

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25th
November, 2009
2009
7.00 pm

Committee Room Two
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
Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer**

Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH

Tel: 01527 64252 (Ext. 3268) Fax: (01527) 65216

e.mail: jess.bayley@redditchbc.gov.uk

Minicom: 595528

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.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

- Where the item relates or is likely to affect your **registered interests** (what you have declared on the formal Register of Interests)

OR

- Where a decision in relation to the item might reasonably be regarded as affecting **your own** well-being or financial position, or that of your **family**, or your **close associates** more than most other people affected by the issue,

you have a personal interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare the existence, and nature, of your interest and stay**

- The declaration must relate to specific business being decided - a general scattergun approach is not needed
- **Exception** - where interest arises only because of your membership of another **public body**, there is no need to declare unless you **speak** on the matter.
- You **can vote** on the matter.

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

- It is a personal interest **and**
 - The item affects your **financial position** (or conveys other benefits), or the position of your **family, close associates** or bodies through which you have a **registered interest** (or relates to the exercise of **regulatory functions** in relation to these groups)
- and**
- A member of public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably believe the interest was likely to **prejudice** your judgement of the public interest.

WHAT MUST I DO? **Declare and Withdraw**

BUT you may make representations to the meeting before withdrawing, **if** the public have similar rights (such as the right to speak at Planning Committee).



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25th November, 2009

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: P Mould (Chair) W Norton
D Smith (Vice-Chair) J Pearce
K Banks D Taylor
G Chance D Thomas
R King

<p>3. Minutes (Pages 134 - 141)</p>	<p>To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday, 4th November 2009 as a correct record.</p> <p>(Minutes to follow)</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>8. Neighbourhood Group Task and Finish Group - Draft Report (Pages 142 - 153)</p>	<p>To consider the draft final report and recommendations from the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>(Report to follow).</p> <p>All Wards</p>



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

Minutes

Present:

Councillor Phil Mould (Chair), Councillor David Smith (Vice-Chair) and Councillors K Banks, G Chance, R King, W Norton and W King

Also Present:

M Collins

Officers:

T Horne, G Revans, Head of Environment and S Horrobin

Committee Services Officer:

J Bayley and H Saunders

103. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillors Pearce, Taylor and Thomas. Cllr W King was named as a substitute for Councillor Taylor.

104. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

There were no declarations of interest or of any party whip.

105. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meetings held on Thursday 1st October and Wednesday 14th October be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

106. ACTIONS LIST

The Committee considered the latest version of the Actions List. Specific mention was made of the following matters.

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

a) Arrow Valley Countryside Centre - Consultants' Report

Officers reported that they had approached the relevant Head of Service for this report. The consultants' report was scheduled to be considered by the Executive Committee on either 7th January or 27th January. Depending on which date was agreed, it would be possible for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to pre-scrutinise this report at either of their meetings scheduled for 16th December or 13th January.

b) Mayoral Web Pages

Officers explained that the Member Services' Officer had been in contact with Councillor Chalk and Officers from IT Services to arrange a meeting to discuss the enhancement of the content of the Mayoral web pages on the Council's website.

RESOLVED that

the Actions List be noted.

107. CALL-IN AND PRE-SCRUTINY

The Committee considered the latest version of the Forward Plan. Officers explained that there was a report listed on the Forward Plan scheduled to be considered at the Executive Committee on 9th December regarding the Council's Single Equalities Scheme. Members agreed that it was important for the Committee to pre-scrutinise this report if possible.

There were no call-ins.

RESOLVED that

the Single Equalities Scheme report be pre-scrutinised by the Committee at the following meeting scheduled for Wednesday 25th November.

