

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wed 18 Mar
2009
7.00 pm

Committee Room Two
Town Hall
Redditch



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Access to Information - Your Rights

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

Your main rights are set out below:-

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

**If you have any queries on this Agenda or any of the decisions taken or wish to exercise any of the above rights of access to information, please contact
Jess Bayley and Helen Saunders
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@redditchbc.gov.uk / helen.saunders@redditchbc.gov.uk
Minicom: 595528**

Welcome to today's meeting.

Guidance for the Public

Agenda Papers

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

Chair

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

Running Order

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

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

Decisions

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

Members of the Public

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

Special Arrangements

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

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

Further Information

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

Fire/ Emergency instructions

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

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

Do Not stop to collect personal belongings.

Do Not use lifts.

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

The emergency Assembly Area is on the Ringway Car Park.

Declaration of Interests: Guidance for Councillors

DO I HAVE A "PERSONAL INTEREST" ?

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

OR

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

you have a personal interest.

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

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

IS IT A "PREJUDICIAL INTEREST" ?

In general only if:-

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

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

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



Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 18 March 2009

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

Agenda

Membership:

Cllrs: P Mould (Chair) R King
D Smith (Vice-Chair) W Norton
K Banks D Taylor
M Chalk D Thomas
W Hartnett

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 - 14)	To confirm the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a correct record. (Minutes attached) All Wards
4. Actions List (Pages 15 - 18)	To note the contents of the Overview and Scrutiny Actions List. (Report attached) All Wards
5. Call-in and Pre-Scrutiny	To consider whether any Key Decisions of the Executive Committee's most recent meeting(s) should be subject to call-in and also to consider whether any items on the Forward Plan require pre-scrutiny. (No separate report). All Wards

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 18 March 2009

<p>6. Task & Finish Reviews - Draft Scoping Documents</p>	<p>To consider any scoping documents provided for possible Overview and Scrutiny review.</p> <p>For this meeting the following proposed items for scrutiny are to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Angling Museum Review;• Neighbourhood Groups Review; and• Overview and Scrutiny review. <p>(Reports attached)</p> <p>All Wards</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Council Flat Communal Cleaning – Chair, Councillor P Mould; and2. Housing Mutual Exchange – Chair, Councillor D Smith. <p>(Oral reports)</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>8. Portfolio Holder Annual Report - Community Leadership and Partnership (Councillor Carole Gandy)</p> <p>(Pages 19 - 22)</p>	<p>To receive a presentation from the Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership on themes proposed by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>All Wards</p>
<p>9. Review of Ditches</p> <p>(Pages 23 - 42)</p>	<p>To consider information about the condition of ditches within the Borough and to determine whether any recommendations could be made to improve those conditions.</p> <p>(Report attached).</p> <p>All Wards</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 18 March 2009

10. Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group - Monitoring Report	<p>To consider an update in relation to the impact of the Charging Policy, introduced following recommendations from the Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group, on the fees and charges setting process at the Council.</p> <p>(Oral reports).</p> <p>All Wards</p>
11. Capital Monitoring Report	<p>To receive a position statement in relation to the Capital Monitoring Report.</p> <p>(Oral report).</p> <p>All Wards</p>
12. Referrals	<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>All Wards</p>
13. Work Programme (Pages 43 - 46)	<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>All Wards</p>

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 18 March 2009

14. Exclusion of the Press and Public

Should it be necessary, in the opinion of the Borough Director, 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 in the relevant paragraphs (to be specified) of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) of the said Act”.

All Wards



Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

MINUTES

Present:

Councillors D Smith, K Banks, M Chalk, W Hartnett, R King, W Norton, D Taylor and D Thomas

Also Present:

Councillor J Brunner

Officers:

R Griffin, A Heighway, T Kristunas, G Revans and J Staniland

Committee Services Officer:

J Bayley and H Saunders

170. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor Mould.

171. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

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

172. MINUTES

RESOLVED that

the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday 16 February be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

.....
Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

173. ACTIONS LIST

The Committee considered its agreed list of actions and specific mention was made of the following matters:

a) Pitcher Oak Golf Course – Potential Savings

Officers informed the Committee under action nine of the Actions List that the information requested by the Committee regarding the potential savings from the closure of Pitcher Oak Golf course had been circulated amongst Members.

b) Review of Overview and Scrutiny Structures - Scoping Document

Officers informed Members that they had met with Councillor R King to complete this scoping document and this would be presented to the Committee at the meeting due to be held on Wednesday 18 March.

RESOLVED that

subject to the comments above, the contents of the Action List be noted.

174. CALL-IN AND PRE-SCRUTINY

There were no call-ins or suggestions for pre-scrutiny.

175. TASK & FINISH REVIEWS - DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENTS

There were no draft scoping documents for consideration.

176. TASK AND FINISH GROUPS - PROGRESS REPORTS

The Committee received reports in relation to current reviews.

a) Council Flat Communal Cleaning – Chair, Councillor P Mould

Councillor Taylor provided an update on the Council Flat Communal Cleaning Review. She explained that she was due to meet with Officers to discuss the re-arrangement of the Consultation Event for local leaseholders and Council flat tenants.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

b) Housing Mutual Exchange – Chair, Councillor D Smith

Councillor Smith informed the Committee that for medical reasons he had had to postpone the Task and Finish Group meeting that had been due to take place on Thursday 5 March. Members of the Group would be informed of a new date for this meeting as soon as possible.

c) Role of the Mayor – Chair, Councillor M Chalk

Councillor Chalk confirmed that the Executive Committee had considered the final report of this Task and Finish Group.

RESOLVED that

the reports be noted.

177. PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORT - COMMUNITY SAFETY (COUNCILLOR JULIET BRUNNER)

The Chair welcomed the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Councillor Brunner, to the meeting. Councillor Brunner presented her Portfolio Holder Annual Report in accordance with the questions set by the Committee. Appendix A to the minutes details Councillor Brunner's responses to these questions.

Members asked several questions regarding the content of Councillor Brunner's presentation. Some Members expressed concern that the consensus reached amongst Members and external partners during the "Dare to Dream" event, regarding the prioritisation of Community Safety by the Council, had been disregarded. Councillor Brunner informed the Committee that this was an aspiration and had never been approved by full Council. However, Community Safety continued to be a priority for the Council and she was committed to tackling crime and the causes of crime.

