

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 8th November,
2011
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 and Michael Craggs
Overview and Scrutiny Support Officers**

**Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH
Tel: 01527 64252 (Ext. 3268 / 3267) Fax: (01527) 65216
e.mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.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

Tuesday, 8th November, 2011

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: Phil Mould (Chair) Bill Hartnett
Mark Shurmer Gay Hopkins
(Vice-Chair) Brenda Quinney
Peter Anderson Alan Mason
Andrew Brazier Luke Stephens
Simon Chalk
Andrew Fry

1. Apologies and named substitutes	To receive apologies for absence and details of any Councillor (or co-optee substitute) nominated to attend this meeting in place of a member of this Committee.
2. Declarations of interest and of Party Whip	To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in items on the Agenda and any Party Whip.
3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 12)	To confirm the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a correct record. (Minutes attached) (No Specific Ward Relevance);
4. Actions List (Pages 13 - 14)	To note the contents of the Overview and Scrutiny Actions List. (Report attached) (No Specific Ward Relevance);
5. Scrutiny of the Forward Plan (Pages 15 - 32)	To consider whether any items on the Forward Plan are suitable for scrutiny. (Forward Plan attached). (No Specific Ward Relevance);

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th November, 2011

<p>6. Task & Finish Reviews - Draft Scoping Documents</p>	<p>To consider any scoping documents provided for possible Overview and Scrutiny review.</p> <p>(No reports attached)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>7. Task and Finish Groups - Progress Reports</p>	<p>To consider progress to date on the current reviews against the terms set by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The current reviews in progress are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Facilities for Disabled People – Chair, Councillor Alan Mason;b) Improving Recycling – Chair, councillor Gay Hopkins;c) Promoting Sporting Participation – Chair, Councillor Luke Stephens; andd) Youth Services Provision – Chair, Councillor Simon Chalk. <p>(Oral reports)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>8. Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Councillor Brenda Quinney</p>	<p>To receive a verbal update on the recent work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>(Oral report)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>9. Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel - Chair's Update</p> <p>(Pages 33 - 36)</p> <p>Councillor Bill Hartnett</p>	<p>To receive a report from the Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel on any further developments in the work of the Panel that may have occurred since the previous meeting of the Committee.</p> <p>[The report contains exempt information as defined in S.100 of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, as it contains information relating to any action taken, or to be taken, in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime. In view of this it is anticipated that discussion of these matters will take place after the exclusion of the public.]</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>All Wards;</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th November, 2011

<p>10. Petition Appeal - Save Brockhill Green Belt (Pages 37 - 44)</p>	<p>To consider an appeal against the decision taken by Council in response to a petition received on 5th September 2011 entitled Save Brockhill Green Belt.</p> <p>(Appeal Notice, Petition Prayer and relevant minute from 5th September Council meeting attached).</p> <p>(Batchley & Brockhill Ward);</p>
<p>11. Portfolio Holder Annual Report - Housing, Local Environment and Health (Pages 45 - 48) Councillor Brandon Clayton</p>	<p>To receive the Portfolio Holder Annual Report from Councillor Brandon Clayton, Portfolio Holder for Housing, Local Environment and Health.</p> <p>(Report attached and oral report to follow).</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>12. Task and Finish Group Monitoring Report - Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) (Pages 49 - 50) Helen Broughton</p>	<p>To receive a monitoring report concerning the implementation of recommendations submitted by the LSP Task and Finish Group in 2010.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>13. Sustainable Community Strategy - Monitoring Update Report (Pages 51 - 68) H Broughton - Redditch Partnership Manager</p>	<p>To receive a monitoring report regarding the Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy.</p> <p>The following reports should be considered in relation to this item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy – Executive Summary;• Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy – Overview and Scrutiny Six Monthly Review;• Raising Educational Achievement and Aspirations Action Plan - 28/10/2011;• Health and Well-Being Action Plan; and• Area of Highest Need Action Plan. <p>(Reports attached Area of Highest Need Action Plan to follow).</p> <p>(Various Wards);</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th November, 2011

<p>14. Gritting and Snow Clearance - Redditch Borough Council Approach - Pre-Scrutiny</p> <p>G Revans, Head of Environmental Services, Head of Environment</p>	<p>To pre-scrutinise the content of a report concerning Redditch Borough Council's proposed contribution to gritting and snow clearance arrangements during inclement weather.</p> <p>(Report to follow)</p> <p>All Wards;</p>
<p>15. Referrals</p>	<p>To consider any referrals to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee direct, or arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Executive Committee or full Council• Other sources. <p>(No separate report).</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>
<p>16. Work Programme (Pages 69 - 74)</p>	<p>To consider the Committee's current Work Programme, and potential items for addition to the list arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Forward Plan / Committee agendas• External publications• Other sources. <p>(Report attached)</p> <p>(No Specific Ward Relevance);</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Tuesday, 8th November, 2011

17. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Chief Executive, during the course of the meeting to consider excluding the public from the meeting on the grounds that exempt information is likely to be divulged, it may be necessary to move the following resolution:

“That, under S.100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following matter(s) on the grounds that it/they involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined paragraphs 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act”.

- **Item 9: Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel – Chair’s Update**

These paragraphs are as follows:

Subject to the “public interest” test, information relating to:

- **Para 1 – any individual;**
- **Para 2 – the identity of any individual;**
- **Para 3 – financial or business affairs;**
- **Para 4 – labour relations matters;**
- **Para 5 – legal professional privilege;**
- **Para 6 – a notice, order or direction;**
- **Para 7 – the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime;**
and may need to be considered as ‘exempt’.

(No Specific Ward Relevance);



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Phil Mould (Chair), Councillor Mark Shurmer (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Peter Anderson, Andrew Brazier, Simon Chalk, Andrew Fry, Bill Hartnett, Gay Hopkins, Brenda Quinney, Alan Mason and Luke Stephens

Also Present:

Michael Collins (Vice Chair of the Standards Committee)
Mrs S Boyd and Mrs M Morley (petitioners representing the war memorial petition).

Officers:

C Felton, L Hadley, J Staniland and L Tompkin

Committee Services Officer:

J Bayley and M Craggs

94. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

There were no apologies for absence.

95. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

There were no declarations of interest nor of any party whip.

96. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27th September 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

97. ACTIONS LIST

Members considered the latest version of the Committee's Actions List.

As requested at the previous meeting, information on the number of affordable housing units that had been provided as part of the new housing development at Windsor Heights had been circulated amongst Members. All actions had subsequently been completed.

RESOLVED that

the Committee's Actions List be noted.

98. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES AND SCRUTINY OF THE FORWARD PLAN

The Committee reviewed the contents of the Forward Plan and considered whether any items were suitable for scrutiny.

Members noted that road gritting and snow clearance arrangements had formed the subject of a Short, Sharp Scrutiny review earlier in the year. Under these circumstances the Committee concurred that Members had appropriate expertise in the subject to make a useful contribution to the Executive Committee's decision making process through pre-scrutiny of a report on gritting and snow clearance, which was due to be considered by the Executive Committee on 15th November 2011. Consideration of this item would also provide the Committee with an opportunity to assess progress that had been made in relation to gritting and snow clearance procedures since the review had concluded.

Finally, Members requested further information on the options to be considered by the Executive Committee on 6th December 2011 regarding the Children's Centres Contract.

RESOLVED that

- 1) **the report *Gritting and Snow Clearance - Redditch Borough Council Approach* be received at the Committee meeting on 8th November 2011 for pre scrutiny; and**
- 2) **the Executive Committee minutes for 4th October 2011 be noted.**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

99. TASK & FINISH REVIEWS - DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENTS

There were no draft scoping documents.

100. TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS

The Committee received the following reports in relation to current reviews.

a) Facilities for Disabled People – Chair, Councillor Alan Mason

The Group was to reconsider the scope of the review following concern that this was too wide.

The Group had not met since the last Committee meeting, however was hoping to meet during the week commencing Monday 24th October.

b) Promoting Sporting Participation – Chair, Councillor Luke Stephens

The Group had recently held a meeting to review what it had learned so far. The Council's Head of Leisure and Cultural Services, had attended the meeting to provide his perspective.

The Council's Sports Development and Physical Activity Manager had been invited to attend the Group's next meeting on 27th October to discuss local provision for disabled sporting participation.

c) Youth Service Provision – Chair, Councillor Simon Chalk

Signage for the Local Democracy Day on 20th October promoting youth participation had been agreed at the Group's most recent meeting.

The next meeting of the Group was scheduled for 19th October.

RESOLVED that

the update reports be noted.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

101. HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillor Brenda Quinney provided an update on the work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC), as Redditch Borough Council's representative.

At its most recent meeting on 18th October 2011, the HOSC received a presentation on the performance of the Out of Hours service across the county. The service was said to be performing well in Worcestershire, especially when compared to the national picture. Members subsequently suggested that the greater use of this service needed to be further promoted in Redditch.

Members heard that new procedures had been introduced at the Alexandra Hospital to improve the quality of care for elderly residents. Extra beds had also been provided on a full time capacity for general use.

Councillor Quinney informed Members that she would also be updating the HOSC on the performance of the new stroke service at the Alexandra Hospital.

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

102. PETITION - WAR MEMORIAL

The Committee considered a petition regarding the Redditch War Memorial.

The Chair invited lead petitioner and other members of the public to speak to the petition. The invited speakers informed the Committee that in recent months there had been a noticeable increase in anti-social behaviour around the War Memorial. In particular, Members heard that members of the public were regularly sitting on the Memorial itself. This was attributed to a lack of nearby public benches. It was also reported that excess litter had damaged the aesthetic appearance of the area.

