

additional papers 1

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tue 2 Jul
2013
7.00 pm

Committee Room 2
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

The Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 widened the rights of press and public to attend Local Authority meetings and to see certain documents. Recently the Freedom of Information Act 2000, has further broadened these rights, and limited exemptions under the 1985 Act.

Your main rights are set out below:-

- Automatic right to attend all Council and Committee meetings unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Automatic right to inspect agenda and public reports at least five days before the date of the meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect minutes of the Council and its Committees (or summaries of business undertaken in private) for up to six years following a meeting.
- Automatic right to inspect lists of background papers used in the preparation of public reports.
- Access, upon request, to the background papers on which reports are based for a period of up to four years from the date of the meeting.
- Access to a public register stating the names and addresses and electoral areas of all Councillors with details of the membership of all Committees etc.
- A reasonable number of copies of agenda and reports relating to items to be considered in public must be made available to the public attending meetings of the Council and its Committees etc.
- Access to a list specifying those powers which the Council has delegated to its Officers indicating also the titles of the Officers concerned.
- Access to a summary of the rights of the public to attend meetings of the Council and its Committees etc. and to inspect and copy documents.
- In addition, the public now has a right to be present when the Council determines “Key Decisions” unless the business would disclose confidential or “exempt” information.
- Unless otherwise stated, all items of business before the Executive Committee are Key Decisions.
- (Copies of Agenda Lists are published in advance of the meetings on the Council's Website:
www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact
Jess Bayley and Michael Craggs
Democratic Services Officers**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: (01527) 64252 ext. 3268 / 3267 Fax: (01527) 65216
email: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk /
michael.craggs@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk**

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

The **Agenda List** at the front of the Agenda summarises the issues to be discussed and is followed by the Officers' full supporting **Reports**.

Chair

The Chair is responsible for the proper conduct of the meeting. Generally to one side of the Chair is the Committee Support Officer who gives advice on the proper conduct of the meeting and ensures that the debate and the decisions are properly recorded. On the Chair's other side are the relevant Council Officers. The Councillors ("Members") of the Committee occupy the remaining seats around the table.

Running Order

Items will normally be taken in the order printed but, in particular circumstances, the Chair may agree to vary the order.

Refreshments : tea, coffee and water are normally available at meetings - please serve yourself.

Decisions

Decisions at the meeting will be taken by the **Councillors** who are the democratically elected representatives. They are advised by **Officers** who are paid professionals and do not have a vote.

Members of the Public

Members of the public may, by prior arrangement, speak at meetings of the Council or its Committees. Specific procedures exist for Appeals Hearings or for meetings involving Licence or Planning Applications. For further information on this point, please speak to the Committee Support Officer.

Special Arrangements

If you have any particular needs, please contact the Committee Support Officer.

Infra-red devices for the hearing impaired are available on request at the meeting. Other facilities may require prior arrangement.

Further Information

If you require any further information, please contact the Committee Support Officer (see foot of page opposite).

Fire/ Emergency instructions

If the alarm is sounded, please leave the building by the nearest available exit – these are clearly indicated within all the Committee Rooms.

If you discover a fire, inform a member of staff or operate the nearest alarm call point (wall mounted red rectangular box). In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately following the fire exit signs. Officers have been appointed with responsibility to ensure that all visitors are escorted from the building.

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

Do Not re-enter the building until told to do so.

The emergency Assembly Area is on Walter Stranz Square.





Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 2nd July, 2013

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: David Bush (Chair) Andrew Fry
Gay Hopkins (Vice-Chair) Alan Mason
Andrew Brazier Yvonne Smith
Simon Chalk Pat Witherspoon
Carole Gandy

<p>4. Youth Services Monitoring Update Report (Pages 1 - 2)</p>	<p>To receive an update on the action that has been taken to implement recommendations made by the Youth Services Task Group in April 2012 and to receive further information about the Positive Activities programme in Worcestershire.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>5. Housing Density Task Group - Final Report (Pages 3 - 14) Councillor David Bush</p>	<p>To consider the final report of the Housing Density Task Group and to determine whether to endorse the group's recommendations.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>6. Future Approach to Crime and Disorder Scrutiny at Redditch Borough Council - Discussion (Pages 15 - 22) Councillor Andrew Brazier</p>	<p>To consider the most appropriate approach for Overview and Scrutiny Members to adopt to Crime and Disorder Scrutiny at Redditch Borough Council in future years.</p> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>All Wards</p>

Youth Services Task Group – Monitoring Update Report
Additional Update

The Executive Committee tasked Redditch Borough Council Officers with taking the following action when working on positive activities:

RESOLUTION 1: Youth activities in Redditch should be promoted using the following communication tools:

- **social networking platforms.**

Action update:

The youth clubs created as part of Redditch Borough Council's Positive Activities Plan (Appendix 2) will be in a position to use social networking sites to promote their activities. This could include creating personalised group profiles using particular social network platforms.