Members asked Councillor Brunner if she understood the decision to cut four fire-fighters from the Hereford and Worcester fire service and whether this would have an impact on safety in the town. Councillor Brunner explained that she did not feel in a position to comment on this issue. However, she offered to request a written response from Hereford and Worcester Fire Brigade explaining the reasons behind these cuts and the impact these might have on safety in the town.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

The Committee commented that it was apparent a large amount of work had been undertaken with young people in relation to Community Safety issues. Members questioned if any work had been undertaken by the Council to target parents on such issues. Officers informed the Committee that the Anti-Social Behaviour Team could offer direct support to parents and families known to the Team. The Council had not utilised Parenting Orders but was in the process of establishing a parenting intervention scheme to address issues of anti-social behaviour and crime through the targeting of parents.

Members questioned whether the interactive CCTV cameras had had a positive impact on Community Safety. The Committee heard that the CCTV cameras had been successful although statistical data was still being collected to confirm this. However, Officers reported that operators had kept details of incidents where the use of CCTV cameras had had a positive impact on crime and anti-social behaviour in the town centre. Officers offered to provide written details of these incidents to Members.

The Chair thanked Councillor Brunner for attending the meeting and proposed that the Committee should recommend that the Council continue to support effective partnership working for the delivery of Community Safety in the town.

Accordingly it was

RECOMMENDED that

the Council continue to support effective partnership working for the delivery of Community Safety in the Borough; and

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

178. CORPORATE PLAN PART II - PRE-SCRUTINY

Officers introduced this item and explained that the Corporate Plan had been refreshed in line with guidance and best practice issued through the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. This Act had removed the requirement for authorities to produce Best Value Performance Plans but had advised that instead they should provide a business plan.

Previous versions of the Council's Corporate Plan had been criticised by the Audit Commission. In order to overcome these

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

criticisms, Officers had asked the Audit Commission for guidance on their expectations for a high-quality Corporate Plan. This advice had informed the development of the new Corporate Plan. Members were informed that the new Plan was in a draft format and would be subject to professional formatting once approved by the Council. It was also noted that the document would be available to Officers, Members, partners and the general public and so needed to be fully understandable to all of these audiences. Officers invited Members to provide comments and suggestions on how the document could be improved.

Members questioned the description of the provision of public transport in the town, recorded on page 7 of the report. It was agreed that this description was quite subjective and, as written, did not reflect the true state of public transport in the town.

On the same page of the report, Members argued that they disagreed with the statement that “In 2008 unemployment rose steadily until July, and much more rapidly after this time as economic conditions deteriorated”.

Members discussed the audience of the document and stressed that the target audience for the document should be carefully considered when writing the plan. The language used was also an important consideration as this could influence the audience’s perception of the Council. Officers confirmed that the document had to be written in a factual style, clearly highlighted where performance could be improved and the strategies the Council were employing to achieve this improvement.

The Committee discussed page 8 of the report, in particular the profiles for the Portfolio Holders. Members felt that further information should be provided regarding the Portfolio Holders.

Members considered page 9 of the document which detailed the management staffing structure. The Committee agreed that the diagram used to demonstrate the levels of management was confusing as it did not clearly show the equal precedence of all of the Heads of Service.

Members considered page 10 of the document which detailed the Council’s Priorities and Vision. The Committee agreed that this page did not clearly differentiate between the two.

Members also made a recommendation regarding the whole document suggesting that a glossary and a list of the Council’s key partners should be provided.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

The Committee discussed the content of pages 20 to 29 which demonstrated how the Council would deliver its new Priorities. Members commented that, as the budget was still in the process of being set, some of the indicators and targets might change. Officers explained it was anticipated that by the time the document was published, budgetary implications for these indicators would be known and could be included in the document.

On page 21, Members requested further information in relation to the sentence reading “expand existing Children’s Centres in Redditch and explore opportunities for new Centres across Bromsgrove.”

Finally, Members considered page 29 which detailed information about equalities and diversity at the Council. The Committee noted that insufficient information was currently provided about the diverse communities living within the Borough.

RECOMMENDED that

- 1) **the sentence “Public transport is also well provided for through a regular train service to Birmingham and Lichfield and a network of local bus services” in paragraph 5 on page 7 be amended to read “public transport is provided for via a train and bus network”;**
- 2) **the reference to unemployment be removed from paragraph 8 on page 7;**
- 3) **further details be provided about each Portfolio Holder’s role and responsibilities on page 8 of the document;**
- 4) **the staffing structure diagram on page 9 be redesigned;**
- 5) **a clear distinction be made between the Priorities and the statement of intent for each Priority on page 10;**
- 6) **a glossary be provided in the document; and a list of the Council’s key partners also be incorporated within the document;**
- 7) **an explanation be written into the Delivery and Key outcomes Section beginning on page 20 that, as budgets were still under review, some of this information was liable to change;**

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

- 8) further information about the different ethnic groups and proportion of young people living in Redditch be included in the first paragraph on page 29; and

RESOLVED that

- 9) Officers provide the Committee with clarification on the final bullet point on page 21 regarding the possibility for exploring opportunities for new Children's Centres across Bromsgrove.

179. QUARTERLY BUDGET REPORT

The Committee considered the third quarterly budget monitoring report for 2008/09.

Particular reference was made to the following matters:

a) Budget 0437: Market

Members discussed the target for the Customer and Client Receipts for the Market. They questioned the meaning of a comment appended to the document reading "unrealistic balancing figure income expected to be £105,000" as well as the accuracy of the negative total figure of 75.94% for the Market. Officers explained that the figures for the Market were supposed to be budgeted to break even but unfortunately income had been lower than expected and so the Council did not expect to meet the target. Officers agreed with Members that the actual total figure was likely to be different to the 75.94% quoted in the document.

b) Budget 0707: Dial-A-Ride

Members discussed the figures for Dial-A-Ride and questioned why the transport costs had been lower than anticipated. Officers confirmed that this had been due to a reduction in the cost of petrol.

c) Budget 0733: Contaminated Land

Members discussed the data provided relating to contaminated land and queried the 2.89% total figure quoted in the document. Officers suggested that this figure would require further consideration by Officers.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

RESOLVED that

the report be noted.

180. QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Committee considered the third quarterly performance monitoring report.

Introducing this report, Officers explained that a summary page had been included that demonstrated the total number of indicators reported for the third quarter, classified according to a red, amber and green colour code system. Red reflected poor performance, green equalled good performance and amber represented average performance or an indicator where no data was available.

Members discussed indicator BV084a “kilogrammes of household waste collected per head”, and media reports that recyclable waste was being taken to landfill sites. They asked if Officers could clarify where recyclable waste from the Borough was being taken. Officers confirmed that, although the current market was difficult, as far as they were aware all recyclable waste was processed in the intended manner and that Officers had received assurances that it was not being deposited in landfill sites.