It was reported that Skateboarders were often in and around the area whilst others rode quickly through on bikes. The increased noise that had resulted was incongruous to the expectation that the area should be a place for quiet reflection. Members sought clarification on the legality of riding a bike in a pedestrian area.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

Taken altogether it was felt that such anti-social behaviour was not only disrespectful but also potentially upsetting for those who wished to remember deceased loved ones in a quiet and peaceful setting. Furthermore, it was felt that some residents would be especially sensitive to this prior to Armistice Day.

Members were firmly supportive of the principle behind the petition and expressed concerns about anti-social behaviour beside the war memorial. However, it was suggested that many of those who were acting in an anti-social manner could be unaware that their actions would be considered by others to be disrespectful. It was subsequently proposed that some residents needed to be reminded of the Memorial's significance.

Members considered various options developed by Officers for swiftly restoring the area to its full respectability (Appendix A). The first of these options would be to install planters around the war memorial, which could be moved as and when required. The second option would involve installation of chain linked barriers around the war memorial.

The Committee concluded that they were keen to ensure that any measures taken to deter people from sitting on the War Memorial and reduce anti-social behaviour in general did not compromise public access to the area nor reduce its aesthetic appeal. Under these circumstances Members favoured the installation of planters around the War Memorial.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) that planters be installed around the war memorial to deter people from sitting on the war memorial;**
- 2) a campaign of education about the war memorial be launched to increase awareness of the purpose of the war memorial;**
- 3) the Executive Committee ask Officers to investigate the possibility of introducing improved signage for the war memorial;**
- 4) the Executive Committee ask Officers to investigate the possibility of introducing seating in the area;**
- 5) the Executive Committee ask Officers to investigate the possibility of installing an extra litter bin in the area and**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

RESOLVED that

- 1) **Officers provide an update to the Committee in approximately six months on the effectiveness of the actions taken to tackle anti-social behaviour around the War Memorial; and**
- 2) **the petition be noted.**

103. PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORT - HOUSING, LOCAL ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH

The Committee received a written report which detailed the performance of services within the remit of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Local Environment and Health, Councillor Brandon Clayton.

On the basis of the information contained within the report Members requested that the following questions be addressed by the Portfolio Holder in his Annual Report to the Committee, which was scheduled to be delivered on 8th November 2011.

- 1) What action has been taken to provide more social housing in Redditch?
- 2) What are the current trends in relation to:
 - a) homelessness enquiries to Redditch Borough Council?
 - b) the number of statutorily homeless people being housed by Redditch Borough Council?
- 3) What affect on the capital programme will the purchase of the housing stock have?
- 4) What action is Redditch Borough Council taking to reduce the number of empty properties within the town to as close to zero as possible? What obstacles, if any, are there in relation to reducing the number of empty properties?
- 5) What initiatives are you considering to increase the rates of recycling in Redditch?

RESOLVED that

the content of the written performance report be noted.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

104. PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORT - COMMUNITY SAFETY AND REGULATORY SERVICES WRITTEN REPORT

The Committee received a written report which detailed the performance of services within the remit of the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services, Councillor Juliet Brunner.

On the basis of the information contained within the report Members requested that the following questions be addressed by the Portfolio Holder in her Annual Report to the Committee, which was scheduled to be delivered on 29th November 2011.

- 1) What affect will the cuts in Police numbers have on crime and disorder in Redditch?
- 2) What will the future provision of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) be in Redditch?
- 3) To what extent have the location of CCTV cameras in Redditch been reviewed and, in particular, how possible would it be to relocate CCTV cameras from existing locations to areas of greater need if considered necessary?
- 4) What action, if any, is planned to address the noise caused by scrap metal dealers? To what extent can this be addressed through licensing processes?
- 5) What will the implications of the introduction of directly elected police commissioners for community safety budgets? What implications, if any, will there be for CCTV systems in the town?

RESOLVED that

the content of the written performance report be noted.

105. MEETING OF THE CHAIR WITH THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL - FEEDBACK

The Chair expressed concern that the quarterly meetings with the Leader of the Council had not been as productive as initially hoped and commented that the discontinuation of these meetings would not prevent dialogue as and when necessary.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

It was suggested that inviting Officers to officially record the meetings could increase their productiveness. However, the Chair suggested that this would be unlikely.

Members were informed that as the meetings were now a requirement as part of the Council's constitution, any proposal for its termination would need to be approved by the Constitutional Review Working Party.

RECOMMENDED that

the quarterly meetings between the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Leader of the Council be removed as a requirement from the Council's constitution.

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

106. JOINT WORCESTERSHIRE SCRUTINY CHAIRS' AND VICE CHAIRS' NETWORK MEETING - FEEDBACK

The Chair provided feedback from the Worcestershire Scrutiny Chairs' and Vice-Chairs' Network meeting on 3rd October 2011 at Malvern District Council.

Members were advised that a number of issues were discussed at the meeting, including the effectiveness of local scrutiny in relation to health, and crime and disorder. The meeting reaffirmed the Chair's view that scrutiny was working well in Redditch. In particular, Redditch Borough Council's arrangements for Crime and Disorder Scrutiny and for receiving regular updates from the Council's representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee were considered to be representative of good practice.

The Committee debated the feasibility of attending a county-wide scrutiny training session. It had been commented that Members had already received two scrutiny training sessions at the start of the municipal year. However, the Committee was keen to work with other Councils over the delivery of joint scrutiny training where appropriate. It was therefore suggested that the Council should offer to be involved in scoping training session to help make it more worthwhile and that further consideration be made after the costs involved had been confirmed.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday, 18th October, 2011

RESOLVED that

- 1) **the subject of joint scrutiny training be considered at a following meeting of the Committee, following confirmation of the financial costs involved; and**
- 2) **the report be noted.**

107. REFERRALS

There were no referrals.

108. WORK PROGRAMME

Members were advised that the written performance report for services within the remit of the portfolio for Leisure and Tourism would be received at the Committee meeting on 29th November 2011 at the request of the Chair. The meeting scheduled for 3rd January 2012 had subsequently been cancelled due to lack of business.

At its next meeting on 8th November 2011, the Committee was due to receive an appeal to the decision of Council on 5th September 2011 regarding the petition to preserve green belt land in Brockhill. An explanation for the appeal would be provided in the agenda pack for the meeting.

The Committee would also receive at a meeting on 29th November 2011 a presentation on the implementation of the housing trailblazers' scheme. The scheme had links to the scrutiny review of homelessness that was completed in 2006.

Finally, Members were advised that a series of provisional dates had been set in early 2012 for parliamentary scrutiny seminars. Expressions of interest were to be submitted to relevant Officers.

RESOLVED that

the Committee's Work Programme be noted.



Actions requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date Action Requested	Action to be Taken	Response
18th October 2011 1	Members requested clarification regarding the purpose and focus of an item on the Forward Plan entitled: 'Children's Centres Contract.	Information about the purpose and focus of the report was emailed to Members of the Committee on 19/10/11. DONE.
18th October 2011 2	Members requested that the potential to remove a number of unused bin cupboards from council properties in order to discourage fly tipping be investigated further. In particular it was suggested that conditions in Mickleton Close should be reviewed further.	This task may take some time to be completed. Lead Officer, Head of Housing, estimated completion date, not specified. TO BE DONE
18th October 2011 3	The Committee requested that further clarification be provided with regards to the focus of the proposed joint scrutiny training in Worcestershire, due to be hosted by Doctor Stephanie Snape, and the financial costs involved in participating in this training exercise.	It should be possible to obtain further information on this subject during the Scrutiny Officers' Network meeting. Lead Officers, Overview and Scrutiny Support Officers, estimated completion date, 28/10/11. (SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY THE DATE OF THE MEETING).

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LEADER'S

FORWARD PLAN

1st November 2011 to 29th February 2012

(published as at 14th October 2011)

This Plan gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken in the coming four months by the Borough Council's Executive Committee.

(NB: There may be occasions when the Executive Committee may make recommendations to Council for a final decision.
e.g. to approve a new policy or variation to the approved budget.)



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

This Plan gives details of items on which key decisions are likely to be taken by the Borough Council's Executive Committee, or full Council, in the coming four months.

“Key Decisions” are ones which are likely to:

- (i) result in the Council incurring expenditure, foregoing income or the making of savings in excess of £50,000 or which are otherwise significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or**
- (ii) be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in the area comprising two or more wards in the Borough;**
- (iii) involve any proposal to cease to provide a Council service (other than a temporary cessation of service of not more than 6 months).**

The Forward Plan is available for inspection free of charge at the Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH from: 9am to 5pm Mondays to Fridays; or on the Council's website (www.redditchbc.gov.uk).

If you wish, you can see or obtain copies of any documents, detailed in the plan, provided they are not confidential, and be kept informed of any additional supporting documents as they become available. You can also arrange to have copies of additional supporting documents. Please ask the Town Hall receptionist to call one of the Committee Services Team on ext: 3269. There is a charge per side of A4. If you wish to make any representations they should be made in writing addressed to the Officer whose name is given as the contact for the relevant item.

The Executive Committee's meetings are normally held every three weeks at 7pm on Tuesday evenings at the Town Hall. They are open to the public, except when confidential information is being discussed. If you wish to attend for a particular matter, it is advisable to check with the Committee Services Team on (01527) 64252, ext: 3269 to make sure it is going ahead as planned. If you have any other queries, Committee Services Officers will be happy to advise you.