108. TASK & FINISH REVIEWS - DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENTS

There were no draft scoping documents.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

109. TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS

The Committee received reports in relation to current reviews.

a) Dial-A-Ride – Chair, Councillor R King

Councillor King informed the Committee that the Task and Finish Group had agreed that, while waiting for the Officer report regarding actions to overcome the shortfall in funding for the service for the current year, the Group had decided that they would be able to progress other tasks. He explained that the Group had met with the WRVS, which operated a bus and social car scheme within Bromsgrove. From information provided during this meeting, the Group had decided that they would like to investigate the possibility of linking in with other service providers in the area including taxi firms, to enhance the Dial-a-Ride service.

b) Neighbourhood Groups – Chair, Councillor K Banks

Councillor Banks informed the Committee that the Group had completed their consultation with all of the Neighbourhood Groups and had received feedback forms from many attendees. In addition, the Group had arranged to undertake consultation with the Student Council. The Group was in the process of writing the final report which they looked forward to presenting before the Committee at the following meeting.

c) Local Strategic Partnership – Chair, Councillor W Norton

Officers informed the Committee that there would be a presentation on the subject of the Local Strategic Partnership at the following meeting of the Committee on 25th November. The Councillors who would be undertaking the review alongside Councillor Norton had been invited to attend that meeting of the Committee to consider the information contained within this report.

RESOLVED that

the progress reports be noted.

110. GARDEN WASTE STRATEGY

The Committee received a Power Point presentation from Officers detailing proposals for the Council to introduce an optional chargeable garden waste collection (Appendix One). Officers

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

explained that that the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, which the Council had signed up to, had set a target of 43% for the recycling or composting of waste materials by 2014. In addition, the national non-statutory target for recycling household waste had been increased from 33% to 45% by 2015. It was important that Redditch Borough Council played its part in achieving these targets.

Members were informed that further reasons to undertake a chargeable garden waste collection included: the fact that it reduced biodegradable waste to landfill; that residents had indicated a demand for this service; and that it had been found to be successfully delivered by other local authorities. Members were informed that, currently, 7% of the waste collected by the Council was garden waste that could be composted. The Council permitted residents to dispose of a small amount of garden waste in their grey bins. Orange sacks, which were charged for by the Council, enabled residents to dispose of extra waste and it had been found in 2008/09 that out of 5000 orange sacks collected in the summer months, around 70% contained garden waste.

Officers outlined the proposals for the additional service to Members. They explained that the service would be optional for residents and that residents taking part in the service would be provided with a brown 240 litre capacity bin in which to put their garden waste. Bins would be collected on alternate weeks between March and November. Officers proposed two options for introducing the service. The first option involved undertaking a pilot in one area of the Borough while the second option would be to deliver the service on a Borough wide basis. Officers commented that the preferred option was to deliver this scheme in a pilot area first. This would enable the Council to assess the take up of the scheme and evaluate its success in one area before deciding on whether to extend the scheme to the rest of the Borough.

It was proposed that the scheme be piloted in the west of Borough. The pilot area was chosen because it was an area where residents lived in traditional types of housing and because of the larger size of gardens. However, Officers had also ensured that a mix of housing types with various sized gardens were included in the pilot area. Indications from consultation conducted as part of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy had indicated that residents would be willing to pay £30 a year for this service.

Members questioned whether this scheme would reduce the numbers of people composting and also commented that it would appear to be less environmentally friendly to move garden waste in

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

fuel inefficient vehicles around the Borough rather than to continue to encourage people to compost. Officers had acknowledged in their presentation that the Council's carbon footprint would rise as a result of the proposals but stressed that to offset these extra emissions, the Council would have to look to cut emissions elsewhere.

Some Members felt that the proposed pilot area would not produce a true reflection of residents' views of this scheme. It was felt that the west side of the town was more rural than the east of the town which was considered more urban with a higher density of houses and smaller gardens. Officers explained that, if Members felt strongly about this, the pilot could be run in two different areas one in the east and one in the west of the Borough providing that it could be delivered within two collection days.

Some Members commented that they felt they were yet to be convinced of the case for supporting the introduction of a chargeable garden waste scheme. It was felt that this scheme was being proposed in order to achieve three things: to generate income; to achieve performance targets set locally and nationally; and to fulfil environmental objectives. Members commented on the take up of the service. It was felt by some of the Committee that the people that usually would dispose of all waste in their grey bins could continue to do so and that those people who made efforts to compost would be the most likely residents to use the scheme. It was also questioned how likely it would be that residents who currently took their garden waste to the household waste disposal site would pay £30 a year for it to be collected from their door.