Members discussed indicator WMHO5 “Switchboards and Contact Centre: percentage of calls answered within 20 seconds”. Members requested clarification from Officers as to whether this referred to calls answered by an automated response machine or by a person. Officers agreed to provide further information regarding this issue for Members.

RESOLVED that

- 1) further clarification be provided regarding indicator WMHO5 as recorded in the preamble above; and**
- 2) the report be noted.**

181. PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORT - QUESTIONS

Questions for the Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership Portfolio’s Annual Report were considered by the Committee.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 25 February 2009

RESOLVED that

members of the Committee individually contact O&S Officers with questions for the Portfolio Holder's Annual Report.

182. REFERRALS

There were no referrals.

183. WORK PROGRAMME

Officers informed the Committee that the Head of Financial, Revenue and Benefits Services was due to attend the Committee on Wednesday 18 March to present the position statement on the Capital Programme.

Officers reminded Members that on Thursday 19 March some Members were due to travel to London to participate in the Centre for Public Scrutiny's (CfPS) training in scrutiny of partnerships and partnership working in scrutiny. It was also noted that a Member training event on the scrutiny of performance was due to take place on Monday 23 March.

RESOLVED that

the Committee's Work Programme be noted.

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm
and closed at 9.30 pm

Overview & Scrutiny **Appendix A**

Committee

Portfolio Holder for Community Safety - Responses to Questions for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Question 1 - Why was the 'Safest Town in Britain' vision dropped from the Council's Corporate Strategy?

Community Safety is still a Redditch Borough Council's key priority. Having listened to partners and taking advice, it was decided that to have a vision that Redditch would be the Safest Town in Britain was misleading and too inspirational. How do you measure what is the safest. Do we compare ourselves with, other new towns, inner cities, rural Boroughs? This is a stated outcome to our residents that we will need to deliver against. I would argue that we will never be the safest but we are safe, the onus being on safe rather than safest.

Compounding this is the ever changing crime definition which makes data analysis very complicated.

Example Colchester and Tendring where headlines stated that the town was hailed the safest in England and Wales by think-tank Reform.

The Council was slammed in the media when crime levels started to rise in certain categories. From April 1 to July 2007 there were 1,872 recorded violent crimes in the two districts, 321 more than during the same period in 2006.

However the category of violent crime at that time spanned incidents ranging from murder and violent wounding to reports of dangerous dogs, harassment, bankruptcy, common assault without injury and public disorder without violence.

The spectrum is so broad Professor Adrian Smith, president of the Royal Statistical Society, advised the Government that the classification of violent crime must change, as less than 50 per cent of all recorded violent crime offences actually involve violence.

It is being honest and managing people's expectations. The Council is one of a number of agencies responsible for crime reduction. Redditch will never have a zero crime level. However there is a lot still to be done to tackle crime and ASB issues.

As stated this is still a priority area for the Council.

Colchester reference:

http://devel.gazette-news.co.uk/mostpopular.var.1568100.mostviewed.safest_town_in_england_try_telling_the_victims.php

Overview & Scrutiny Appendix A

Committee

Question 2 - Which of our partner agencies are helping to address community safety within the Borough? Do you feel that our partners are contributing effectively?

Positive contributions from partner agencies, i.e Redditch Community Safety Partnership Tasking. Funding is received from the Police, Fire Service and PCT. WCC support through the analyst role.

More work still needs to be done with local delivery as a number of agencies are not co-terminus with our boundaries. Partnership work is about managing relationships. Community Safety Team bring this invaluable skill. Act as catalysts, draw it all together.

Need to make sure that the Redditch Community Safety Partnership is 'fit for purpose' under the new Comprehensive Area Assessment Regime, as Community Safety and Partnership working is a key area.

Question 3 - What do you feel is the Council's role in shaping residents' perceptions of community safety within the Borough?

Councils have a significant impact on community safety and peoples perceptions through the design and management of the physical, built environment and also through the social conditions that are perceived to cause crime in residential and rural areas.

Elected Members and Officers often do not see how important their roles are. e.g If Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act was applicable when Redditch was expanded, the majority of the design faults that we have inherited would not have existed.

The Council can tackle perception issues in many and varied ways through the application of our core services, for example:

Local Strategic Partnership

- Through the work in preparing the Sustainable Community Strategy – at District and County level, the Council is actively involved in promoting the well-being and improved quality of life for our community.
- The local problems, concerns, needs and priorities identified enable the Council to gain an understanding of the relative importance attached to crime and disorder, and this supports the focused work of the Community Safety Team who co-ordinate and leads specific Community Safety Issues.

Community Safety Team

- They co-ordinate and facilitate the implementation of the Partnership Plan by all relevant partners and the community.
- Participate in the Strategic Action Task Groups to ensure links are made between agencies and the community
- Liaise regularly with the Lead officers from the other statutory partners to ensure that crime reduction targets are met, to share good practise,

Overview & Scrutiny **Appendix A**

Committee

- Ensure that all RBC services are aware of their responsibilities under Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998

ASB Team

- Co-ordinates responses to reports of anti-social behaviour
- Case manage Council Tenant ASB issues
- Support other providers in tackling ASB issues

Environmental Services

- Licensing – managing the night time economy
- Graffiti – underpasses
- Efficient collection and disposal of refuse
- Noise Nuisance
- Stray dogs

Financial Services

- Maintain systems for auditing the costs of community safety activity
- Housing Benefits – prevention of fraud, and also when the officers visit many homes in the district they help identify problems and vulnerable people in the community.

Planning

- Preparation of planning briefs
- The Local plan aims to advance sustainable development and incorporates objectives and principles relating to safety, e.g. personal safety and freedom from crime through design, creation of new communities which are attractive and well designed.

Housing Services

- Homelessness
- Domestic Abuse
- Tenancy enforcement
- Capital spend on improved security – Woodrow Centre

Human Resources

- Diversity and Equalities Policies

Information Services and IT

- The website provides useful links and contacts for agencies and members of the community on all matters relating to crime reduction and community safety.

Overview & Scrutiny Appendix A

Committee

Legal Services

- Enforcement Action – e.g. Anti-Social Behaviour Orders
- Noise and Statutory Nuisance Notices

Leisure Services

- Sports facilities for young people
- Provision of recreational/diversionary activities

Local Authority Elected Members

- Members have a clear role in directing the input of the Local Authority to the crime and disorder reduction work through normal committee structures, and through the accountability of the Chief Executive to them.

Communications

- The Council's Communication Team has regular contact with the Community Safety Team and other Partnership Media officers to discuss media coverage of crime and disorder issues.