Officers have been advised that a bespoke Redditch Youth Services website cannot be produced by the Council. However, Worcestershire County Council is currently reviewing Plug and Play, the designated website for young people living in Worcestershire. This website will be re-launched once the review has been completed. Redditch Borough Council, like other organisations, will be in a position to promote youth activities using this website.

The Council's Social Media Policy is currently in the process of being reviewed. The new policy will better enable officers to use social media as a tool to communicate with residents. There is also the potential that additional opportunities may be identified by the Leisure and Cultural Services team during transformation.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

2nd July 2013

HOUSING DENSITY TARGETS TASK REVIEW – FINAL REPORT

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Greg Chance, Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development and Transport.
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford, Head of Planning and Regeneration.
Ward(s) Affected	No specific ward relevance.
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

This report contains the final proposals of the Housing Density Targets Task Group. The group is proposing one overall recommendation, split into three distinct parts, which is designed to help encourage wider housing provision in the Borough and form part of the Council's emerging policy on housing as part of the Local Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATION

Policy 5 of the emerging Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 be revised as per Appendix 1 to incorporate the following headline points:

- i. All new housing developments within the Borough on sites less than 0.16 hectares should be exempt from the Council's housing density requirements;**
- ii. All new self-build housing developments on sites larger than 0.16 hectares within the Borough should meet a minimum housing density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare; and that**
- iii. All new bungalow developments within the Borough on sites larger than 0.16 hectares should meet a minimum density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare.**

3. KEY ISSUES

Background

- 3.1 The Housing Density Targets Task Group was established in February 2013 to review the impact of the Council's existing housing density requirements on the range of housing provision in the Borough, especially around whether the Council should retain its current minimum density requirements. It was intended that the findings of the review would then be included as part of the Council's consultation into Local Plan No 4 which would be running concurrently.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

- 3.2 Three members were initially appointed to the review: Councillors David Bush, Brandon Clayton, and Roger Bennett. Councillor Bush was appointed to chair the review. However, Councillor Clayton was required to resign from the group during the review following his appointment onto the Council's Executive Committee. Councillor Carole Gandy was subsequently nominated as his replacement.
- 3.3 Following Government changes to the planning system through the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Borough Council set about preparing a Local Plan rather than a Core Strategy. The new plan became known as 'Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan 4'. The NPPF states that it is at the discretion of individual local authorities to determine their own density levels, and therefore does not prescribe minimum density targets.
- 3.4 The Local Plan 4 outlines the vision and policies regarding how Redditch will aim to be like in 2030. It states that while any housing development should take density limits into account and that each potential new housing site should be assessed on its own individual merits. Local Plan No. 4 was to be published for public consultation during April / May 2013. Members felt it was therefore timely to analyse whether the Council's emerging Policy 5, incorporating housing density policy, would be suitable for the town's housing requirements in future.
- 3.5 As part of the wider Local Plan No. 4, the individual Policy 5 states that 'effective and efficient use of land must be sought in all new development schemes.' In particular, it states that: 'densities of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare will be sought in Redditch Borough, and 70 dwellings per hectare will be sought on sites for residential development that are within or adjacent to Redditch Town Centre and the District Centres'.
- 3.6 Policy 5 also states that 'lower densities will only be considered acceptable where it has been demonstrated that there are site specific limitations which negate standard densities being met, or where there would be a detrimental impact on the current and future amenity, character, and environmental quality of the neighbourhood. Development may be supported if there are substantial overriding environmental, social and economic benefits to justify the development'.
- 3.7 The group initially consulted relevant lead Officers to gain a greater understanding of the justification for Policy 5 as it stood. Members then referred to existing data regarding what Redditch's housing requirements were expected to be in future based on projected demographic changes, with particular reference made to the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Redditch (2012). Members also consulted a local housing developer to gain their perspective on how density level requirements affected the housing trade in the Borough. Finally, questionnaires were submitted to the majority of estate agents in the town to seek their views about the existing level of demand and around what provision was needed to meet future demand.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