The full Council meets in accordance the Council's Calendar of Meetings. Meetings commence at 7.00pm.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Carole Gandy	Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership & Partnership
Councillor Michael Braley	Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Councillor Juliet Brunner	Portfolio Holder for Community Safety & Regulatory Services
Councillor Brandon Clayton	Portfolio Holder for Housing, Local Environment & Health
Councillor J Pearce	Portfolio Holder for Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development & Transport
Councillor Derek Taylor	Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Tourism
Councillor G Chance	
Councillor M Hall	
Councillor Debbie Taylor	

CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATIONS

For **Key Decisions** the summary document appended to the Forward Plan sets out details of any proposed consultation process. Any person / organisation not listed who would like to be consulted or who wishes to make representations on the proposed decision are encouraged to get in touch with the relevant report author as soon as possible before the proposed date of the decision. Contact details are provided.

Alternatively you may write to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, The Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, B98 8AH or e-mail: denise.sunman@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Item No.	Decision Taker	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Decision	Type of Decision (Key or Non-Key)	Lead Councillor/ Portfolio Holder	Comments
1	Council	5 Dec 2011	17 Oct 2011	Safeguarding Policy and Procedure	Non-Key	Councillor Juliet Brunner	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 15 Nov 2011
2	Council	5 Dec 2011		Gritting and Snow Clearance - Redditch Borough Council Approach	Non-Key	Councillor Brandon Clayton	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 15 Nov 2011
3	Council	5 Dec 2011		Housing Revenue Account - Outcome of Review	Key	Councillor Brandon Clayton	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 15 Nov 2011
4	Council	5 Dec 2011		Sandycroft - Future of Site	Key	Councillor Michael Braley	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 15 Nov 2011
5	Council	5 Dec 2011		Redditch Community Safety Partnership - Future arrangements	Key	Councillor Juliet Brunner	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 15 Nov 2011

Item No.	Decision Taker	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Decision	Type of Decision (Key or Non-Key)	Lead Councillor/ Portfolio Holder	Comments
6	Council	16 Jan 2012		Children's Centres Contract	Non-Key	Councillor Derek Taylor	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 6 Dec 2011
7	Executive	6 Dec 2011		Quarterly Performance Report - Quarter 2 - July to September 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
8	Executive	6 Dec 2011		Quarterly Budget Monitoring - Quarter 2 - July to September 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
9	Executive	6 Dec 2011		Quarterly Monitoring of the Benefits Service Improvement Plan - Quarter 2 - July to September 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
10	Executive	6 Dec 2011		Quarterly Customer Services Monitoring - Quarter 2 - July to September 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	

Item No.	Decision Taker	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Decision	Type of Decision (Key or Non-Key)	Lead Councillor/ Portfolio Holder	Comments
11	Executive	6 Dec 2011		Quarterly Monitoring - Write Off of Debts - Quarter 2 - July to September 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
12	Council	16 Jan 2012	17 Oct 2011	Core Strategy - Consultation	Key	Councillor Jinny Pearce	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 10 Jan 2011
13	Council	20 Feb 2012		Statutory Development Management Services - Proposed Fees	Key	Councillor Jinny Pearce	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to Council following its meeting on 31 Jan 2012
14	Executive	31 Jan 2012	11 Nov 2010	Street Naming Policy - Review	Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
15	Executive	13 Mar 2012		Quarterly Performance Report - Quarter 3 - October to December 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	

Item No.	Decision Taker	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Decision	Type of Decision (Key or Non-Key)	Lead Councillor/ Portfolio Holder	Comments
16	Executive	13 Mar 2012		Quarterly Budget Monitoring - Quarter 3 - October to December 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
17	Executive	13 Mar 2012		Quarterly Monitoring of the Benefits Service Improvement Plan - Quarter 3 - October to December 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
18	Executive	13 Mar 2012		Quarterly Customer Services Monitoring - Quarter 3 - October to December 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	
19	Executive	13 Mar 2012		Quarterly Monitoring - Write Off of Debts - Quarter 3 - October to December 2011	Non-Key	Councillor Michael Braley	

Item No.	Decision Taker	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Decision	Type of Decision (Key or Non-Key)	Lead Councillor/ Portfolio Holder	Comments
20	Executive	Awaiting New Date	4 Oct 2011	Housing Allocations Policy - Review	Key	Councillor Brandon Clayton	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to full Council
21	Executive	Awaiting New Date	4 Oct 2011	Roxboro House - Disposal Options	Key	Councillor Brandon Clayton	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to full Council
22	Executive	Awaiting New Date	12 Jan 2011	Town Centre Landscape Improvements (including Church Green)	Key	Councillor Brandon Clayton, Councillor Jinny Pearce	*Executive Committee will make recommendations to full Council

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on 15 Nov 2011

<p>LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER Councillor Brandon Clayton</p>	<p>ITEM Housing Revenue Account - Outcome of Review</p>	<p>WARDS AFFECTED All Wards;</p>
<p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Report of the Head of Housing REPORT AUTHOR L Tompkin Head of Housing and Community Services</p>	<p>SUMMARY To consider the final outcome of the Review of the Housing Revenue Account.</p>	<p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN To seek agreement for the Council's 30 year Business Plan and to agree the financial payment of debt</p>
<p>CONSULTATION DETAILS Briefings Attendance at Borough Tenants Forum Letter to tenants</p>	<p>Method of Consultation Councillors Borough Tenants Forum Directors and Heads of Service, Redditch Borough Council</p>	<p>Consultation Period or Dates October - November 2011</p>

DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

Not applicable

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on 15 Nov 2011

LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER	ITEM	WARDS AFFECTED
<p>Councillor Michael Braley</p> <p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Report of the Head of Finance and Resources</p> <p>REPORT AUTHOR M Bough Housing Policy and Performance Manager</p>	<p>SUMMARY</p> <p>To consider the future of the site known as Sandycroft.</p> <p>[The report may contain exempt information as defined in S.100 of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, as they may contain information relating to the financial of business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information. In view of this it is anticipated that discussion of these matters will take place after the exclusion of the public.]</p>	<p>(Central Ward);</p> <p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN Decision of Council required regarding future of site</p>

CONSULTATION DETAILS	Method of Consultation	Consultation Period or Dates
	Stakeholders Redditch Borough Council Officers Worcestershire County Council Homes and Communities Agency	

DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on **15 Nov 2011**

<p>LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER Councillor Juliet Brunner</p>	<p>ITEM Redditch Community Safety Partnership - Future arrangements</p>	<p>WARDS AFFECTED All Wards;</p>
<p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Report of the Head of Community Services</p> <p>REPORT AUTHOR A Heighway, Head of Community Services</p>	<p>SUMMARY To request Members to approve the merger of Redditch Community Safety Partnership (RCSP) with Bromsgrove Community Safety Partnership (BCSP) and Wyre Forest Community Safety Partnership (WFCSP). This would result in the creation of a North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership (NWCSP).</p>	<p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN</p>
<p>CONSULTATION DETAILS Briefings Reports</p>	<p>Method of Consultation Councillors Responsible Authorities which include the Police, Fire Service, Primary Care Trust, Worcestershire County Council, the Police Authority and Chief Executives.</p>	<p>Consultation Period or Dates June to November 2011</p>

DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

Not applicable

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on 10 Jan 2012

LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER	ITEM	WARDS AFFECTED
<p>Councillor Jinny Pearce</p> <p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration</p> <p>REPORT AUTHOR E Baker Acting Development Plans Manager</p>	<p>Core Strategy - Consultation</p> <p>SUMMARY To seek endorsement of the Core Strategy Consultation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix A - Officer Responses to Core Strategy Consultation 21st January – 4th March 2011; - Appendices B to L - as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) Evidence Base. Appendix B for use in Development Management decision making; - Appendix M - (Local Development Scheme No.5) with revised Local Plan timescales; and - Appendix N - (Consultation Booklet on Redditch Growth) for consultation during January to March 2012 and associated 	<p>All Wards;</p> <p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN</p>

	<p>background documents; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix O – Sustainability Appraisal 	
<p>CONSULTATION DETAILS</p>	<p>Method of Consultation Members and the Planning Advisory Panel (PAP)</p>	<p>Consultation Period or Dates Planning Advisory Panel meetings between October and December 2011</p>
<p>DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH</p> <p>Not applicable</p>		

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on 31 Jan 2012

LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER	ITEM	WARDS AFFECTED
<p>Councillor Jinny Pearce</p> <p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration</p> <p>REPORT AUTHOR A Rutt Development Control Manager</p>	<p>Statutory Development Management Services - Proposed Fees</p> <p>SUMMARY To consider proposed Planning Application fees as a result of recent changes to legislation, which requires Local Planning Authorities to set their own Planning Application Fees.</p>	<p>All Wards;</p> <p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN</p>
<p>CONSULTATION DETAILS Website consultation. Agents focus group debate / discussion and comment.</p>	<p>Method of Consultation</p>	<p>Consultation Period or Dates To be confirmed</p>
<p>DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH</p>		

Item No. 14

KEY DECISION

Proposed to be made by the Executive on 31 Jan 2012

LEAD MEMBER / PORTFOLIO HOLDER	ITEM	WARDS AFFECTED
<p>Councillor Michael Braley</p> <p>DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DECISION TAKER Background Papers: none specified.</p> <p>REPORT AUTHOR D Poole, Head of Business Transformation</p>	<p>Street Naming Policy - Review</p> <p>SUMMARY To consider a review of the Street Naming Policy.</p>	<p>All Wards;</p> <p>REASONS FOR BEING ON THE FORWARD PLAN</p>
CONSULTATION DETAILS	Method of Consultation	Consultation Period or Dates

DECISIONS TO BE MADE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel: Chair's report of Panel meeting held on Wednesday 26th October 2011.

All Members of the Panel were present along, with Michael Collins (Independent Vice-Chair of the Standards Committee). An apology for absence was received from Ken Hazeldene (Redditch Anti Harassment Partnership).

Officers from the Community Safety team gave an informal training session on the Community Safety Partnership's newly incepted Performance Management Framework to help Members scrutinise and interpret the report.