Actions requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date Action Requested	Action to be Taken	Response
09/07/08 1	Members agreed to postpone further consideration of a potential review of the Borough's fishing tackle heritage, proposed during the WPPA, until the Role of the Mayor review had been completed.	Councillor Hunt has submitted a scoping document for this item for the Committee's consideration on 18 March. (WILL BE DONE SOON). Lead Member, Councillor D Hunt, estimated completion date, 09/03/09.
24/09/08 2	Members requested that Environmental Services Officers attend a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to provide an update report regarding fly tipping and the progress of the 'Worth It' campaign.	(TO BE DONE). Lead Officer, Waste Management Manager, estimated completion date not specified.
14/01/09 3	The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism proposed an item for scrutiny.	The OSSOs have consulted with the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism regarding this proposal. He has suggested that he would be prepared to postpone submitting a completed scoping document for this item until June 2009 for Member capacity reasons. He also explained that Officers are currently doing some work to address this issue and that it might therefore be prudent to postpone further consideration of this item until Officers have completed this piece of work. (TO BE DONE) Lead Member, Councillor Anderson, estimated completion date, 17/06/09.

<p>04/02/09</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Members received the final report from the Worcestershire Joint Scrutiny into Flooding Task and Finish Group which contained a number of recommendations. Members recommended that this report should be referred to a Working Group of Officers, including the Operations Manager Asset Maintenance and the Councillor's Emergency Planning Officer, for further consideration and to develop costings. The Working Group of Officers was tasked with then referring the final report and recommendations to the Executive Committee.</p>	<p>(TO BE DONE). Lead Officer, Director of Housing, Leisure and Customer Support. Estimated completion date, not specified.</p>
<p>04/02/09</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Following discussion of the Joint Scrutiny into Flooding item members requested that there be an Emergency Planning (Briefing/Training) Session for all Councillors.</p>	<p>Officers to organise an Emergency Planning Session for Councillors. (TO BE DONE). Lead Officers, Member Services Officer (in consultation with the Head of Customer and IT Services) estimated completion date, not specified.</p>
<p>04/02/09</p> <p>6</p>	<p>Members received a presentation on the Shared Services Board and Joint Working and requested that Overview and Scrutiny be involved throughout the shared services process.</p>	<p>Relevant Officers to report before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as part of the shared services process where appropriate. (TO BE DONE) – ONGOING.</p>
<p>04/02/09</p> <p>7</p>	<p>Members discussed a referral from the Executive Committee: a review of the Neighbourhood Groups process. They requested that relevant Officers meet with the Leader of the Council to complete a scoping document for this proposed review.</p>	<p>The completed scoping document to be presented at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 18 March for further consideration. (WILL BE DONE SOON). Lead Member, Councillor Gandy, estimated completion date, 18 March 2009.</p>

<p>16/02/09</p> <p>8</p>	<p>Councillor R King explained that he would be completing a scoping document containing proposals that would help to develop the Overview and Scrutiny process at Redditch Borough Council.</p>	<p>Councillor R King will be submitting a completed scoping document for the consideration of the Committee on 18 March. (WILL BE DONE SOON). Lead Member, Councillor R King, estimated completion date, 18 March 2009.</p>
<p>25/02/09</p> <p>9</p>	<p>Members questioned the rationale for reducing the number of fire-fighters from the Hereford and Worcester Fire Brigade and the impact that this might have on community safety. Councillor Brunner was asked to request further information from the Hereford and Worcester Fire Brigade to request a written explanation of the rationale for this reduction in the number of fire-fighters for the consideration of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>Councillor Brunner confirmed on Monday 2 March that she has contacted the Hereford and Worcester Fire Brigade to make this request. No date has been provided by the Fire Brigade as to when this information will be made available. DONE.</p>
<p>25/02/09</p> <p>10</p>	<p>The Control Centre Manager provided some information about the impact of CCTV cameras on community safety in the Borough.</p>	<p>Officers were asked to circulate copies of the documentation provided by the Control Centre Manager for the consideration of Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. DONE, Lead Officers, OSSOs.</p>
<p>25/02/09</p> <p>11</p>	<p>Members considered the contents of a draft copy of the Corporate Plan Part II and made a number of recommendations for the consideration of the Executive Committee on 11 March.</p>	<p>Officers to ensure that these recommendations are recorded in a referral report for the consideration of the Executive Committee. (WILL BE DONE SOON). Lead Officers, OSSOs, estimated completion date, 3 March.</p>

<p>25/02/09</p> <p>12</p>	<p>During consideration of the draft Corporate Plan Part II Members questioned the reasons for references to Bromsgrove in the statement referring to children's centres on page 21 of the report.</p>	<p>Officers to clarify this point for the consideration of members of the Committee. (TO BE DONE). Lead Officer, Head of Strategy and Partnerships, estimated completion date, not specified.</p>
<p>25/02/09</p> <p>13</p>	<p>Members discussed Performance Indicator WMO5, "Switchboard and Contact Centre: Percentage of calls answered within 20 seconds".</p>	<p>Officers to clarify in writing whether this Performance Indicator relates to calls answered by a person or by an automated response machine. (TO BE DONE). Lead Officer, Head of Customer Services and IT, estimated completion date, not specified.</p>

Glossary

- OSSO - Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer
- WPPA - Work Programme Planning Afternoon

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

No Direct Ward Relevance

18 March 2009

PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNUAL REPORTS: QUESTIONS AND SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION WITH COUNCILLOR GANDY, PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP

The following themes have been suggested by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Questions relating to these themes will be posed to Councillor Gandy, Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership, at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on Wednesday 18 March 2009.

- 1) What do you wish to achieve for Redditch?
- 2) What difficulties, if any, are you encountering in achieving your aims and objectives for Redditch?
- 3) What are your views on partnerships? The future of local government?
- 4) In the current budget basket of service cut options, which would you keep and which would you save?

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

18 March 2009

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 Council, but not exclusively (other Members may also	

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

18 March 2009

		have this shared role) (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 / agenda preparation processes • Regulatory Committees, via normal report / 	

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

18 March 2009

		<p>agenda preparation processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Redditch Borough Council
Ditches and Other Minor Watercourses

Rivers, streams and the like, which convey running water throughout the year or a substantial proportion of it, are controlled by Redditch Borough Council (RBC), in its capacity as Local Drainage Authority, in accordance with the Land Drainage Act (LDA) 1991. In addition, for Main Rivers – River Arrow and Shell Brook, the Environment Agency is the principal regulatory body. The Shell Brook comprises of – The Wharrage, Wixon Brook, Swan's Brook and Bow Brook where these flow into the other, within the RBC area.