4. RECOMMENDATION

We **RECOMMEND** that Policy 5 of the emerging Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 be revised as per Appendix 1 to incorporate the following headline points:

- i. all new housing developments within the Borough on sites less than 0.16 hectares should be exempt from the Council's housing density requirements**

- 4.1 It was explained to the group during their investigations that current housing density requirements made it extremely difficult for small locally based developers to compete with nationally based firms due to the latter's greater capacity to deliver larger housing developments that met density requirements. It was suggested to the group that more opportunities should be facilitated for smaller scale select builds on certain sites which could enable a wider variety of housing to be developed.
- 4.2 Members were also told that local developers were far more likely to source their employment locally compared to the large nationally based developers, and heard that the difficult conditions for smaller developers had a negative impact on local employment. In the case of the housing developer that was consulted, they also worked with local colleges to give apprentices the opportunity to gain experience working in the building trade.
- 4.3 The group was told that smaller developers should become far more competitive if they could build to lower density requirements. Members therefore feel that smaller, locally based developers need more help and flexibility in this respect, especially as it was argued they could help provide a wider range of housing in the Borough. It was felt that this could help make Redditch a more attractive proposition to people currently living outside the town and enable it to better compete with nearby locations such as Bromsgrove and Barnt Green as a desirable place to live. Indeed, a local estate agent commented that they had seen many potential buyers for executive level detached homes in Redditch look elsewhere due to lack of supply. Furthermore, all of the estate agents that responded to the group's consultation felt that Redditch needed a larger supply of larger executive type housing.
- 4.4 Evidence from the Worcestershire SHMA suggests that 'there is also a continued requirement to deliver medium and larger family-size dwellings consisting of 3 and 4+ bedrooms in all authorities'. Evidence specific to Redditch suggests that 'there is likely to be a significant increase in the number of higher value jobs, linked to the expansion of the service sector.' The group therefore feels that local housing developers must be supported to help deliver more detached executive homes that will be sufficient to meet rising demand. In particular, it is felt that Redditch needs to attract more professionals to live and work in the Borough. Policy 5 explains that 'applicants should refer to the most up to date SHMA to determine the most appropriate types of dwellings required throughout the Borough'. The Redditch SHMA Overview Report mentions that "the lower levels of lettings turnover in the

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

larger 3 bedroom and, in particular, 4+ bedroom family housing result in there being limited availability of such stock and highlight the continued need to deliver new additional dwellings to boost supply for families.”

- 4.5 During their investigations, Members were informed by a representative from the Asian community in Redditch that finding suitable larger houses within the Borough for extended families from the Pakistani community was a real issue. The group heard that many of these families were housed in the town centre area where properties are older and in many cases in need of considerable repair. The group therefore suggests that the supply of larger properties within the Borough should be increased to help meet the housing needs of this community.
- 4.6 Members also became concerned that, in some instances, the Council’s existing minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare had led to developments having a ‘detrimental impact on the amenity, character and environmental quality of an area’ as stated in Policy 5. Members feel that density requirements have not been suitable for particular developments within the Borough, and have indeed reduced the visual attraction of these locations. Members of the review suggest that applying density level requirements to these smaller sites is not appropriate as there is very little flexibility for developers to meet these requirements without compromising the look and amenities of the general area itself.
- 4.7 The group appreciates that there must be a fair balance between giving local developers more freedom to deliver new housing on smaller sites while ensuring that there is sufficient land for the Council to meet its own housing targets. With this in mind, the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2011) explains that sites needed to be at least 0.16 hectares in size before they were considered. Essentially this means that they are able to accommodate a minimum of five dwellings at a minimum of thirty dwellings per hectare. Members therefore propose that a threshold is established at 0.16 hectares for exempting new developments from density requirements. This would ensure that all these developments would meet the minimum density requirements to be assessed under the SHLAA. This five dwelling threshold would also give the Council a strong argument for including a windfall allowance in the five year housing supply.
- 4.8 The group feels that exempting all new housing developments within the Borough on sites less than 0.16 hectares from the Council’s housing density requirements could lead to a number of significant benefits being realised in terms of providing greater support to local developers, producing more local employment opportunities, and facilitating a wider variety of housing in the Borough to help meet future demand. The group therefore believes that setting a threshold at 0.16 hectares would help achieve a fair balance for the needs of local developers, the Borough Council, and local residents.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