Members asked Officers how they would assess whether the pilot project had been successful. Officers agreed that this was something they needed to think about. They agreed to put in additional information in the report for the Executive Committee about how this could be assessed. Members commented on the accompanying proposals to stop the sale of orange bags and to not permit residents to put garden waste in green bins. They asked what kind of measures would be undertaken to police this. Officers explained that as part of the waste collection process for recyclables, residents' green bins were checked on collection and this would be the approach taken for green waste and grey bins. The Council had not had to take any enforcement action against residents for misuse of bins and so it was considered unlikely to be a major cause of concern.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

Officers presented eight recommendations and one resolution that would be presented to the Executive Committee at their meeting on 18th November. Members voted in favour of introducing the scheme, however there was a split vote with four Members voting for and three Members voting against the scheme. They requested that this split in the vote be observed by Officers during the course of the Executive Committee meeting. All Members agreed that, if approved, the collection should be introduced in a pilot area initially rather than throughout the Borough. They also requested that the Council pursue recommendations 7a and 8a rather than recommendations 7b and 8b in the Officers' report.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the Executive Committee approve Officers' recommendation to introduce an 'opt-in' chargeable garden waste collection;**
- 2) **the Executive Committee agree to implement this scheme initially in the pilot area suggested by Officers;**
- 3) **the Executive Committee endorse recommendation 7a that 'the amendment of the Council's current collection policy relating to garden waste in grey bins be considered to coincide with the start of the new service to prevent garden waste being placed in grey bins in the pilot area;**
- 4) **the Executive Committee approves recommendation 8a that 'the amendment of the Council's collection policy relating to the sale of orange sacks be considered to coincide with the start of the new service to prevent waste, including garden waste being disposed of in orange sacks in the pilot area; and**

RESOLVED that

- 5) **the report be noted.**

111. CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET BIDS

Officers informed the Committee that it had not been possible to provide the report detailing the budget bids in time for that meeting of the Committee. It had been suggested that, as it would be difficult to arrange for reports in the budget setting process to be completed for the Committee to pre-scrutinise, the Committee instead undertake post-scrutiny of those items.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

Officers explained that the budget bids report was due to be considered by the Executive Committee on 18th November. It was therefore suggested that the Committee post-scrutinise this report at their meeting scheduled for 25th November. It had been suggested that the Fees and Charges report be post-scrutinised at a meeting of the Committee on 16th December following consideration of this report by the Executive Committee at its meeting scheduled for 9th December. Whilst it was expected that the majority of the decisions made during the meeting would be forwarded to Council as recommendations, the Executive Committee would also be able to make resolutions. However, the Committee was advised that any recommendations it wished to make on the Fees and Charges report could be referred back to the Executive Committee at their meeting on 7th January or to full Council on 1st February.

Members expressed concern that they had not been able to pre-scrutinise the Budget Bids report. They requested that a detailed explanation be provided by senior Officers which would clarify why reports relating to the budget bids and fees and charges items could not be provided for pre-scrutiny.

RESOLVED that

further information be provided by senior Officers to the Committee explaining the reasons why the Budget Bids and Fees and Charges reports could not be provided for pre-scrutiny.

112. REFERRALS

Officers informed the Committee that an issue for scrutiny was to be referred to the Committee from the Complaints Appeal Panel. This issue related to the procedures used by Property Services. The minutes of Panel would be submitted for consideration at the following meeting of the Committee which would help to provide further details about this referral.

113. WORK PROGRAMME

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme. They requested that an item be added to the Work Programme for consideration of the Committee. Members asked for the Committee to review the current Civil Parking Enforcement Scheme. Officers explained that this scheme had been introduced as a result of a scrutiny review into the subject and that a report could be tabled for

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4th November 2009

the Committee as part of the Committee's role in monitoring scrutiny recommendations.

RESOLVED that

Officers be invited to present information regarding the Civil Parking Enforcement Scheme at a meeting of the Committee in January.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 8.45 pm

.....
Chair



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

All wards

25th November 2009

8. NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS TASK AND FINISH GROUP DRAFT PRESENTATION REPORT

(Report of Councillors Banks, Enderby, Pearce and Thomas)

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to inform the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of the final recommendations that have been made by the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group.

2. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to **RECOMMEND** that

- 1) the Neighbourhood Groups are not now fit for purpose and should be discontinued;
- 2) the Partners and Communities Together (PACT) group meetings should be re-launched and delivered as an equal partnership arrangement;
 - a) Redditch Borough Council should work with the Police and other local agencies participating in Partners and communities Together (PACT) to agree funding and administration for PACT meetings;
 - b) a protocol should be jointly developed outlining the roles and responsibilities of all agencies in the re-launched Partners and Communities Together Groups;
 - c) the Chairs of all Partners and Communities Together meetings should be independent members of the community;
 - d) promotion of the re-launched Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings should be appropriately targeted towards clarifying the meaning of the new arrangements for residents living in areas where PACT and Neighbourhood Group meetings currently only take place on the same night;
 - e) there should be small, local budgets for each of the re-launched Partners and Communities Together groups which could be spent at the discretion of the group;

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

- 3) **the Neighbourhood Groups also be replaced with a further variety of methods that will enable Redditch Borough Council to inform and consult more effectively with local residents;**

these alternative methods should include the following:

- a) **the Council should publish quarterly editions of Redditch Matters during the year to inform residents about local public services, activities and Council business;**
 - b) **Redditch Borough Council should continue to host road shows throughout the Borough;**
 - c) **Redditch Borough Council should embrace the Worcestershire Viewpoint Citizens Panel and use every opportunity to work with the Panel to consult with residents over local issues;**
 - d) **the Council should promote web based systems, such as the Worcestershire Hub and FixMyStreet, that can be utilised to resolve residents' individual issues;**
 - e) **social networking should be used by the Council to inform and consult with residents in appropriate circumstances;**
 - f) **the use of Councillor Calls for Action be promoted in order to be used to resolve local neighbourhood issues;**
 - g) **more effort should be made by the Council to advertise the fact that residents should resolve individual issues through direct contact with Councillors, Officers and the One-Stop-Shops;**
 - h) **the Council should work in equal partnership with the Police and other local agencies to advertise Street Briefings and Environment Visual Audits to local residents;**
- 4) **Redditch Borough Council should continue to seek ways to better engage and consult with a more diverse range of residents;**
 - 5) **the Council should have a robust monitoring system in place to assess the effectiveness of each of the mechanisms used to inform, engage and consult with local residents;**

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

- 6) **the Community Forum and similar groups which engage and consult with local residents should report to the Executive Committee; and**
- 7) **the Council should have a central electronic database which would be used for the purposes of consultation with key partners in the Borough.**

3. **Objectives of the Review**

- 3.1 Our review was established in June 2009. The Group consisted of four Members: Councillor Banks who chaired the Group; and Councillors Enderby; Pearce; and Thomas.
- 3.2 We were commissioned to undertake this review of the Council's Neighbourhood Groups by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. We were specifically tasked with reviewing how the Neighbourhood Groups were operating and whether this corresponded with their purpose; determining whether the Neighbourhood Groups represented value for money; and considering whether alternative consultation methods would be more effective.
- 3.3 The review was considered to be a timely exercise. Central government is increasingly encouraging local authorities to actively engage residents and other local stakeholders over developments in service delivery and local decision making. Indeed, Section 138 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 introduced a duty to involve, requiring local authorities to involve local representatives persons where appropriate. In this context, a review of the continuing viability of the Neighbourhood Groups as a local consultation mechanism was considered important.

4. **Methods and Activities**

- 4.1 We interviewed relevant Officers from Redditch Borough Council to develop an understanding of the existing Neighbourhood Groups process. We also interviewed the leaders of each of the political party groups represented on the Council to develop an understanding of the political perspectives towards the process and alternative consultation methods that could be utilised by local authorities.
- 4.2 At an early stage we sought to establish the purpose of the Neighbourhood Groups as we understood that this would help to inform our assessment of the ongoing viability of the process. In order to achieve this we questioned our interviewees about what they perceived to be the purpose of the Neighbourhood Groups. We also circulated a questionnaire amongst Borough Councillors, County Councillors, local Police Officers and relevant Council Officers which

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

asked recipients to outline their views of the purpose of the Neighbourhood Groups.