(Any enforcement actions are pursued by means of Section 25 LDA 1991).

Restoration and improvement of ditches is generally dealt with by means of the Agricultural Land Tribunal in accordance with Section 28 of LDA 1991. Roadside ditches draining a public highway are slightly different in that the Highway Authority, Worcestershire County Council (WCC) has certain powers and responsibilities under the Highways Act to ensure that drainage arrangements for the highway are satisfactory.

In all cases, the principal responsibility for maintenance lies with the riparian landowner(s) concerned. Typically, the centre of a ditch or watercourse denotes the actual ownership boundary, irrespective of whether there are any hedges or fences present. These merely denote operational boundaries to secure stock and other property.

RBC has a considerable amount of land drainage assets (43.6 km, nearly 44% of total) which are maintained as part of a Term Contract by Asset Maintenance. In addition, we have a continued working arrangement with WCC to inspect/cleanse their land drainage assets (excluding roadside ditches) as part of the management regime of our own assets on one or both sides of the highway. The responsibility for ditches within RBC land generally lies with the respective service unit, who may also be responsible too, for short lengths of ordinary watercourse.

RBC has not had a dedicated, full-time Land Drainage Officer since the mid-1990's. Consequently, any efforts made in exercise of our powers and responsibilities, has been on a shared-time basis. Inevitably, our focus has had to be with the principle watercourse network and in light of the Government's Pitt Review findings, this policy should be carefully re-considered.

Ditches where they exist(ed), do provide valuable storage and conveyance capability, especially during extreme events. Due to the character of the urban area, such assets are mainly the responsibility of Landscape as part of woodland and parkland management. However, there are substantial rural areas within the southern and western areas which are not within RBC's immediate operational control. There are also considerable contributory areas to the north and west of the RBC boundary, which drain into our watercourse network. We have no control over these whatsoever and rely on our neighbouring authorities to exercise due diligence.

It is recognised that a considerable amount of ditches may have already been lost or are not being maintained to a sufficiently high enough standards. However, there are insufficient resources available for improved levels of service at the current time. With the possible effects of Climate Change increasing in significance, and publication of the Government's Pitt Review, this policy should now be carefully reviewed. Each improved ditch could act as a mini-reservoir, thereby increasing storage potential and possibly also reducing the rate of peak flows to the main watercourse network.

CAW/E265

05 March 2009

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL – FEBRUARY 2009

DRAFT LAND DRAINAGE & LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE POLICY

General

The maintenance responsibilities for riparian land owners are set out in law. In addition, there may be other specific requirements in accordance with the Land Drainage Acts 1991 and 1994. Following the July 2007 floods and publication of Sir Michael Pitt's review into the circumstances thereof, further primary legislation is anticipated. A draft "Flood and Water Bill" is expected to be published by June 2009. This is expected to unify various pieces of drainage legislation and therefore any references below, refers to documents currently in force.

These comments chiefly apply to trees, shrubs and other planting. With reference to "Living on the Edge" published by the Environment Agency 'The Agency aims to preserve access to banks of rivers for maintenance and safety purposes'.

The principle criteria for applying the various levels of inspection and/or maintenance regimes are determined by a channel's location and the type of channel concerned. A hierarchy is set out below in terms of implications and/or constraints and each criterion is set out in order of merit, with number 1 being the highest.

Where lengths of river are obscured by vegetation, not only does this make maintenance more difficult, but it is almost always impossible to carry out proper inspections, maintenance and denudes light from the general river corridors. This could mask problems of erosion, pollution, and general obstructions. It is not intended that all riverside vegetation is to be removed as it may provide other environmental benefits in terms of stability or valuable habitats for a range of species of both flora and fauna. A similar set of criteria applies to culverts and culverted watercourses except that sewerage type factors will in most instances, normally suffice. These are principally located within the Redditch Urban Cordon area.

Reference to "EA" means the Environment Agency, or its forebears and to "LDA" means the Local Drainage Authority – Redditch Borough Council or its forebears.

Heirarchy – Locations

- L1 Woodland (including copse and/or coppices)
- L2 General Land (including formal or informal public open space)
- L3 Highway areas

Hierarchy – Channels

- C1 Main River – River Arrow, The Wharrage, Wixon Brook, Swan's Brook and Bow Brook
- C2 Ordinary Watercourse – An open channel which conveys flow for more than 50% of the time.
- C3 Arterial Ditch – An open channel which serves and receives flows from other ditches, prior to discharge to a main river or ordinary watercourse. These normally flow during wet weather only.

- C4 Ditch - An open channel which may or may not serve or receive flows from other ditches, prior to discharge to an arterial ditch. These normally flow during wet weather only.
- C5 Roadside Ditch – These are adjacent to highways (public or private) and may either wholly serve the highway or drain it in combination with other land. These normally flow during wet weather only. In terms of access, Ordinary Watercourses which abut the highway are in effect roadside ditches. They can eventually discharge to a variety of outlets.
- C6 Culverted watercourses are pipes or other conduits comprising of several such contiguous lengths which convey flows from an open channel ordinary watercourse to either a lake or pond, public surface water sewer, or another open channel (irrespective of the latter's status). A culvert is a single length of pipe or conduit, usually beneath a road, path or other crossing point.

L1 – Woodland

By their very nature, densely planted wooded areas can have a serious impact upon open channel performance. Clear zones must be maintained on either side although localised deviations around mature trees are acceptable, provided that the specified zone is contiguous throughout. Where a channel is adjacent to a boundary, then the clearance zone should be doubled from the boundary, providing enhanced access on one side only.

Clearly, the presence of trees near channel banks at bends can have a positive benefit. However, if allowed to self-set unchecked, there is a danger that the entire channel edge becomes vegetated on both sides. This is unacceptable as not only is access impaired, often leading to serious maintenance problems as well as denuding light from the river corridor. Trees are also a major source of nuisance from leaf and other debris and their close proximity to an open channel is therefore mostly deleterious.

A matrix needs to be developed to identify suitable species, and the permissible size and spacing of trees – the larger the tree, the larger the space between similar examples is required.

Where such an area adjoins a highway (Foxlydiate Wood/Bromsgrove Road), situations can arise whereby trees can become unsafe and ultimately may fail, and partially obstruct the highway. Consideration needs to be given to also create zones either for clearance, selective retention and/or improved inspection regimes.

L2 – General Land

Clear zones must be maintained on either side although localised deviations around mature trees or other features are acceptable, provided that the specified zone is contiguous throughout. Where a channel is adjacent to a boundary, then the clearance zone should be doubled from the boundary, providing enhanced access on one side only.