- ii. **all new self-build housing developments on sites larger than 0.16 hectares within the Borough should meet a minimum housing density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare**

- 4.9 It was suggested to the group by a local housing developer that there was significant local demand for self-build developments in Redditch. They were referred to previous self build sites that had been successfully developed within the Borough, including on Icknield Street and Wolverton Close in Ipsley. It was therefore suggested that more land should be put allocated for these types of developments.
- 4.10 Central Government introduced new initiatives as part of the Localism Act to help encourage more self-build developments. For example, the *Community Right to Build* initiative allows local communities to undertake small-scale, site-specific, community-led developments, including new homes. The intention is to enable the individual communities to retain the benefits of the development. Proposals must meet some minimum requirements, including the strategic elements of the local plan, before they can be approved.
- 4.11 The group are aware that self-build developments can possess a number of strong ecological advantages over traditional house building, especially around energy saving through its strong emphasis on green building design leading to zero carbon housing standards. The group feels that more self-build developments in Redditch, whether through private groups or cooperative means, can also help make local people more employable through improving their range of skills, especially in the construction and business fields.
- 4.12 The group suggests that more should be done to encourage more of these developments to produce a wider variety of housing in the Borough through innovative designs to suit the distinct needs of local residents. Community cohesion could also be improved through local people coming together on these developments. Members are aware that there have been a number of successful cases across the country to the benefit of the local community and environment, including the Hedgehog Housing Co-Operative development of ten timber frame detached bungalows which were constructed in Bevendean, Brighton. The project, which started in 1996, was initiated by four local residents who were in urgent need of being rehoused. They saw self build project as a means to take real ownership and to literally build for a secure future for their family. Drawing on the support of self build groups, they were successful in gaining approval from the city council by highlighting the potential benefits to the local community through the provision of more eco-friendly housing that would be tailored to the needs to the current inhabitants. The scheme has since been praised as a clear example of how self built housing can be truly innovative.
- 4.13 Members feel that more of these of the developments should be actively encouraged in Redditch. It is proposed that self-build projects on sites larger than 0.16 hectares within the Borough should meet a reduced minimum housing density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare. It is argued that reducing the density

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

requirement would allow individual communities to benefit from these developments within the Borough, and to help facilitate a wider variety of local housing provision which Members feel can help attract more people to live in Redditch now and in future. Eliminating density requirements altogether on sites less than 0.16 hectares would give added incentive for more of these developments on very small pockets of land. The group believes that in giving local people the opportunity work together on these schemes could help develop a greater sense of community in Redditch and would improve the skills of local residents in doing so.

iii. all new bungalow developments within the Borough on sites larger than 0.16 hectares should meet a minimum density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare

- 4.14 According to the Office for National Statistics, Worcestershire is projected to have a population of almost 607,000 by 2031, representing an increase of around 49,500 on the 2010 figure, or just less than 9 per cent. This projected increase in population is concentrated almost exclusively in the 65-plus age range, with the number of people aged 65 and over projected to increase by more than 64,000. In total, this represents a growth of nearly 60 per cent among the 65+ age group between 2010 and 2031. This accounts for 130 per cent of the total projected population increase for Worcestershire during this period.
- 4.15 However, during the review, Members grew concerned that Redditch did not appear to possess a sufficient supply of suitable accommodation to meet the demand of an ageing population.
- 4.16 The majority of estate agents that responded to the group's questionnaire suggested that there was a real need for more bungalows to be built within the Borough, with one estate agent claiming that more two and three bedroom bungalows were 'desperately needed'.
- 4.17 The group suggests that there is an inadequate supply of accommodation for elderly people who want to live independently within the Borough. They are concerned that a significant proportion of existing elderly accommodation within the Borough is not suitable for independent living. In particular, the group argues that there needs to be more ground floor based accommodation that is easily accessible for elderly people in Redditch.
- 4.18 At the time of publication, there were 494 households on the Council's housing register where the main applicant was aged 55 or over. This equated to 23 per cent of the total number of households on the register. 277 of these were aged 65 or over.
- 4.19 It is felt that there needs to be more flexibility for new bungalow developments within the Borough to help meet a rising demand for ground floor accommodation. Once again, the group suggests that a threshold site size should be established at 0.16 hectares before a reduced minimum density requirement would apply. This would

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

2nd July 2013

ensure that all developments that reach this threshold could be assessed for inclusion in the SHLAA and would give the Council a strong argument for including a windfall allowance in the five year land supply.