- 4.3 Based on the information gathered from these expert sources we concluded that the purpose of the Neighbourhood Groups was to provide a forum where the Council could: inform residents and other stakeholders about Council business, including policies and developments in service delivery; engage with residents and other stakeholders over the needs of local communities; and consult with residents and other stakeholders over policies, developments in service delivery and local decision making.
- 4.4 However, we concurred that unfortunately the Neighbourhood Groups were failing to meet this purpose. Evidence gathered during the course of our review indicated that a consistently low number of people attended Neighbourhood Group meetings. Moreover, the residents attending Neighbourhood Group meetings were overwhelmingly white and either middle-aged or elderly. (For further information please view Appendix E, pp 89-95, in the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report). Under these circumstances the Neighbourhood Groups failed to enable the Council to inform, engage or consult with a representative sample of local residents.
- 4.5 The evidence provided by expert witnesses indicated that there was a lot of duplication over the types of items that were considered at Neighbourhood Group meetings and at Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings, which are similar public meeting arrangements which take place in the Borough. Many respondents though considered the PACT meetings to be more effective than the Neighbourhood Group meetings: the items which were prioritised during PACT meetings were quickly listed on the West Mercia Police website alongside information about the action taken to resolve the issues.
- 4.6 We interviewed Inspector Ian Joseph, a senior representative of the West Mercia Police, to obtain an understanding of a key partner's view of the Neighbourhood Groups and opportunities to enhance the ability of local public service organisations to engage with residents through partnership working. It was during this meeting that the suggestion was made that the Partners and Communities Together meetings, by involving all partners working together to resolve issues of concern to the local population, could be re-launched as the primary local meeting arrangement. In this context the Neighbourhood Groups would no longer be required.
- 4.7 We also concluded that additional consultation mechanisms could be used by the Council to more effectively engage with residents. In particular, we felt that it was important for the Council, and the Council's partner organisation, to utilise a range of methods as this

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

could enable the Council to interact with a more diverse and representative sample of the local population.

- 4.8 As a group we recognised that our proposals would have significant implications for local residents, particularly for those residents who have regularly attended Neighbourhood Group meetings in previous years. We therefore consulted widely with residents over our initial proposals by circulating information about our review amongst residents for whom we had contact details and attending the October round of Neighbourhood Group meetings to present our proposals. The feedback provided by residents was largely supportive of our proposals and informed our final recommendations.

5. Recommendations – Further Details

- 5.1 More detailed information about each of the recommendations has been provided in the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group – Final Report. However, some brief details are also provided in this Executive Summary:

- 1) **The Neighbourhood Groups are not now fit for purpose and should be discontinued.** (For further information about recommendation 1 please refer to pp 28-29 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.1.1 During the course of our review we assessed the number of residents who had attended Neighbourhood Group meetings for which figures were available, from February 2007 – February 2009. Unfortunately this analysis revealed that less than 2 per cent of the population attended Neighbourhood Group meetings.

5.1.2 Many of the Councillors, Officers and residents who were consulted during the course of our review commented that the Neighbourhood Groups were not working effectively. Typically it was suggested that: few items were resolved following Neighbourhood Group meetings; often personal issues were raised which could have been resolved more quickly if they had been referred directly to relevant Officers or Councillors at an earlier stage; and many of the issues discussed were not within the remit of the Council to resolve or required work from more than one organisation.

5.1.3 Despite these problems Redditch Borough Council continued to invest £62,210 per year to support the three Neighbourhood Group meetings which took place in thirteen locations across the Borough. In particular, significant expenditure of £43,690 was allocated to central support

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

service costs, or the indirect costs involved in providing Officer support for the process.

5.1.4 We concluded that due to the small number of residents attending meetings the Neighbourhood Groups were not effectively meeting their purpose to inform, engage and consult with residents. Furthermore, we agreed that the continuing expenditure on the Neighbourhood Groups, when attended by so few residents, could not be justified as cost effective. We therefore believe that the Neighbourhood Groups should be discontinued.

2) The Partners and Communities Together (PACT) group meetings should be re-launched and delivered as an equal partnership arrangement. (For further information about recommendations 2-2e please refer to pp 30-45 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.2.1 As a group we did recognise that local public meetings remained important to many people. Indeed, during our consultation process many residents commented that they appreciated local meetings because it provided them with an opportunity to meet with local officials face to face. However, we believed that this requirement could be met through the delivery of one rather than two local public meeting arrangements.