The Panel received a good overall picture of the Partnership's performance, and noted the trend in crime over the previous twelve months was generally downward. It was especially pleasing to read that night time economy (NTE) related violence and public order offences was down from 241 during 2009/2010 to 198 for 2010/2011. The Panel subsequently requested that our congratulations be passed onto the Partnership for its performance. The Panel also acknowledged that Redditch in the national context was a low crime area and was a safe place to live.

However, Members noted recorded figures for the following areas of crime were higher than at the same position twelve months earlier: serious acquisitive crime; harassment offences; racially or religiously aggravated offence; and crime with vulnerable adult interest marker.

The Panel requested that it be updated on protocols for young people attending hospital with alcohol or drug related conditions. This was due to be received by the Community Safety Partnership at its forthcoming meeting on 2nd November 2011.

Upon being asked to explain what difference the Partnership had made to make Redditch a safer place, Officers sighted the introduction of the following examples: of a mural outside the railway station to compliment the work of the Town Centre Partnership to re-model and improve the area; of attractive artwork in underpasses that were previously drab and dark; and of practical safety and security measures in to the homes of particularly vulnerable residents. The Panel agreed that, in the absence of the press at the meeting, a press release would be prepared based on the Officer's answer.

The Panel considered the Work Programme and noted that at our next meeting in January we would need to propose questions for the Chair of the Community Safety Partnership ahead of her appearance at the following meeting in January.

Members heard that the Partnership was to consider at its next meeting on 2nd November the proposal to merge with the Wyre Forest and Bromsgrove Community Safety Partnerships to form a North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership. We were advised that the respective Wyre Forest and Bromsgrove Partnerships had already approved the proposal.

The Panel agreed by a majority vote that it did not agree with the proposal and to communicate this to both the parent Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to the Redditch Community Safety Partnership. It was felt that Redditch as a Borough could lose its identity and the focus of a merged partnership would not be solely on Redditch.

The Panel RECOMMENDED that:

Redditch Borough Council does not approve 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).

Bill Hartnett.
Chair, Redditch Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.
26th October 2011

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

**Save the Brockhill Green Belt Petition (October 2011)
Complaint to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee**

The Complaint

There are two areas of concern we have in respect of the petition

- **The way the petition was dealt with on the evening**
- **The allocation of the petition solely to RBC Planning**

We were led to believe that if there were over 400 signatories on a petition then this could trigger a presentation being made by the Petition Team in front of a full Council, where it could be openly discussed.

When we arrived at the Town Hall we were approached and presented, by RBC Legal, the following

- **You can't discuss the Brockhill ADR because of the development application for 171 houses submitted by Persimmon and being heard on the following Wednesday**
- **The Councillors cannot discuss the petition in case it is construed by Persimmon as detrimental to this pending application**
- **The outcome is that the petition will be passed directly to RBC Planning because it is Policy based**

We discussed that the petition is only about Brockhill Green Belt and actually criticises RBC Planning but were told in no uncertain terms the above would happen.

In answer to the above points

- **The petition is clearly about Brockhill Green Belt and Brockhill Green Belt only**
- **The representation submitted as a part of the official petition pack made it clear that the petition was not about Brockhill ADR. However as Brockhill East Green Belt has been included into Brockhill East Policy 29 in the CS then there may have been some mention to Brockhill ADR. However there would have been no direct reference to the pending application for 171 houses**
- **There is mention in the petition representation submitted, referring to the CS and Planning Policies, however there is a lot of criticism aimed directly at RBC Planning. Not just concerning policy but the processes by which they arrived at the requirement and inclusion of Green Belt for immediate development**

We believe because we are being critical of RBC Planning, the petition should never have been passed to them solely. They have an input, yes: the same as we do, but we believe that passing it solely to them is too self-regulatory and that is one of the reasons why we are here tonight to make our complaint and ask you to assist us in changing the outcome. There is little that can be done in respect of the presentation, but we feel we should have been given the option to reschedule the presentation to a time when an open discussion could have been held.

Below you will find an explanation of the situation and some of the criticisms as we see them and you will find our conclusions at the end of the report.

Background

Redditch Borough has been set a target of 7,000 dwellings by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS) for the period 2006 to 2026. It was agreed that 4,000 were to be sited within the boundary and the remaining 3,000 cross boundary. The Core Strategy (CS) refers to this target and maintains that it remains in force until its official replacement by the Localism Bill.

Issues

Redditch Borough has a very limited reserve of non Green Belt land on which to develop and after this plan, will be close to land availability bankruptcy. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) last revisited in April 2010 highlights sites available and deliverable for the plan period within the Redditch boundary. They show a figure insufficient

to meet the WMRSS target and more than likely insufficient to address the new target that Redditch Planning are currently investigating and evaluating. Two of the sites included in the CS, Brockhill East And Brockhill West are exiting Greenbelt and the petition was clearly in respect of these sites and these sites only. It has never been or will be, anything to do with the Brockhill ADR.

Sustainability Development is mentioned a number of times in the CS and the official definition is **“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”**. We believe that building on Green Belt in such a manner as the CS proposes is totally in breach of this definition and therefore development on these two Green Belt sites can not be called ‘sustainable development’.

PPG2 (Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts)

There are 5 purposes of including land in Green Belt and not for development, 2 of which are highlighted here

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The PPG2 deems all building to be inappropriate on Green Belt unless very exceptional circumstances exist. The protection is also to encourage recycling of derelict and other urban land. Therefore, there is a requirement to investigate further all land availability in Redditch, for example the NHS Smallwood Hospital site and the land east of the railway at Brockhill East, where the owners have recently held a public consultation exercise showing how they would like to build 212 new dwellings. These sites are not Green Belt so must be considered before any Green Belt is developed.

Section 3.4 details 5 reasons that indicate why building on Green Belt would not be inappropriate. None of these reasons are applicable to the Brockhill Green Belts.

To develop on Green Belt there must be very clear exceptional circumstances. RBC Planners are using an argument ‘Due to the high level of housing needs and limited locations for development, exceptional circumstances exist to remove land from the Green Belt to form part of the strategic sites for development’. We believe this argument is void when considering the CS is only a partial CS, with questionable and possibly changing targets and without a full clear strategic approach showing how they will deliver Redditch’s full requirements for the period 2006 to 2026 and beyond. We also believe that this statement together with the Sustainable Development definition show that if Green Belt is included in this way, no development can be classed as **‘sustainable’**

Paragraph 2.12 states that ‘any proposals affecting Green Belts should be related to a time-scale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan. The CS Policy 7 states ‘All Strategic Sites for development can come forward immediately in accordance with the policies in the Development Plan’. Brockhill East and West Green Belts are Strategic Sites and are Green Belt. These two statements seem to be in direct conflict.

The Core Strategy

Redditch cannot build its total requirement as identified in the CS. When challenged about its completeness, Redditch Planning have acknowledged and identified that it is only a partial CS. It requires further, possibly long and intricate discussions between themselves and Bromsgrove DC in respect of possible expansion. The Planning Department are reviewing the requirements using more accurate statistics from WCC and with the forthcoming Localism Bill about to be introduced, may present new targets and further associated development sites. Until this is complete, Green Belt should not be considered as a strategic site for development.

Complaint – In respect of RBC Planning

The existing partial CS has identified two areas of Green Belt as strategic sites Policy 29 Brockhill East and Policy 30 Brockhill West.

Policy 29 Brockhill East

The Green Belt we are petitioning for is a part of this policy. Together with Brockhill ADR it has been titled Brockhill East. We would like to make it clear that this petition is concerning Brockhill Green Belt only and does not include Brockhill ADR.

Policy 30 Brockhill West

Brockhill West was known and identified as late as April 2010 in the SHLAA as Foxlydiat Green Belt. Its name changed when it was included in the CS as a strategic site for development. There is no reference made at all to it being Green Belt either in the title or in the whole of Policy 30, in its principals or justification. For a public consultation document this is unacceptable, unprofessional and misleading. People were asked to comment on the CS without being supplied with a full and clear description of the site identified. To most locals this is the only document they ever get to read in respect of planning and care should be taken to ensure it is complete, clear and accurate.

When the RBC Planners were asked why the Foxlydiat Green Belt site name was changed, the reply was 'the SHLAA identifies parcels of land by location/street name. Brockhill West reflects a strategic site rather than a current land use designation in a particular location'.

One may say, okay, fair enough, however it is interesting that the site for Policy 31 is still referred to as 'Land to the rear of Alexander Hospital'. Let's ensure the rules are applied fair and evenly please. The number of dwellings for both sites is about the same, 150 for Brockhill West and 145 for the Alex.

There has been a complete and systematic removal of Green Belt reference for Brockhill West and this is unacceptable.

There are over 670 petitioners represented here today and many did not realise that Brockhill West was actually Green Belt and therefore made no representation to planning as part of the public consultation process for the CS in March 2011. There seems to be a total lack of transparency here. There is no excuse for removing Green Belt from the title and not having any reference to its Green Belt status. To thoroughly erase all reference to Green Belt cannot be explained as simply an error, oversight or simple mistake. There is no mention or explanation of the 'very clear exceptional circumstances' that exist to allow development on Green Belt as outlined in the PPG2 Green Belts report and there is definitely no reference in this report to the use of Green Belt for employment purposes, especially when there is currently, according to the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, over 1 million square feet of empty office and industrial space in existence in Redditch. In fact the PPG2 states quite the opposite and states that before building on Green Belt the council concerned should be encouraged to recycle old and disused areas.

What is Redditch Planning doing towards this recycling?

When asked this question at the public consultancy meeting for Brockhill they were totally unaware of the amount of empty office space that existed. You only have to drive around Redditch to see lots of empty offices so it really isn't anything new and therefore figures' should have been available at the time the employment land was included in the Brockhill West strategic site.