Financial Implications

4.20 There are no financial implications.

Legal Implications

4.21 The proposed re-wording of Policy 5 is a variation to the current Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 policy that has been out for consultation. If accepted, the revised Policy 5 would be incorporated into the Publication Version of the plan, which is due to be published for consultation, in September 2013.

Service / Operational Implications

4.22 There are no service or operational implications.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

4.23 There are no customer equalities or diversity implications.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risk management identified.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Policy 5 Effective and Efficient Use of Land, extracted from the Draft Borough of Redditch Local Plan 4.

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Michael Craggs, Democratic Services Officer, on behalf of the Housing Density Targets Task Group

Email: michael.craggs@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel.: (01527) 64252 Ext: 3267

Policy 5 Effective and Efficient Use of Land

Land for development is a finite resource. Whilst it is acknowledged and accepted that some greenfield land must be used to meet development requirements, there remains a need for prudent re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land within the Borough which, has the potential to contribute towards meeting Redditch's development needs. Furthermore, the greenfield land that is allocated for development should be developed efficiently to maximise its potential.

Policy 5

Effective and efficient use of land must be sought in all new development schemes. With respect to residential development, this will be achieved in the following ways:

- i) the reuse and regeneration of Previously Developed Land (PDL) will be actively encouraged. Where the economic viability of a scheme on PDL is questionable, and can be fully demonstrated by the applicant, the Borough Council may negotiate a more appropriate level of infrastructure provision, or deferred payment scheme with the applicant, in order to secure beneficial reuse of a site;
- ii) densities of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare will be sought in Redditch Borough, and 70 dwellings per hectare will be sought on sites for residential development that are within or adjacent to Redditch Town Centre and the District Centres
- iii) higher densities will be sought in locations close to public transport interchanges; and
- iv) ~~iv-~~ higher densities will also be sought in other locations where it can be demonstrated that there will be no detrimental impact on the amenity, character and environmental quality of an area.

Applicants should refer to the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment to determine the most appropriate types of dwellings required throughout the Borough. Lower densities will ~~only~~ be considered acceptable where ~~it has been demonstrated that the scheme reflects the Borough's housing needs, there are~~ ~~there are~~ site specific limitations which negate standard densities being met, or where there would be a detrimental impact on the amenity, character and environmental quality of an area if the standard densities were to be pursued on-site.

Lower density developments may be necessary on some smaller sites, self-build sites or when providing bungalows. In these situations the following approaches will apply:

- i. all new housing developments within the Borough on sites less than 0.16 hectares should be exempt from the Council's housing density requirements
- ii. all new self-build housing developments on sites larger than 0.16 hectares within the Borough should meet a minimum housing density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.9 cm, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.9 cm, No bullets or numbering

iii. all new bungalow developments within the Borough on sites larger than 0.16 hectares should meet a minimum density requirement of 15 dwellings per hectare.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.9 cm

Formatted: Font: Arial

Schemes for the development of private residential gardens will generally not be supported unless they lie within existing settlements, integrate fully into the neighbourhood, and can clearly demonstrate that there would be no detrimental impact on the current and future amenity, character and environmental quality of the neighbourhood. Development may be supported if there are substantial overriding environmental, social and economic benefits to justify the development.

With respect to non-residential development, schemes on PDL, which propose the re-development of tired or redundant sites, will be considered favourably.

There will be a presumption against development on PDL where it can be clearly demonstrated that over time, land has been afforded beneficial amenity value or where biodiversity issues would be compromised through redevelopment of the site.

Reasoned Justification

Encouraging development on previously developed land allows maximum use to be made of vacant and previously developed sites within the Borough; thus reducing the pressure for development on greenfield sites and maximising the use of existing infrastructure.