Clearly, the presence of trees near channel banks at bends can have a positive benefit. However, if allowed to self-set unchecked, there is a danger that the entire channel edge becomes vegetated on both sides. This is unacceptable as not only is access impaired, often leading to serious maintenance problems as well as denuding light from the river corridor. Trees are also a major source of nuisance from leaf and other debris and their close proximity to an open channel is therefore mostly deleterious.

A matrix, as set out in 'L1' above, needs to be developed. There should be no formal access track within 2m (pedestrians) of the banks edge, assuming that the top of banks are relatively level. Where these requirements are not possible and the stability of the track is not in question, then either mature planting and/or safety barriers must be provided.

L3 – Highway Areas

Working in or adjacent to a highway may require appropriate Notices and warning signs to be deployed. Typically, access is only possible from the made highway surface(s) and usually the space requirements set out elsewhere are normally satisfied.

In addition to land drainage requirements, there may be issues of highways visibility which can have an impact upon management practices of trees, hedges and the like.

C1 - Main Rivers

The EA has certain powers in respect of Main Rivers, however the responsibility for maintenance of the channel beds and banks remains with the riparian owner(s) and they should be relatively free from any obstructions and provided with a minimum clear zone of 5m on either side, or equivalent thereof. Hard structures within this zone, whether in or adjacent to the channel or not, may require the formal consent of the EA and/or approval of the LDA.

C2 – Ordinary Watercourses

The channel beds and banks are the responsibility of the riparian land owner and should be relatively free from any obstructions and provided with a minimum clear zone of 5m on either side, or equivalent thereof. Hard structures within 5m of the bank, whether in or adjacent to the channel or not, may require the formal consent of the EA and/or approval of the LDA.

C3 – Arterial Ditch

The channel beds and banks are the responsibility of the riparian land owner and should be relatively free from any obstructions and provided with a minimum clear zone of 3m on either side, or equivalent thereof. Hard structures within 5m of the bank, whether in or adjacent to the channel or not, may require the formal consent of the EA and/or approval of the LDA.

C4 – Ditch

The channel beds and banks are the responsibility of the riparian land owner and should be relatively free from any obstructions and provided with a minimum clear zone of 2m on either side, or equivalent thereof. Hard structures within 5m of the bank, whether in or adjacent to the channel or not, may require the formal consent of the EA and/or approval of the LDA.

C5 – Roadside Ditch

The channel beds and banks are the responsibility of the riparian land owner and if adopted, WCC the highway authority, on a shared basis. The latter only has obligations insofar as S80 of the Highways Act applies.

They should be relatively free from any obstructions and there is usually sufficient width from the road surface to facilitate access for maintenance purposes. Appropriate safety measures are to be employed which may involve either Traffic Management Measures and or Temporary Closure Orders. Prior permission from the Highway Authority or other Street Works Manager, must be obtained in writing. Hard structures within this zone, whether in or adjacent to the channel or not, may require the formal consent of the EA and/or approval of the LDA.

C6 – Culverted Watercourses

These are the responsibility of the person whose land within which the pipes or conduits are laid. No hard structures (except inlet/outlet headwalls) within 5m of the centre of pipes or conduits will be permitted. Any hard surfaces over the pipes or conduits will require the formal approval of both the landowner and LDA.

Summary

In clearing watercourses, it is presumed that normal dredgings can be deposited within the range of the excavator's boom, i.e. effective operating circle from the bank. Similarly leaving other loose materials, such as from forestry management in close proximity to any open channel potentially has severe consequences from a flood risk perspective. In the Council's view a range of distances applies, and where the land in question is publicly accessible, these distances from the nearest bank are to be doubled.

Thus the distances are: -

- Main Rivers 15m (30m)
- Ordinary Watercourses 10m (20m)
- Arterial Ditches 5m (10m)

In the case of roadside ditches, such materials cannot normally be stored within the accessible land as these distances cannot be achieved and would in any event be within the dedicated highway zones.

For other areas, the disposal or treatment of vegetation (by Landscape Services) is to be as follows: -

- Minor vegetation Shredded and deposited on suitable flat areas
- Logging Secured (within critical zones) by means of pegs and wires.
- Burning Where it is not practicable to shred brush and the like, then limited burning is to be carried out to reduce the debris safely. This must be in accordance with any other Council policies on such matters and is a last resort.

Normally, the Council's Land Drainage Term Contractor regularly removes debris from the channels and temporarily deposits on adjacent banks to dry. As soon as is reasonably practicable, this is then removed by them to the Contractor's tip. In some instances, the removal is not possible due to problems of remote or unsafe access. In these instances, Landscape Services need to be advised for disposal as above, probably by burning.

Other Initiatives

Where willow whips are likely to be harvested, these may be utilised for providing soft-engineering solutions to low-risk erosion problem areas. Landscape Service officers are requested to advise Asset Maintenance officers at an early stage of the availability of such materials so that an effective programme of recycling can be achieved. Asset Maintenance will keep a register of locations where these may be put to use and a jointly taken decision on their use agreed.

Notes: O & S Committee, Wednesday, 18 March 2009

Introduction:

There has been an extensive response and reaction by Local Authorities in Worcestershire, following the July 2007 floods. A leading, co-ordinating role has been developed by Worcestershire County Council (WCC). In addition to previous Local Resilience Forum (LRF), two new groups were formed: -

- Worcestershire Land Drainage Partnership (WDLP), and
- A sub-group, Land Drainage Technical Group (LDTG)

These comprised of various officers as well as representatives from other external organisations, including landowners as well as the Environment Agency (EA). The WDLP is normally chaired by WCC and the LDTG by Wychavon District Council (WDC) respectively.

This process later recognised and recommended by Sir Michael Pitt's Review into the July 2007 floods, has clearly been well under way for some time by local authorities in Worcestershire.

Progress to Date:

Regular meetings have taken place of both WDLP and LDTG, the latter now only convened to address any major technical issues that may arise in the future. There has been a significant pooling of knowledge and expertise. This is very much a 'work in progress' exercise, with collation of data so that coherent reports can be prepared by constituent member authorities.

What became clear was that the circumstances, timing and magnitude of flooding problems, varied considerably throughout Worcestershire. It was agreed that it would be necessary to form a 'core' of policies/actions which each would need to consider how these are to be delivered. A secondary list would also need to be prepared in the form of a shopping list, so that those criteria which applied in a particular area could be actioned in an approved, recognised manner.