There has been a recent article published in the Redditch Advertiser Oct 12, where a Councillor actually makes a statement about empty housing and the need to re-cycle.

Brockhill West is quite a small site and is surrounded on one side by the Redditch/Bromsgrove Boundary and on the other by community woodland.

It is not adjacent to the existing Brockhill estate and there are no linking paths etc.

It really adds little value to the sustainability (perhaps none at all) and deliverability of the CS. It would only supply about 37 low cost rented social dwellings maximum. The landowner's questionnaire (LOQ) completed in respect of Brockhill West and the representation made on behalf of Persimmon by RPS for the CS show clearly that Brockhill West is seen by Persimmon and their agent as only an 'enabler' to allow them to continue building another 1,500 dwellings on the adjacent Bromsgrove Green Belt. Policy 30 actually refers to, in its

principals, a stream and an oil pipeline. Neither of these is actually on the current Brockhill West site within the Redditch boundary but do certainly exist on the site in Bromsgrove.

It is interesting that cross boundary references are being added ahead of any discussions on cross boundary expansion especially considering the references to Green Belt have been totally removed.

Also how can 150 dwellings justify having associated retail and employment land? It is obvious that this retail/employment development is consistent to the greater plan as shown in the RPS North West Redditch Concept Masterplan (Option 1). RPS supplied us with this and has informed us that Option 1 is the preferred option of Redditch Planning. This may add some bias to any decision Redditch Planning will take, when deciding a best and preferred option for cross boundary consideration and development.

Recently, Gallagher Estates Limited held a public consultation for the building of 212 dwellings on the non Green Belt land east of the railway line adjacent to Brockhill East/Brockhill ADR and this could, if passed, be able to replace the 150 dwellings scheduled for development on Brockhill West Green Belt immediately. An outline planning application has now been submitted to RBC Planning.

The SHLAA Process

Paragraph 4.3 in the SHLAA states 'assessment should involve key stakeholders including house builders, social landlords, local property agents and **local communities** plus other relevant agencies such as Housing Corporation and English Partnerships. The purpose of this involvement is to discuss and agree methods, assumptions, judgements and findings throughout the process to ensure the robustness and transparency of the Assessment. Appendix 1 details all members of the Redditch SHLAA Working Partnership which was formally established in October 2009'.

This working partnership has no local representation at all and considering approximately 1,000 dwellings are proposed for the Brockhill area this seems very unsatisfactory.

There should be another thorough and independent review process, this time involving the local community.

We believe this criticism of RBC Planning is fair and justified and is the reason why RBC Planning should not have sole control over the outcome of this petition.

Conclusions

If there was an issue hearing the petition on that particular evening i.e. because of the Brockhill ADR/Persimmon Planning Application being presented on the Wednesday following, the petition presentation should have been rescheduled.

We live in a democratic country and therefore should be able to openly present to Council on behalf of our petitioners. There should not be censorship of what can be said by the petition team, as long as it's true and not disrespectful. Finally, until the presentation was heard the outcome should not have been decided.

As Elected Councillors on our behalf and as guardians of the beautiful Green Belt land Redditch still has, we believe you should have the ability to discuss, speak and oversee this issue openly.

We therefore request that, the petition involves and is overseen, by some form of independent committee, to ensure it does not become just another objection to the CS.

Answers are required to questions raised from the petition presentation and some importance should be given to these, with associated timescales. This should be a formal process not an informal chat as recently offered by Ruth Bamford.

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL**COUNCIL**

5th September 2011

PETITION – SAVE BROCKHILL GREEN BELT

Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr J Pearce
Relevant Head of Service	Head of Planning and Regeneration
Not a Key Decision <i>(in relation to this specific item)</i>	

A Petition has been received containing approximately 674 signatures in accordance with the new constitutional arrangements / new Petition Scheme. The 'prayer' of the petition is as follows:

"Redditch Borough Council, through its Core Strategy, is intending to seek development on Green Belt lands in the Brockhill area of Redditch.

We the undersigned request Redditch Borough Council to abandon these damaging and inappropriate proposals.

We also request Redditch Borough Council to preserve and protect the green belt in Redditch and exempt it from any further development."

The recently adopted scheme provides for the 'petition organiser', Mr Mark Whitworth, to be given the opportunity *"to present the petition at the meeting and the petition will then be discussed by Councillors, with a maximum of 15 minutes being allowed for the consideration of each petition. The Council will decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. They may decide to take the action the petition requests, not to take the action requested for reasons put forward in the debate, or to commission further investigation into the matter, for example by a relevant committee. Where the issue is one on which the Council's Executive Committee is required to make the final decision, the Council will decide whether to make recommendations to inform that decision. The petition organiser will then receive written confirmation of this decision."*

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Jess Bayley, Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer and Denise Sunman, Committee Services Officer
 E Mail: jess.bayley@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk / denise.sunman@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
 Tel: 01527 64252 ext 3268 / 3270



Council

5th September 2011

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Anita Clayton (Mayor), Councillor Gay Hopkins (Deputy Mayor) and Councillors Peter Anderson, Michael Braley, Rebecca Blake, Andrew Brazier, Juliet Brunner, David Bush, Michael Chalk, Simon Chalk, Brandon Clayton, Andrew Fry, Carole Gandy, Adam Griffin, Malcolm Hall, Bill Hartnett, Roger Hill, Robin King, Wanda King, Alan Mason, Phil Mould, William Norton, Jinny Pearce, Mark Shurmer, Luke Stephens, Debbie Taylor and Derek Taylor

Also Present:

M Collins (Vice-Chairman, Standards Committee)

Officers:

J Bayley, K Dicks, C Felton, C Flanagan, S Hanley, J Pickering, S Skinner and A Walsh

Committee Services Officer:

I Westmore

The following extract from the minutes of the 5th September Council meeting contains the relevant minute relating to the deputation who attended the meeting to present a petition on the following subject: Save Brockhill Green Belt.

MINUTE 49

DEPUTATION - SAVE BROCKHILL GREEN BELT

A petition had been received, in accordance with current Constitutional arrangements and the Petition Scheme, which contained in excess of the 400 signatures required to trigger a Council debate. In addition, the petitioners had asked that the Council receive a deputation on this matter.

Prior to receipt of the deputation, the Council's Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services clarified for the benefit of Members and the petitioners / deputation the extent of the involvement which the Council might properly have in this matter at

.....
Chair

this particular stage. Advice was given that planning applications were only to be determined by the Planning Committee but that planning policy was a matter for Council approval in due course. However, the petition focussed upon matters being considered and consulted upon within the ongoing Core Strategy development process.

The members of the deputation, Mr Mark Whitworth and Mr Richard Lee, supported by Mr David Moss, addressed the Council on the subject of the two areas of land in Brockhill, those covered by Policy 29 in the draft Core Strategy (Brockhill East) and Policy 30 (Brockhill West).

Mr Whitworth reminded Members of the outcomes of earlier reviews of land available for development within the Borough. It had previously been acknowledged that areas of green belt should not be considered as potential sites for future development. Members were informed that the deputation and petition were not in objection to the future development of the ADR land in Brockhill.

Mr Lee argued that the Brockhill East area should be removed from the developing Core Strategy as land suitable for development. It was noted that the Planning Inspectorate had previously stated that the current green belt would be readily defensible and that exceptional circumstances did not prevail that should cause this designation to be removed. The high ecological and environmental interest and sensitivity of the site was noted as was the quality of the farmland, the potential visual impact of any development and the high amenity value of the area.

Mr Whitworth noted that Brockhill West was not referred to as green belt in the current Core Strategy consultation despite it being previously designated as the Foxlydiate Green Belt. The small size of this site made it relatively insignificant in terms of meeting Redditch's future housing needs but there was the obvious potential for it to be used as an enabler for substantial development across the boundary in Bromsgrove. The inclusion of the site within the Master Plan and its designation as a Strategic Site was considered a substantial change in the space of a few months. It was argued that development of the green belt should be a last resort and not a first option.

Members noted the comments of the Deputation and the content of the petition and, in accordance with the advice of Officers

RESOLVED that

the petition stand referred to the ongoing Core Strategy development process which was to be reported for formal decision by the Council at a later date.



Overview & Scrutiny Committee

No Direct Ward Relevance

8th November 2011

PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORTS: QUESTIONS AND SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION WITH COUNCILLOR BRANDON CLAYTON, PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING, LOCAL ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH

The following questions have been suggested by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. These questions will be posed to Councillor Brandon Clayton, Portfolio Holder for Housing, Local Environment and Health at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on Tuesday 8th November 2011.

- 1) What action has been taken to provide more social housing in Redditch?
- 2) What are the current trends in relation to:
 - a. homelessness enquiries to Redditch Borough Council?
 - b. the number of statutorily homeless people being housed by Redditch Borough Council?
- 3) What affect on the capital programme will the purchase of the housing stock have?
- 4) What action is Redditch Borough Council taking to reduce the number of empty properties within the town to as close to 0 as possible? What obstacles, if any, are there in relation to reducing the number of empty properties?
- 5) What initiatives are you considering to increase the rates of recycling in Redditch?

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

NB Note draft revision /Update – Page 2. S

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL **GUIDE TO / FOR PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

Portfolio Holders are appointed annually by the Council (separate sheet refers) and between them cover all areas of the Council's work and responsibility.

"Portfolio" indicates a specified area of responsibility allotted by formal resolution, for the purposes listed below.