The National Planning Policy Framework removes the previous PPS3 requirement for a specific PDL target, allowing local authorities the flexibility to consider whether a local target would be appropriate. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) demonstrates that it is clearly not possible to deliver substantial levels of housing on PDL in Redditch. This is due to its tight administrative boundaries which are surrounded by Green Belt, and the nature of its previous New Town status, which limits the amount of development that may have reached the end of its natural life and is prime for redevelopment within the urban area. The Borough Council's previous brownfield development target, identified in the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996 – 2011, stipulated a target of 25% of all residential development on brownfield land. The Borough Council was able to more than double the brownfield delivery against this target during the period up to 2011. Therefore, exceeding previous brownfield development targets, limits the scope and potential during this Plan period. However, there is still a need to promote the reuse of PDL in the interest of Redditch's capacity limitations, and whilst it is not considered beneficial to set a PDL target, it would be prudent to actively encourage development on the areas of known PDL within the Borough. The SHLAA and Employment Land Review (ELR) identify PDL potential within the Borough. Therefore, the Borough Council considers it prudent to encourage regeneration and redevelopment of sites which may be tired or have remained vacant for a number of years, in order to revitalise these parts of the town, thereby encouraging future investment in Redditch and contributing towards the Borough's development targets.

There are some instances where redevelopment of brownfield land should be resisted, such as previously cleared sites which have, over time, become part of the open and green character of an area and value is placed on the contribution these areas make to the community or biodiversity. In these instances, the contribution these sites make to the

character of the area will be afforded careful attention before their redevelopment is considered.

The NPPF does not specify minimum density targets and considers that density levels should be set by local authorities to reflect local circumstances. Based upon past density rates achieved in Redditch, at a time when minimum density requirements were set, it is considered that continuation of these density ranges will continue to be achievable and in keeping with the character of existing development within the Borough. There may be instances when achieving minimum density targets will compromise ~~the e the~~ character of the surrounding area, meeting particular identified housing needs -or if there are physical limitations within the site boundary. In these circumstances, the character of the surrounding area, the identified housing need, or and the sites physical constraints will be afforded careful attention before higher density development is considered.

Formatted: Not Strikethrough

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Homes with large back gardens are common feature in some of the older districts in the Borough and previously a number of housing completions have come from developments on garden land. Although garden land was previously defined as brownfield land, it has now been removed from this definition. This does not mean that all development on garden land should be refused but rather that careful consideration should be given to any proposals and whether there are any mitigating factors. One of the most important considerations will be the retention of the existing character of residential areas. Development which significantly increases the proportion of ground coverage or the scale of proposed buildings is likely to be out of keeping with its surroundings and therefore is likely to be unacceptable and will be refused. Development of garden land will only be supported where it fully integrates into the neighbourhood and is in keeping the character and quality of the local environment, unless it can be demonstrated there are significant overriding mitigating circumstances.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

2nd July 2013

CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY IN REDDITCH

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Rebecca Blake, Community Safety and Regulatory Services
Portfolio Holder Consulted	No
Relevant Head of Service	Judith Willis, Acting Head of Community Services
Ward(s) Affected	No specific ward relevance.
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

This report explains the undertakings of the Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel since being formed in 2010 to scrutinise the performance of the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE:

how the Council's statutory crime and disorder scrutiny function should be most suitably undertaken

3. KEY ISSUES

Background

- 3.1 Sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 included provisions that required local authorities to have a Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review or scrutinise the decisions and actions of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CRDPs) in England and Wales. These provisions came into effect in April 2009
- 3.2 In accordance with the new provisions, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered what procedures the Council should adopt for the scrutiny of crime and disorder matters in July 2009. There were several roles that this Committee could undertake: holding the CDRP to account for its decision making; scrutinising the performance of the CDRP; and undertaking policy reviews of specific crime and disorder issues. The Committee could also highlight and challenge people's perceptions of crime and disorder in the local area and undertake community engagement and consultation to establish local people's priorities for crime and disorder issues.
- 3.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Borough Council establish a designated Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel as a sub-committee to

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

scrutinise the performance of the local CDRP, the Redditch Community Safety Partnership