5.2.2 We believe that a re-launch of the Partners and Communities Together process would be appropriate because it would challenge unfortunate existing perceptions that this is a Police only process. The West Mercia Police have indicated that they are as keen as we are to ensure that all relevant stakeholders understand that Partners and Communities Together is designed to address local problems through partnership working.

5.2.3 The Council has signed up to the Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy. This strategy commits the Council to a vision for 'Redditch to be successful and vibrant with sustainable communities built on partnership and shared responsibility'. We believe that by committing to a re-launch of the Partners and Communities Together process the Council would demonstrate its commitment to partnership working.

5.2.4 However, we do not feel that the exact arrangements for delivering the re-launched Partners and Communities Together process can be specified by us as a Group. Instead, we feel that these arrangements would need to be the subject of more detailed negotiations between the relevant partners that would be represented on the re-launched process. We

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

have, however, made a number of suggestions for the consideration of those partners, which are detailed in our final report (pp 31-45).

5.2.5 We further believe that Council investment in the re-launched Partners and Communities Together process would represent greater value for money for the people of Redditch than investment in the Neighbourhood Groups. Indeed, following the discontinuation of the Neighbourhood Groups we would anticipate that the Council would make considerable savings even whilst investing in the re-launch of the Partners and Communities Together process. However, we do not feel that we can specify the extent of the financial savings that would be made or the amount that the Council would need to invest in the re-launched Partners and Communities Together process as this would be subject to the outcomes of negotiations between the relevant partner organisations.

3) The Neighbourhood Groups also be replaced with a further variety of methods that will enable Redditch Borough Council to inform and consult more effectively with local residents. (For further information about recommendations 3-3h please refer to pp 46-64 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.3.1 We believe that there are a variety of measures that can be used by the Council to more effectively inform, engage and consult with residents than the Neighbourhood Groups. Some of the activities which we think have the potential to be particularly effective are already implemented or must be made available by local authorities in accordance with legislative requirements. However, we are concerned that these measures, such as Councillor Calls for Action and Street Briefings, are not recognised by many people and therefore need to be more actively promoted.

5.3.2 We consulted with residents over many of the alternative mechanisms which we are proposing should be used by the Council. Significant support was expressed by residents for the following measures: Citizens Panels; Councillor Calls for Action; Environment Visual Audits; FixMyStreet; road shows and Street Briefings.

5.3.3 We also consulted with the Redditch Student Council to obtain further information about how younger people would prefer to communicate with the Council. They were unanimous in their view that the Council should utilise Facebook to engage with younger people.

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

5.3.4 We are aware that some concerns have been expressed by a number of residents that increasingly organisations are using IT methods to interact with the public, although not all residents have access to the internet. Whilst we are recommending that web based facilities, such as FixMyStreet, should be promoted by the Council and social networking should be undertaken by the Council to interact with residents, this only forms one part of our package of proposals. We feel that the opportunities provided through using IT facilities should be utilised alongside and not at the expense of face to face interaction and traditional forms of written communications.

4) Redditch Borough Council should continue to seek ways to better engage and consult with a more diverse range of residents. (For further information about recommendation 4 please refer to pp 65-66 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.4.1 During the course of our review it has become clear that consultation processes are constantly evolving. Measures which may have effectively enabled the Council to inform, engage and consult with residents at one time might no longer be effective a few years later.

5.4.2 We believe that increasingly developments in technology, particularly information technology, will enable people to develop new communications tools. This should facilitate more efficient and convenient forms of engagement for future years.

5.4.3 The Council needs to be able to respond to these changes so that it can make use of new opportunities as and when they arise. This will ensure that the Council continues to remain familiar with the needs of our communities and will enhance the local authority's ability to comply with the responsibilities set out in the duty to involve.

5) The Council should have a robust monitoring system in place to assess the effectiveness of each of the mechanisms used to inform, engage and consult with local residents. (For further information about recommendation 5 please refer to pp 67-68 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.5.1 In the current economic climate there are scarce resources available to local authorities and their partner organisations and this situation is set to continue for the foreseeable future. Public service organisations must ensure that public spending addresses local needs and leads to the best possible outcomes for local communities. In this context we believe that any mechanisms which are utilised by the Council to

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

inform, engage and consult with residents should be robustly monitored to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.