Many problems that had arisen in the past were believed to have been caused through a lack of consistency of approach between neighbouring authorities in Worcestershire or other neighbouring counties.

At a local level, it is recognised that we need to incorporate as much web-based information as possible and as soon as documents listed below are approved, these will be added. This will enable customers to recognise how we operate/maintain our land drainage assets and in the case of private riparian landowners, they will be able to recognise if their own actions are in accordance with such policies.

One theme which has not yet been fully explored is the introduction of Land Drainage Bye-Laws across the county. These are a very useful tool and can add to the various enforcement strategies to ensure satisfactory levels of maintenance and planning policies are consistently applied throughout Worcestershire. These have a 'model' format and there is a statutory framework which needs to be followed and they are to

be formally ratified, prior to applying. This process currently takes at least 6 months from the published draft stages before they come into effect and may be amended or supplemented by imminent changes in legislation.

Timetable of Critical Events:

Following the Governments response in December 2008 to the Pitt Review, a number of items of legislation have been timetabled and these in conjunction with other suggestions, are tabulated below (note dates are provisional and in some cases actions may hopefully be sooner rather than later): -

- June 2009 Draft "Flood & Water Bill"
- Summer 2009 New building regulations "for flood resilient buildings"
- December 2009 EA to provide LRF's with inundation maps for each reservoir
- December 2009 Met Office and EA to jointly introduce "Extreme Rainfall Alert Service"
- June 2010 National Flood Emergency Framework
- June 2010 new standards for sewers, and
- December 2011 National emergency exercise

Conclusions:

At present, no account has been taken of cross-boundary working or applying catchment focus to future emergencies. Historically, local authorities have worked solely within their own individual areas. Clearly, climatic changes that have apparently recently taken place, prior to and following July 2007 take no account of such boundaries.

There are significant watercourses which pass through Redditch, where the vast majority of their catchments lie outside the Borough Boundary.

Appendices:

Please note that the following documents are for 'reference purposes only' at the present time. Where there are any specific references to locations and/or properties, disclosure is subject to normal Data Protection Act policies. Some of these are currently unavailable and so marked. They are as follows: -

1. Draft "Land Drainage Protocol" – WDLP/LDTG
2. Catchment Analysis – RBC (07/01/09)
3. Balancing Areas – RBC (15/01/09)
4. Landscape & Land Drainage Maintenance Policy – RBC (18/02/09)
5. Ditches – RBC (05/03/09)
6. Dredging Policy – RBC (Not available – in course of preparation)
7. Flood Resilience Analysis – RBC (05/03/09)
8. WDLP/LDTG – (RBC Draft, currently unavailable)

Clive Wilson
Operations Manager – Asset Maintenance
CAW/P2022

09 March 2009

Flood Resilience Analysis

Introduction:

The following list has been compiled as a desk top exercise, with reference to EA Flood Zones Maps, and where applicable, local knowledge. No reference has yet been made to any of the utility companies.

The list is purely furnished for guidance purposes, to provide an initial focus on potentially vulnerable locations within Redditch Borough Council's administrative area. Address details highlighted in [blue and underlined](#) are not known to have flooded. Those in **bold text** are locations which can become marooned and isolated from the general highways network.

Astwood Bank

Astwood Lane (Mutton Hall)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway Residential
---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------

Batchley

Salter's Lane (200 & 202)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway
Rosedale Close (41 – 44)	S38	Unadopted Highway
Beech Tree Close (1 – 28)	Worcestershire CC	Public Footpath
Oak Tree Avenue (1 – 4 & 12 – 19)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway

Bordesley

A441	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway
B4101 Dagnell End Road (The Dingle, Beoley Poultry Farm, The Bungalow, Rose Barn & Dagnell End Farm)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway

Elcocks Brook

Norgrove Lane (The Mill House & Norgrove Court)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway Residential
Sillins Lane	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway

Feckenham

Priest Bridge WRW Beanhall Mill Farm	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Sewage Treatment Works Business/Residential
B4090 Droitwich Road (25, 27 & Weavers Barn)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway Residential
<i>B4090 Salt Way</i>	<i>Worcestershire CC</i>	<i>Public Highway</i>
<i>Feckenham Sub-station</i>	<i>National Grid</i>	<i>Electricity Supply</i>

Mill Lane (9, 11, Old Mill House & Pavilion)		Residential
Astwood Lane (9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, Barratt's of Feckenham & Rock Hill Farm) <i>Astwood Lane</i>	(Incl. Prop. Housing)	Business/Residential <i>Business/Residential</i>
Swansbrook Lane	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway
Feckenham First School (Emanjays, Foxley Farm, Richardson's Yard & Holly Cottage)	Worcestershire CC	State Education

Ham Green/Callow Hill

Brookhouse Lane	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway
-----------------	-------------------	----------------

Hunt End

Blaze Lane (Old Yarr)	Worcestershire CC	Public Highway Residential
--	-------------------	-------------------------------

Other Comments

The Flood Zone Maps also indicates extensive areas of flooding which are not substantiated by records and anecdotal evidence. I would comment as follows: -

BATCHLEY

Batchley Road

This is believed to be due to surface flooding arising from flooding upstream, which is unable to return to Batchley Brook. The properties, including Batchley Shops (residential above) nearest to Batchley Pools are likely to be the most susceptible. Generally, dwellings are considerably higher in relation to Batchley Brook.

Bridley Moor Road/Hewell Road

This may be due to surface flooding arising from flooding upstream. Generally, dwellings are considerably higher in relation to Batchley Brook.

Pulman Close

This is believed to be due to surface flooding arising from flooding upstream. Generally, dwellings are considerably higher in relation to Batchley Brook. Further reports confirm this to be due to natural run-off from adjacent green areas.

Salter's Lane

The balancing areas shown on the Flood Zones Maps are too extensive. They are shown as one as opposed to two (Ponds B & C). Pond A, rear of Windsor Road is not shown, but this is strictly speaking an appurtenance to the surface water sewerage system as opposed to a pure, land drainage feature.

CHURCH HILL

Church Hill Brook

There are only minor problems affecting Exhall Close and Arley Close and these would be immediately adjacent to the river corridor.

Enfield

Windsor Road

Flooding is indicated on either side. This is erroneous. Land on the south side is particularly at a considerably higher elevation. On the north side, there is limited evidence of flooding caused by the Red Ditch which is at a higher elevation than either Windsor Road or Batchley Brook into which it ultimately drains. There remains a moderate risk that the highway can become surcharged which could cause some flooding problems.

The area immediately to the west of the Redditch to Birmingham Railway Line is not susceptible to flooding – no reports on 20/07/07.