"Portfolio Holder" indicates a member of the Council's Executive Committee who, within the allotted area of responsibility,

CAN	1.	Monitor Council performance informed by documents such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Strategy • Corporate Plan • Service Plans • Budgets • E.Government statements • BVPI's / Local PI's (separate document available) • Forward Plan 	*
	2.	Monitor the implementation of Council policy and decisions informed, in addition to the above, by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council reports and Minutes • Personal contact with Officers 	*
	3.	Act as consultee for Members and Officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formally, in accordance with approved delegations of authority to Officers • Informally for general reference. 	*
	4.	Act as "Spokesperson" for the Council in relation to Press / Media / outside the	

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

		Council, but <u>not exclusively (other Members may also have this shared role)</u> (Council decision – 11th October ??)	
	5.	Act as “Rapporteur” a) to report annually to Overview & Scrutiny on the Services for which the Portfolio Holder has responsibility; and b) to act as a channel for feedback from representatives of outside bodies which fall within the remit of the Portfolio Holder. (Council Annual Meeting 22 nd May 2006)	
	6.	<i>the role of Portfolio Holders be expanded to include a higher level of involvement with the Local Strategic Partnership, and, more specifically, with relevant Sub-Groups of the Redditch Partnership, as and when formed.</i> (Exec January 2007 / Council ...)	
CANNOT		Act with delegated authority in any personal capacity (PFHs cannot therefore commit resources – financial / staffing, without further authority – Exec., Council, or Officer authority)	
			*
MAY	1.	Represent and “sponsor” their allotted Portfolio(s) at meetings of the Executive and the Council, and, <i>where appropriate</i> , at other Council meetings, e.g. O&S.	
	2.	Develop closer working relationship with relevant lead Directors and, via Directors, other relevant Officers.	
	3.	Attend relevant meetings, e.g. relevant O&S meetings, beyond those to which formally appointed by the Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an approved duty where invited to the meeting • Also as an approved duty when present on own initiative. <p style="text-align: right;">in accordance with current approved constitutional requirements.</p>	
	4.	Seek to trigger reports to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Executive or Council, via normal report / 	

Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

		<p>agenda preparation processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory Committees, via normal report / agenda preparation processes • Overview and Scrutiny Committee <p>in accordance with current approved constitutional requirements.</p>	

G:M&C/Members/Portfolio Holder Guide
& Constitution / Const.documents/revised sms/8.7.6/16.7.7

**LSP Task and Finish Group – Monitoring Report on Recommendations –
November 2011**

Recommendation	Response
<p>1. The Partnership’s website, hosted by Redditch Council, should be re-launched with expanded material.</p>	<p>Redditch Partnership web pages were re-launched in early 2010 structured in accordance with the Task and Finish Group’s suggestion. They are maintained on a regular basis.</p>
<p>2. The Partnership should hold an annual “We Are Redditch “event for partners to inform the public about their work and consult them about their priorities.</p>	<p>The “We Are Redditch” event was held in January 2010 as a response to the CAA report and the red flag. It was also used as an opportunity to consult with the public regarding their priorities for the new Sustainable Community Strategy. As the Strategy is now completed, Redditch Partnership has not needed to undertake consultation in 2011. They do however, review information from other consultations undertaken by partner organisations.</p>
<p>3. The Partnership should publicise its work and invite public reaction by placing regular items by partners in Redditch Matters.</p>	<p>Redditch Matters contains a section for Redditch Partnership news or news related to the activities of the Partnership e.g. education, schools etc.</p>
<p>4. The Partnership should advertise and hold an annual meeting for partners and the public to discuss the state of the Borough.</p>	<p>A Redditch Partnership Conference was held on 16th June 2011. Members of the public were not invited to attend as the event was aimed at launching the new Sustainable Community Strategy to partner organisations.</p>
<p>5. LSP Board meeting minutes should be circulated with the agenda for Council meetings as part of the new Leader’s Items section.</p>	<p>Minutes are now directly circulated to Members by the Redditch Partnership Manager once they have been finalised after each Board meeting. This ensures they are not too out of date once members receive them.</p>
<p>6. There should be pre-scrutiny of each new Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>Pre-scrutiny of the new SCS took place in March 2011.</p>
<p>7. The Leader of the Council should provide a formal Annual Report of the Partnership at the end of the Municipal year.</p>	<p>Councillor Carole Gandy has delivered a formal verbal Annual Report about the Redditch Partnership at full Council.</p>

<p>8. Information about the Partnership should be included in the induction material for new Councillors.</p>	<p>Basic information about Redditch Partnership has been provided to the Member Service Officer for inclusion in the information packs for new Members for both 2010 and 2011.</p>
<p>9. An event focussing on the Partnership be included as a standard part of the annual councillor training programme.</p>	<p>Two Members training sessions have been provided by the Redditch Partnership Manager, one in October 2010 and one in October 2011.</p>
<p>10. There should be a full review and audit of each completed SCS by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>O&S Committee examined pre-scrutinised the new SCS on 2nd March 2011.</p>
<p>11. The Redditch Partnership and SCS should be subject to six-monthly monitoring sessions by the Committee.</p>	<p>The first six monthly review is taking place at the O&S Committee meeting on 8th November.</p>
<p>12. The next SCS should have fewer, more focussed targets (perhaps four – six) which are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.</p>	<p>The new SCS has only four key priorities.</p>
<p>13. For the foreseeable future, the SCS should contain targets relating to health and educational inequalities in Redditch.</p>	<p>The focus of the majority of the work of Redditch Partnership is raising educational standards and tackling health inequalities.</p>
<p>14. The priorities within the SCS should reflect residents' priorities (as identified through consultation) and also dovetail with those of the Worcestershire Partnership.</p>	<p>Two consultation events were held in 2010, the results of which fed into the writing of the new Redditch SCS. Worcestershire Partnership has recently refreshed its own SCS by auditing all of the district LSP priorities and forming a new set of priorities which reflect those of all the districts.</p>
<p>15. The LSP requires the support of a full-time permanent Partnership Manager reporting directly to the Director of Policy, Performance and Partnerships.</p>	<p>Helen Broughton was appointed as the full time, permanent Redditch Partnership Manager in May 2011 as part of the Shared Services Review of Policy, Performance and Partnerships Directorate.</p>

Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy – Executive Summary

Vision

The Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy is built around a shared vision for the Borough. It is envisaged that by 2026:

‘Redditch will be successful and vibrant with communities that have access to good job opportunities, good education, good health and are communities that people will be proud to live and work in’.

About Redditch

Redditch is situated in the north east of Worcestershire and lies 15 miles south of the West Midlands conurbation. The Borough covers a total of 54 square kilometres, and is comprised of several communities focused around district centres. Redditch was designated a New Town in 1964 and since then the population has increased dramatically from 32,000 to around 78,813 (2001 census).

Compared to other areas of Worcestershire, the Borough has a higher proportion of young people aged 0-17 (22.4% compared to 20.8% in the County), and a smaller proportion of individuals aged 65 or over (14.1% compared to 18.7% in the County). Redditch has the largest proportion of ethnic minority groups of Worcestershire’s six districts with 8% of the population from an ethnic group.

In 2009, the then Government’s performance assessment regime, the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) gave Worcestershire a ‘red flag’. This red flag was given specifically for the differences in the quality of life for people living in Redditch compared to people living in the rest of Worcestershire. Particular areas highlighted included: lower life expectancy; high levels of smoking; poorer GCSE exam results; more people reliant on benefits; and more families on a low income.

Health Inequalities

In broad terms the health of people in Redditch is similar to the England average; however, there are significant differences in health and well being between Redditch and Worcestershire. Inequalities particularly exist in lifestyle choices including smoking, physical activity, and alcohol.

Nationally, alcohol abuse has been flagged as an issue and Redditch is no different. Approximately 19.3% of people in Redditch are considered to be “binge drinkers” and there are approximately 1,629 hospital stays per year for alcohol related harm. Levels of smoking have also been identified as an issue of concern for Redditch. The prevalence of adults who smoke is estimated at 22% which is just below the England average of 22.2% and the worst in the County. According to the 2010 Health Profile, 29.9% of adults in Redditch are classed as obese. The percentage of adults classed as healthy eaters has decreased since 2009 from 24.3% to 21.7% and is now significantly worse than the England average.

Educational Attainment

Educational performance of pupils in Redditch has been recognised as an issue over many years. Redditch has consistently fallen behind Worcestershire in the percentage of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* to C. Data from 2009 and 2010 shows that while average results are getting better in Redditch, they are still behind those of the County as a whole.

The Economy

Job losses for people living in Redditch have increased the most and recent statistics from the Office for National Statistics show that more people are out of work with the

overall unemployment level in Redditch at 8.7%. This is 0.6% lower than the regional average, but 0.8% higher than the national average. The gap between the unemployment level for Redditch and Worcestershire is 4.2% with Worcestershire's unemployment level at 4.5% (as at March 2010).

Pockets of Deprivation

According to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2007, from the district level summary (where 1 is the most deprived) of the average deprivation score, Redditch is ranked 131st out of 354 areas nationally. This is the most deprived area in Worcestershire. Redditch is in the top 40% most deprived districts.

The most deprived areas in Redditch include parts of Winyates, Church Hill, Batchley and Woodrow. Winyates housing estate is the most deprived area in Redditch, and is the sixth most deprived area in the County. Based on this evidence, Redditch Partnership decided to focus its Areas of Highest Need project on Winyates Centre and the immediate surrounding area.

Priorities

Priority One	Health Inequalities	Focus is on three issues: smoking, alcohol; and obesity / health lifestyles.
Priority Two	Education attainment and raising aspirations of young people.	Focus is on three issues: improving literacy and numeracy; raising aspirations; and improve statistical levels of attainment.
Priority Three	The economy of Redditch with a focus on providing a larger and more diverse job offer.	Focus is on three broad issues: promotion of Redditch as a business location; jobs and worklessness; and fostering economic ambition in young people.
Priority Four	Areas of deprivation with an initial focus on Winyates and Church Hill.	Winyates project focuses on: enhanced security measures for residential areas in Centre; and community engagement in the area.