5.5.2 We are aware that there was no standard system in place to monitor the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Groups. Instead, the impact of the groups on local communities was assessed on an ad hoc basis. We think that this prevented the Council from taking action to address the shortcomings of the Neighbourhood Groups at an earlier date.

5.5.3 The impact and implementation of our recommendations, if approved, will be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in due course. However, the scrutiny monitoring process is limited to one or two meetings. We feel that robust, standard monitoring arrangements will also be required in the long-term to review the ongoing effectiveness of all the consultation measures utilised by the Council.

6) The Community Forum and similar groups which engage and consult with local residents should report to the Executive Committee. (For further information about recommendation 6 please refer to pp 69-70 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.6.1 The Community Forum was designed to act as a critical friend to Redditch Borough Council in relation to equalities issues. Members of the Community Forum are consulted over the equalities implications of local strategies and policy changes as a standard part of the Council's consultation process.

5.6.2 We believe that the Community Forum is an important initiative. Through interacting with members of the Forum the Council is able to engage with representatives of groups who have traditionally proved hard to reach.

5.6.3 However, we have some concerns about the current operation of the Community Forum. We feel that work needs to be undertaken to strengthen the Forum's governance arrangements so that there can be greater transparency in relation to the work of the Forum and the contribution that it makes to policy development and decision making at the Council.

5.6.4 We believe that the governance arrangements of the Redditch Community Forum should be organised so that it reports directly to the Council's Executive Committee. Meetings of the Executive Committee are open to public attendance and minutes of Executive Committee meetings are published on the Council's website. In this context, all interested parties could

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

view information about the contribution that has been made by the Forum to policy development and local decision making.

- 7) The Council should have a central electronic database which would be used for the purposes of consultation with key partners in the Borough.** (For further information about recommendation 7 please refer to pp 71-72 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

5.7.1 There is currently no central Redditch Borough Council database of contact details for residents which could be utilised for consultation purposes. Instead, there are a number of different contact lists which are used for specific purposes, such as the distribution list for the Neighbourhood Groups. Access to these distribution lists is not provided across the Council but rather to Officers working in specific service areas.

5.7.2 We feel that this situation is untenable in an environment where the duty to involve requires local authorities to actively engage with local representatives over Council business wherever appropriate. Moreover, we believe the number of residents who provided their contact details for use in future consultation processes during the course of the 2009 road shows clearly demonstrated that there was some willingness amongst residents to engage with the Council.

5.7.3 A central electronic database could amalgamate the contact details from the different distribution lists to create a larger distribution list. We recognise that if this action was to be approved permission would need to be obtained to do so and it would need to be undertaken in accordance with data protection rules set out in the Data Protection Act 1998.

5.7.5 We also recognise that any central database would need to be carefully managed. Contact details should only be accessed for the purposes which have been permitted by the resident or business contact. We believe that a similar method should be used to that which has been implemented to manage use of the contact details provided during the road show events. For that process a senior Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, manages access to the data.

6. Conclusion

We believe that Redditch Borough Council must ensure that the methods it uses to inform, engage and consult with residents are fit for purpose both for the present and for the future. We have reached the conclusion that alternative mechanisms would enable the Council, together with the Council's partner organisations, to more effectively interact with residents than the Neighbourhood

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

25th November

Groups. Indeed, we believe that the alternative arrangements we have proposed will be more cost effective and widely appreciated by a more diverse section of the local community.

7. **Background Papers**

The Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Report. (A comprehensive Bibliography of the sources that were scrutinised during the course of the review have been provided in this document).

8. **Consultation**

- 8.1 There has been extensive consultation with representatives of external bodies and with the public. (For further information about the consultation that took place as part of this review please refer to pp 24-27 of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group Final Report).

9. **Author of Report**

The authors of this report are the Chair of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group, Councillor Kath Banks, and Councillors Enderby, Pearce and Thomas. Further information about this report can be obtained from Jess Bayley, (Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer) who can be contacted on extension 3268 or e.mail: jess.bayley@redditchbc.gov.uk .