- 3.4 It was expected that the relevant five Members of the Panel would be able to develop sufficient expertise on crime and disorder issues. It was thought that this arrangement would also enable the Panel to develop close working relations with representatives from the Redditch Community Safety Partnership. The Panel would also have the opportunity to undertake task and finish reviews on significant issues if it elected to do so.
- 3.5 The Chair of the Panel would update the parent Overview and Scrutiny Committee following each meeting to report on its business.
- 3.6 The Panel's first meeting took place on 8th March 2010. The Panel was scheduled to meet on a quarterly basis, although it would be able to meet on a more regular basis at its own discretion. Legally, the Panel is only required to meet once a year to scrutinise the Community Safety Partnership.
- 3.7 Since its first meeting in March 2010, the Panel has continued to meet on a quarterly basis. It has made three recommendations to date.
- 3.8 The first two recommendations were approved by the Executive Committee in January 2011. The first recommended that the Borough Council endorse and support the need for a Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) in the West Mercia Police Area. The second recommendation proposed that a letter be issued to the Health and Wellbeing Board to strongly encourage that the SARC be developed. The SARC was eventually opened in February 2013 in Bransford, Worcester, and offers services of evidence gathering and support with a 24-hour victim helpline. It was jointly funded by the West Mercia Police and the NHS.
- 3.9 The only other recommendation was rejected in November 2011. This proposed that the Council should not support the merger of Redditch Community Safety Partnership (RCSP) with Bromsgrove Community Safety Partnership (BCSP) and Wyre Forest Community Safety Partnership (WFCSP) resulting in the creation of a North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership (NWCSP). The NWCSP was eventually formed in April 2013. According to its own website, the NWCSP "provides a co-ordinated approach to tackling crime, delivering projects across the whole of the area and making best use of resources."
- 3.10 Since the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership began operating in shadow form in 2012, the Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel remains the only sub-committee of its kind in North Worcestershire. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees in both Wyre Forest and Bromsgrove act as their local authority's crime and disorder committees.
- 3.11 The Panel has not undertaken any task and finish reviews since being established in 2010.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**2nd July 2013

Possible Options

- 3.12 The Committee could retain the status quo and leave the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel to focus on the performance of the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership and to raise any areas of concern or highlight good practice regarding community safety in Redditch.
- 3.13 Alternatively, the Committee could decide to become the Council's designated crime and disorder committee and suspend the current operation of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel in the process. It would be required to fulfil the statutory obligation of looking at crime and disorder matters at least once a year. Should there are any particular aspects of concern, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could decide to undertake further scrutiny on this subject. This could involve setting up task and finish reviews into matters of particular concern. Under this scenario, the Committee could appoint the existing members of the Panel to lead on a review.

Financial Implications

- 3.14 There are no direct financial implications directly relating to this report.

Legal Implications

- 3.15 If the Committee proposes to change the current arrangements, the procedure rules for the Panel in part 8 of the Constitution would need to be updated.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.16 There are no direct service or operational implications that have been identified for this report.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.17 No direct customer or equality and diversity implications have been identified for this report.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 No risks have been identified.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel Terms of Reference

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Michael Craggs, Democratic Services Officer
Email: michael.craggs@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

2nd July 2013

Tel.: (01527) 64252 Ext: 3267



Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel **Terms of Reference**

CONSTITUTION

The Panel will operate as a formal 'Sub-Committee' of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and will be Redditch Borough Council's designated Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee in accordance with Sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.

The Panel shall comprise 5 elected non-Executive Members (2+2+1 if to be politically proportionate) of the Council. These will be appointed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or else at the Annual Meeting of the Council. The Chair of the Panel will be a member of a political group not forming part of the ruling administration. The Chair will also be a member of the parent Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Panel will have the power to commission specific policy reviews relating to the work of the Community Safety Partnership. These could be undertaken as Task and Finish Groups. Each Task and Finish Group established by the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel will be led by an identified member of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.

For the purposes of continuity, substitute membership on Task and Finish Groups is discouraged and allowed only at the Chair's discretion.

RULES OF OPERATION

The Panel has power to discuss, but no power to make decisions on, matters listed in the Terms of Reference below.

It shall meet as often as necessary, though it shall have at least 4 scheduled meetings per year.

Meetings shall normally take place early evening.

The Panel shall advise and make recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Chair of the Scrutiny Panel will report on the work of the Panel at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

For the purpose of accountability, adequate notes shall be taken of business transacted, which shall be available for inspection by other Members of the Council, subject to proper control, in accordance with the Code of Conduct, of information deemed by the Proper Officer to be exempt.

Council

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel will be Redditch Borough Council's designated Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel in accordance with Sections 19 and 20 of the Police and Justice Act 2006.

The Panel will carry out the following functions:

- a) to hold the Redditch Community Safety Partnership to account for its decision making;
- b) to scrutinise the performance of the Redditch Community Safety Partnership;
- c) to undertake policy reviews of specific crime and disorder issues;
- d) to highlight and challenge people's perceptions of crime and disorder in the local area;
- e) to undertake community engagement and consultation to establish local people's priorities for crime and disorder issues; and
- f) to promote the positive work of the Redditch Community Safety Partnership.

OFFICER SUPPORT

The work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel will be supported by the Overview and Scrutiny Support Officers.