Delivery

Four action plans have been produced which focus on the four priority areas. They contain actions which are to be undertaken in partnership and which are not already being undertaken by partner organisations as part of their core business. Delivery of the action plans is driven by the Theme Groups with regular reports up to the Redditch Partnership Management Board. The action plans are viewed as 'live' documents which can be altered and amended as new projects come on stream or if circumstances change.

The actions listed are just the start and Redditch Partnership must develop and build on these over the next three years, responding to new ideas and developing innovative solutions to meet the Vision it has set out for Redditch. The yearly meeting of Redditch Partnership will formally review overall progress towards achieving the vision and also hold the Partnership Board to account.

For more information about Redditch Partnership and to see a full copy of the Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy please go to <http://redditch.whub.org.uk/cms/housing-services/redditch-partnership.aspx> or contact the Redditch Partnership Manager at helen.broughton@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk or telephone 01527 64252 Ext.3237.

Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy – Overview and Scrutiny Six Monthly Review

The Redditch Sustainable Community Strategy was pre-scrutinised in March 2011 with the final Strategy gaining approval by full Council on 28th March 2011. Two of the key priorities of the Partnership are health inequalities and raising educational achievement. The Action Plans of these Priorities are attached to this report for Members consideration. The Health Action Plan is currently in the process of being reviewed.

A further priority of the Partnership is Economic Development. An Action Plan for this priority was produced along with the SCS but this has since been withdrawn. Instead, actions from various other organisations and partner bodies such as Economic Development Unit and Local Enterprise Partnerships are monitored, with the Partnership Board providing direction and intervention on this where necessary.

Finally, a list of current activity being undertaken in Winyates as part of the Areas of Highest Need Project is provided. As this project is dynamic and fast changing, the upkeep of an Action Plan in the original format has been difficult to maintain. The Redditch Partnership Board is currently working with the Neighbourhood Development Manager to develop measures and outcomes for the project.

Other Work of Redditch Partnership (not included in the Action Plans) – April – October 2011

- **Redditch Partnership Conference** - this was held on 16th June 2011. The purpose of the conference was to launch the new SCS and bring representatives from partner organisations and agencies together to discuss how they could contribute to the work of the Partnership.
- **Fire Safety Checks** – the work between Ableflame, Hereford and Worcester Fire Service and Redditch Borough Council conducting fire safety checks to try to reduce death and injury in vulnerable people from fires in their homes.
- **Maintaining skills training services in the Borough** - NEW College has worked in partnership with the Council to undertake the delivery of basic skills training at Greenlands Business Centre.
- **Promotional activity** - SureStart having the use of a shop unit in the Kingfisher Centre to promote their work.
- **Redditch Partnership Events Diary** - a calendar of events in Redditch is maintained by the Partnership and circulated on a regular basis to partners to help raise awareness of all partner events in Redditch.
- **Enhanced partnership working for the delivery of Leisure Services** -
- **Morton Stanley Park** – joint consultation with Redditch Borough Council and partners having stalls at the event.
- **Local Joined Up Working** – Redditch Partnership Board, lead by Redditch Borough Council is looking at ways of applying the concept of transformation in local service delivery.
- **Work with the new Clinical Commissioning Group (CCGs)** – partners are working with the new CCGs to influence health provision and service delivery with the aim of tackling health inequalities in the Borough.

Raising Educational Achievement and Aspirations Action Plan - 28/10/2011

To improve literacy and numeracy in Redditch schools									
Redditch Partnership Issue 1:	Aim:	Key Issues:	Project	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner(s)	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date
	To improve levels of attainment at KS2 and progress from KS1 to KS2 in literacy and numeracy to at least in line with Worcestershire average. To improve the percentage of students attaining grade C or above in English and maths, and who make the expected progress in English and maths from KS2 to KS4, to at least in line with Worcestershire average.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low levels of literacy and numeracy on entry to some Redditch schools, and some rates of progress below expectations. • This has a negative impact upon the overall levels of attainment and progress of some pupils. • Levels of attainment and rates of progress in literacy and numeracy are influenced by pre-school provision and by parents. 							
			<p>1a. To consider issues of early years care and the role of Children's Centres and their impact on literacy and numeracy levels.</p> <p>1b. To raise greater awareness of Children's Centres.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redditch Local Children's Partnership to consider recent Ofsted reports for Children's Centres in Redditch. To determine further action from this. • Request that all schools promote Children's Centres for relevant families 	March 2011	WCC / LCP	None identified	Increased number of children from appropriate backgrounds accessing Children's Centres	<p>Completed</p> <p>On-going</p>

	<p>2. To increase parental engagement in their children's education and the impact this has on educational development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify examples of best practice in Redditch schools and those who have achieved the Leading Parent Partnership (LLP) award designed to encourage parents to engage in their children's education. Schools to actively promote these examples of best practice to other schools to encourage them to take up parental engagement award schemes / initiatives. Compile a list of support services available to families and circulate to all schools in Redditch for circulation to relevant families. 	July 2011	LCP	None identified	<p>Increased number of schools gaining the LPP award and initiatives in Redditch schools designed to engage parents with their children's education.</p> <p>Greater uptake of support services by parents, and parents better informed about the support services they can access.</p>	<p>Examples of best practice sent to schools</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>On-going. To be reviewed by Partnership</p>
<p>3. To review access to educational support services for families in Redditch.</p>				WCC			

To raise the aspirations of children and young people in Redditch							
Redditch Partnership Issue 2:	To raise awareness of the opportunities on offer to children and young people in Redditch.						
Aim:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners and schools feel that aspirations of young people in the town are generally very low. Young people are not always taking full advantage of the opportunities that already exist in the town for them. More work needs to be done to help provide more opportunities for young people in the town and to promote these opportunities more effectively. 						
Key Issues:							
Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners and schools feel that aspirations of young people in the town are generally very low. Young people are not always taking full advantage of the opportunities that already exist in the town for them. More work needs to be done to help provide more opportunities for young people in the town and to promote these opportunities more effectively. 						
Actions to Tackle Key Issues:	Project	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date
	1. To establish a large careers fair in Redditch for all students in Redditch.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Group to undertake the organising of liaising with schools, possible employers and to arrange venue and transport hire. 	5 th April 2011	RBC / WCC	Funding has been identified.	<p>Numbers of people attending (min of 1600 children will be attending)</p> <p>To have raised greater awareness with young people about different career options.</p>	Completed.
	2. To organise a 'roadshow' that can visit schools in the town to promote job roles in Redditch's public, private and voluntary sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit volunteers for the roadshow using the Redditch Partnership Board. Discuss with schools a format and timetable for the road shows. 	High schools – end of 2011 Middle schools - 2012	RBC in conjunction with Redditch Partnership Board	None identified.	To have raised greater awareness with young people about different career options.	On-going
	3. To establish mentoring schemes in more schools in the Borough.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact schools already using mentoring schemes and ask them to attend an LCP meeting to discuss their experiences. 	March 2011	RBC, West Mercia Police	None identified.	To raise the number of pupils most in need to access support through a mentoring scheme.	Mentoring information sheet sent to schools.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contact schools not using a mentoring scheme to discuss their mentoring requirements.• Further discussions to be held with voluntary sector providers about their capacity to deliver a mentoring programme.• Actions have been developed in the Redditch Partnerships Economy Action Plan.• Discussion at a future LCP meeting to decide on further actions for this			RBC Economic Development Unit		None identified.		To be arrange
	3. To review the development of education and employment networks.			May 2011	LCP				

To improve annual statistical levels of attainment and progress for pupils in Redditch schools at the end of KS2 and KS4 at least in line with rates of progress for Worcestershire									
To increase the number of academic pupils retained in Redditch schools.									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational attainment at KS2 and at GCSE in Redditch schools is below the average for Worcestershire. Parents' perception of Redditch schools, particularly of the High Schools, is poor. A number of parents choose to send their children to schools across the boundary where schools are perceived to be 'better'. This has a detrimental impact upon the prior attainment profile of High Schools in Redditch. 									
Redditch Partnership Issue 3:	Aim:	Key Issues:	Project	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date
			1. To identify the movement of children to schools out of the Redditch area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the number of Redditch families that have transferred pupils to schools out of the area, to include age of transfer, location and reason(s). This should focus initially on September 2010 start, then add data for previous years if / when possible. 	May 2011	Widening Participation team, WCC. Led by Jan Greenhalgh		The collection of evidence which provides a clearer idea of the patterns of movement to other schools and reasons for this.	To be reported October.
			2. To better market, publicise and promote Redditch schools to Redditch residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partners to work with schools to identify communication contacts/champions to feed good news stories to the local press of activities and pupil success (with a focus on academic) in Redditch schools. 	On-going	WCC / RBC / Clr Barry Gandy	None identified	Achievements of pupils / schools are more widely publicised, helping to change perceptions of schools in Redditch.	<p>On-going Schools are getting working harder good news in the press.</p> <p>Work has been undertaken by feed good news to the press.</p>

Comment [11]:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight (through writing to them) those schools that have improved their profile using these means. 	On-going	WCC / RBC	None identified.	Evidence base established which shows where parents are sending their children to be educated out of the Borough and reasons for this.	No action taken reviewed by Partnership.
3. To establish what perceptions of Redditch schools exist and to design interventions to address these.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a mapping exercise to establish what consultation work has already been conducted with residents regarding education in Redditch. Design and undertake a series of consultation exercises to establish what perceptions are. Possible questions to be designed to test perceptions which could be used at the RBC Road shows during 2011. Using the consultation results, design a targeted promotional campaign to tackle these perceptions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a mapping exercise to establish what consultation work has already been conducted with residents regarding education in Redditch. Design and undertake a series of consultation exercises to establish what perceptions are. Possible questions to be designed to test perceptions which could be used at the RBC Road shows during 2011. Using the consultation results, design a targeted promotional campaign to tackle these perceptions. 	On-going	Hugh Bennett / Helen Broughton			

