is undertaken.

Members expressed the following views:

Councillor Rankin asked if Mr Josh had received Prince 2 training. Mr Josh said the training was available within the Council and he had an understanding of the principles. Councillor Rankin then noted 2.2 and 2.3 of the report which referred to the function being either 'passive' or 'active' and asked how this status was determined. Mr Josh advised that this element was in the gift of Management Board – who understood the roles of the PMO. Mr Josh added that, primarily, the approach taken was passive and this included the provision of consistent information, but in some instances health checks and reviews on projects were undertaken and this represented a more active approach.

Councillor Woodward asked if there was any Member involvement in the Programme Management Board. Mr Josh advised that the Programme Management Board was a role undertaken by Management Board and there was no Member involvement.

Councillor Rankin asked if the PMO was set up as a result of the number of projects due to be undertaken by the Council, or because of issues that had arisen with projects in the past. The Director of Change and Communities, Paul Taylor, advised that it was combination of the two. He said an example of a project that could have been delivered more successfully was the Partnership Planning Support Project. Mr Taylor added that one of the first projects undertaken by Mr Josh was to bring the Planning Support Service back in-house, which was completed on time and within budget. Mr Taylor further added that the Management Board had looked at the risks associated with the growing number of large cross-cutting projects being undertaken and resourced a passive PMO. Mr Taylor went on to say that individual projects had their own, separate project support and there was Member representation on the relevant project board.

Councillor Rankin suggested that a similar presentation be provided for all Members.

RESOLVED to note the report.

CIVIC AMENITY VEHICLE SERVICE - UPDATE ON REVIEW

OSC83/15 The Chair, Councillor Rankin, introduced the report which provided an update on the review of the Civic Amenity Vehicle Service. The Head of Environment and Street Scene, Gary Stevenson, highlighted the following points:

The Recycling/Household Waste Contract Task and Finish Group, as part of its work, had recommended that a report on the review be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, following input from the Parish Chairmen's Forum.

The report provided a six-month update following changes to the service and appendix A was an extract from minutes of the Parish Chairmen's Forum meeting (where the same report was considered).

The report included detail on the amount of materials collected since the service had changed and how this was separated. The report confirmed that the amount of waste sent to landfill had reduced and the split-service allowed more compostable material to be collected as garden waste.

The changes helped residents focus on which materials could be recycled. Work had been done with residents at the point of disposal and enforcement work had also been carried out to deal with illegal commercial waste.

Councillor Hannam said the figures for fly-tipping had been useful and asked if an annual report could be produced for these figures solely. Mr Stevenson advised that the figures could be extracted and provided as twelve-months of data, as part of the Sustainability Portfolio Holder's update.

Councillor Rankin asked if there was an intention to start charging residents for potentially non-domestic waste e.g. DIY waste. Mr Stevenson advised that, as a waste disposal issue, this was a county council function. He was aware, however, that Kent County Council was reviewing its waste disposal strategy and the household waste recycling sites would be included as part of the review. Councillor Rankin asked if there was any update on the provision of an additional amenity site to the east of the borough by KCC. Mr Stevenson advised that the Leader of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Councillor Jukes, had been in conversation with the KCC Cabinet Member for Planning, Highways, Transport and Waste, Matthew Balfour, about exploring opportunities for an additional site. Mr Stevenson added that KCC had not identified any land that would be suitable.

Councillor Dawlings said it would be ideal from the borough council's perspective for a new site to come forward at the same time as a new household recycling and waste contract was agreed, and asked if this was likely. Mr Stevenson reiterated that it was ultimately a decision for KCC but added that the recommendation from the Recycling/Household Waste Contract Task and Finish Group, that KCC and neighbouring district councils be asked to discuss the feasibility of a site, was due to be considered by the Cabinet and would hopefully receive support.

RESOLVED to note the report.

REPORT OF THE TACKLING EXCESSIVE SPEEDS IN RURAL AREAS TASK AND FINISH GROUP

OSC84/15 The Chair of the Tackling Excessive Speeds in Rural Areas Task and Finish Group, Councillor Bill Hills, advised Members that a full draft of the report would be made available to next scheduled meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny, Committee, 12 June 2017, subject to the views of the Task and Finish Group.

Councillor Hills advised that one of the draft recommendations from the Task and Finish Group (the distribution of road safety posters by the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Licensing and Food safety Teams when visiting premises) had already been taken up by the officers concerned.

RESOLVED to note the update.

TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - VERBAL UPDATE FROM SCRUTINY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

OSC85/15 The Scrutiny and Performance Officer, Nick Peeters, updated Members on the status of the Committee's task and finish groups.

RESOLVED to note the update

WORK PROGRAMME

OSC86/15 The Committee discussed its work programme for 2017/18.

Councillor Palmer had received comments from residents and parish councillors regarding the provision of rural bus services and asked that it be considered as an item for the work programme.

Councillor Hills suggested that a review of how scrutiny operates in other authorities would be useful piece of work and serve to inform the scrutiny function at Tunbridge Wells.

RESOLVED to note the Committee's work programme and options for adding to it.

URGENT BUSINESS

OSC87/15 There was no urgent business.

DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

OSC88/15 It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee would take place on Monday 12 June 2017.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 8.45 pm.