Health and Well-Being Action Plan

Redditch Partnership Issue 1:	Obesity									
Key Deliverable:	Reduce obesity levels in Redditch									
Top Three Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over abundance of takeaways in the town. Volume of food being consumed and overweight being seen 'as the norm'. Lack of positive activities. 									
Key Actions to Tackle Key Issues:	Project	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner (s)	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date			
	<p>1. Winyates Healthy Eating Project (A two phase project. Phase one – production of a cookbook. Phase Two – involves using the cookbook as a tool for community led healthy eating initiatives).</p>	<p>Phase One:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure funding for the project Establishing a Steering Group Establish links with local schools, community groups and traders Production of cookbook Event to launch cookbook. 	Summer 2011	RBC - Liz Williams / Helen Broughton Worcestershire PCT - Debbie Baker-Price	£5,000 from the PCT.	The effective engagement of schools and community groups including intergeneration work between Arrow Vale High School and Ipsley Middle school.	<p>Recipes have been tested and cookery book is now in the process of being produced.</p> <p>A launch event will take place in December. There has been slight slippage with this project and it is envisaged that Phase One will be completed by the end of December 2011.</p>			

		<p>Phase Two:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase one will inform the key actions for Phase Two 	<p>March 2012</p>			<p>Establishment of infrastructure to facilitate community engagement leading to community cohesion whilst addressing the public health agenda for disadvantaged communities.</p>	
	<p>2. Where possible, undertake Health Impact Assessments on all partners' policies and strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To produce a matrix to assess the Redditch Core Strategy. To undertake a Health Impact Assessment of the Core Strategy. 	<p>December 2011</p>	<p>RBC - Ruth Bamford. Worcestershire PCT – Peter Fryers</p>	<p>Officer time</p>	<p>Number of Health Impact Assessments undertaken.</p>	<p>A matrix has been produced and an initial assessment of the Core Strategy Policies has been undertaken. The next stage of the process is to assess those policies which have been identified as having an impact on health. This work is ongoing and will be</p>

Redditch Partnership Issue 2: Key Deliverable:	Smoking												
Top Three Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Pressure • Self worth • Role models 												
Key Actions to Tackle Key Issues:	<p>Project</p> <p>1. Encourage employers and the voluntary sector to signpost to stop smoking services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To explore the possibility of running a campaign in the FSB Voice magazine. • To establish and promote a stop smoking league table for businesses. • To arrange a presentation evening for the smoking league table winners. 	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner (s)	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date						
			On- going	FSB - Des Sutton RBC - Helen Broughton Worcestershire PCT - Debbie Baker-Price	To be confirmed	<p>Numbers of businesses that sign up.</p> <p>Number of smokers that quit.</p> <p>Number of partners / spouses that quit.</p>	<p>Progress has been delayed on this action owing to the stepping down of the Redditch FSB representative.</p>						

	<p>2. To encourage partners to support the 2011 Stop Smoking Campaign, "Time to Quit".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide local partners with campaign materials and to provide signposting training (utilised from the 'Smoke Free' website). Information to be circulated to the LSP Board on national health campaigns. 	<p>March 2011</p> <p>On-going</p>	<p>RBC - Helen Broughton</p> <p>Worcestershire PCT - Debbie Baker-Price</p>	<p>Use existing Department of Health material</p>	<p>Number of partners promoting national events</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
	<p>3. GPs Activity Referral</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target GPs in Health Hotspots to promote the re-launch of the Activity Referral Scheme. 	<p>On-going project</p>	<p>RBC – Shireen Budieri</p> <p>Worcestershire PCT - Debbie Baker-Price /</p>	<p>Use existing Worcestershire PCT resources</p>	<p>Increased number of referrals from GPs in deprived areas</p>	<p>On-going.</p>

Redditch Partnership Issue 3:	Alcohol Misuse											
Key Deliverable:	Reduce levels of alcohol misuse in Redditch											
Top Three Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's not "don't drink" – it's the message and the support that is the key. Alcohol is used to mask the real underlying issues. Alcohol is viewed as less of a priority to other health issues. 											
Key Actions to Tackle Key Issues:	Project	Key Actions	Completion Date	Lead Partner (s)	Resources	Measures of Success	Progress to date					
	1. Increase awareness of sensible drinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To make sure Department of Health information about sensible drinking is accessible to partners. Provide brief intervention training to members of the public – pilot this project in Winyates. Raise awareness of existing services of alcohol misuse. Work with local employers to raise awareness of sensible drinking and existing services for tackling alcohol related issues. 	April 2011	RBC - Angie Heighway / Helen Broughton	Department of Health existing resources.	Number of leaflets handed out	On-going					
			September 2011	DAAT - Kate Ray		Number of people trained						
			On-going									
			On-going			Number of leaflets handed out.						



Overview and Scrutiny

No Direct Ward Relevance

Committee

8th November 2011

WORK PROGRAMME

(Report of the Chief Executive)

Date of Meeting	Subject Matter	Officer(s) Responsible for report
ALL MEETINGS	REGULAR ITEMS	(CHIEF EXECUTIVE)
	Minutes of previous meeting Consideration of the Forward Plan Consideration of Executive Committee key decisions Call-ins (if any) Pre-scrutiny (if any) Consideration of Overview and Scrutiny Actions List Referrals from Council or Executive Committee, etc. (if any) Task Groups / Short, Sharp Review Groups - feedback Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive Chief Executive
	REGULAR ITEMS Quarterly Performance Report Quarterly Budget Monitoring Report Annual Update on the Implementation of the Civil Parking Enforcement Scheme	Chief Executive Chief Executive Relevant Lead Heads of Service

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

	<p>REGULAR ITEMS</p> <p>Update on fly tipping and progress with the Worth It campaign</p> <p>Update on the work of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel.</p> <p>Updates on the work of the Worcestershire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Updates on the outcome of quarterly meetings of the Leader and Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Petitions (as and when received)</p> <p>Bi-Annual Recommendation Tracker Reports – Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Bi-Annual Recommendation Tracker Reports - Petition Recommendations</p>	<p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p> <p>Chair of the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Panel</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council representative on the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p>
<p>OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED</p>		
<p>8th November 2011</p>	<p>Gritting and Snow Clearance – Redditch Borough Council Approach – Pre-Scrutiny</p>	<p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p>
<p>8th November 2011</p>	<p>LSP Task and Finish Group – Monitoring Update Report</p>	<p>Relevant Lead Director</p>
<p>8th November 2011</p>	<p>Monitoring Report – Scrutiny of the Sustainable Community Strategy</p>	<p>Relevant Lead Director</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

8th November 2011	Petition Appeal – Save Brockhill Green Belt	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
8th November 2011	Portfolio Holder Annual Report – Housing, Local Environment and Health, Councillor B Clayton	Councillor B Clayton
29th November 2011	Housing Trailblazers' Presentation	Relevant Lead Head of Service
29th November 2011	Housing Revenue Account Report – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
29th November 2011	Portfolio Holder Annual Report – Community Safety and Regulatory Services, Councillor Brunner	Councillor Brunner
29th November 2011	West Midlands Regional Scrutiny Network Meeting – update on the outcomes of the latest meeting	Councillor Mould
29th November 2011	Youth Employment at Redditch Borough Council – Update Report	Relevant Lead Head of Service
3rd January 2012	Performance report for services within the remit of the portfolio for Leisure and tourism	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
24th January 2012	Budget Update Report – Pre-Scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
24th January 2012	External Refurbishment of Housing Stock – Monitoring Update Report	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

24th January 2012	Portfolio Holder Annual Report – Portfolio for Leisure and Tourism, Councillor Derek Taylor	Councillor Derek Taylor
24th January 2012	Scrutiny Proposal – review of Redditch Market	Councillor Quinney
14th February 2012	Performance report for services within the remit of the portfolio for Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development and Public Transport	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
6th March 2012	Performance report for services within the remit of the portfolio for Community Leadership and Partnership	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
6th March 2012	Portfolio Holder Annual Report – Portfolio for Planning, Regeneration, Economic Development and Transport, Councillor Pearce	Councillor Pearce
27th March 2012	Portfolio Holder Annual Report – Portfolio for community Leadership and Partnership, Councillor Gandy	Councillor Gandy
27th March 2012	Improving Recycling Rates Short, Sharp Review – Final Report	Councillor Hopkins
17th April 2012	Youth Services Provision Task Group – Final Report	Councillor S Chalk
17th April 2012	Facilities for Disabled People Task Group – Final Report	Councillor Mason
22nd May 2012	Promoting Sporting Participation Task Group – Final Report	Councillor Stephens

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

8th November 2011

22nd May 2012	Work Experience Task Group – Monitoring Report	Relevant Lead Head of Service
August 2012	Update Report – Promoting Redditch Task and Finish Group	Relevant Lead Head of Service
OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED		
	Budget Bids and Medium Term Financial Plan	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Energy Consumption – Submission of a Scoping Document	Councillor Anderson
	Equalities and Diversity – Submission of a Scoping Document	Councillor Fry
	Gritting Short, Sharp Review Group – Monitoring Report	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Overview and Scrutiny Member Training on Pre-Scrutiny.	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Town Centre Landscape Improvements (including Church Green Improvements) – Pre-scrutiny	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Worcestershire Supporting People Strategy	Relevant Lead Head of Service