Middlehouse Lane/Birmingham Road

The area immediately to the east of the Redditch to Birmingham Railway Line is not susceptible to flooding – no reports on 20/07/07. Previously, there were problems with respect to highway drainage and/or public surface water sewers. Both STW and WCC have carried out works which on the basis of the 20/07/07 event have significantly improved the situation. No reports from Birmingham Road, Middlehouse Lane is now only affected to a minor extent and at reduced frequencies.

LAKESIDE

Marlfield Lane/Proctors Barn Lane

This area, immediately to the south of Coventry Highway (A4023) is not believed to be so extensively affected. It's possible that the course modelling failed to recognise the presence of this highway (elevated embankment) and the corresponding drainage rationalisation works that were carried out at the same time.

River Arrow

The areas to the west of Holloway Drive near Arthur Street and Broadground Road are not known to be so susceptible to flooding. I suspect that levels have been raised as a part of the Meir Road development and hence are not believed susceptible either.

Arrow Valley Park/Blacksoils Brook

The Arrow Valley Lake is not susceptible to flooding (although levels would react under adverse conditions), nor is the parallel reach of the Blacksoils Brook. The levels which dictate any effects from the River Arrow's confluence with the Brook is

approximately 170m downstream of two weirs. Therefore any 'parallel' effects on the Arrow upstream would not have any influence on these.

Stitch Meadow is believed to be vulnerable to water logging – not flooding.

MOONS MOAT

Blacksoils Brook

The industrial areas east of Winyates Way (north & south of Coventry Highway are not known to flood with the exception of one property off Oxleasow Road. This may be due to surface drainage problems.

Similarly, the Padgetts Lane Industrial Estate is not known to be susceptible to flooding.

MATCHBOROUGH WEST

Ipsley Brook

Areas of possible flooding at Merevale Road, Ashorne Close, Brinklow Close and Washford Industrial Estate are not known to be as vulnerable as is suggested.

Redditch Borough Council - Catchment Areas Analysis

To help us understand some of the effects of the July 2007 floods, a preliminary schematic of the individual catchment areas has been digitally produced. The basis of these details is with reference to contoured OS plans where available, and no scanning has taken place. In other instances, indicative lines have been drawn between the various known watercourses. No account has been taken for the presence of ditches or sewers, neither of which appear on OS records and could otherwise distort the actual areas potentially draining to one watercourse or another.

NB. The catchments are split into 2 main areas East and West. The former drains to the River Arrow (to the east of the Birchfield Road/Evesham Road) ridge. The western areas ultimately drain to the River Severn, locally via the Bow (Shell) Brook system. These 2 watercourses are the only Main Rivers (EA Classification) within the RBC administrative area. At this stage, the Ipsley Brook has not been identified separately and in any event, comprises of several elements which ultimately feed to the main channel, either directly or via sewered connections.

<u>WEST - Bow Brook</u>		BDC		<u>EAST - River Arrow</u>		Total		BDC	
Spring Brook	361.649 ha	308.444	85.29%	River Arrow - BDC	3,217.155 ha		<u>3,217.155</u>	100.00%	
(Webheath)	103.075 ha	13.580	13.17%		1 - 3,217.155 ha	A441 Bordesley			
Alders Brook	309.054 ha			Batchley Brook	1,074.776 ha		628.726	58.50%	
Thickwithey Brook	114.099 ha			Red Ditch	200.110 ha		107.158	53.55%	
	<u>887.877 ha</u>			River Arrow - RBC	116.027 ha	(excl. Rush Lane BA)	<u>735.884</u>	<u>57.72%</u>	
Swans/Elcocks Brook	491.141 ha	251.207	51.15%		2 - 4,608.068 ha	Park Way	3,953.039	85.79%	
1A -	1,379.018 ha	573.231	41.57%	Old Yarr/Blaze Lane					
				Dagnell Brook	1,216.660 ha		1,136.710	93.43%	
The Wharrage	205.951 ha			Church Hill Brook	366.971 ha		281.691	76.76%	
Wixon Brook	158.695 ha			Blacksoils Brook	464.330 ha	(incl. SoDC)	239.473	51.57%	
1B -	364.646 ha				<u>2,047.961 ha</u>		<u>1,657.874</u>	<u>80.95%</u>	
1 - 1,743.664 ha		573.231	32.88%	River Arrow - RBC	504.193 ha	(incl. Church Hill)			
					3 - 7,160.222 ha	Warwick Highway	5,610.913	78.36%	
Plack Brook	230.604 ha			River Arrow - RBC	1,086.667 ha	(incl. Ipsley Brook)	<u>157.727</u>	(SoDC)	
Swans Brook	208.431 ha				4 - 8,246.889 ha	A435 Washford	5,768.640	69.95%	
2A -	439.035 ha			Mill Lane/Whirley Hole					
1 -	1,743.664 ha			Mill Lane/Whirley Hole	573.231	26.26%			
2 - 2,182.699 ha									
Doe Bank Brook	226.320 ha								
Brandon Brook	708.039 ha								
3A -	934.359 ha								
Bow Brook	602.855 ha								
3B -	1,537.214 ha								
2 -	2,182.699 ha								
3 - 3,719.913 ha		573.231	15.41%	Priest Bridge					

Redditch Borough Council - Catchment Areas Analysis (Flows)

This document is to be read in conjunction with the "Areas" spreadsheet. As part of the EA's actions into Catchment Flood Management Plans, before a risk based approach can be employed, a means of grading watercourses needs to be made.

The 2 principle criteria for designating a particular ditch or watercourse as being defined (by the EA) as a "Rapid Response Catchment" are: -

1) that its time to peak flows is less than 5 hours, and
the peak discharge exceeds 4 m³/s/km² (40 litres/s/ha)

2)

<u>WEST - Bow Brook</u>		Trigger Q	<u>EAST - River Arrow</u>		Total	BDC	
Spring Brook	361.649 ha	14.5 m ³ /sec	River Arrow - BDC	<u>3,217.155 ha</u>		<u>3,217.155</u>	100.00%
(Webheath)	103.075 ha	4.1 m ³ /sec		1 - 3,217.155 ha			
Alders Brook	309.054 ha	12.4 m ³ /sec	Batchley Brook	1,074.776 ha	43.0 m ³ /sec	628.726	58.50%
Thickwithey Brook	114.099 ha	4.6 m ³ /sec	Red Ditch	200.110 ha	8.0 m ³ /sec	107.158	53.55%
	<u>887.877 ha</u>		River Arrow - RBC	<u>116.027 ha</u>			
Swans/Elcocks Brook	491.141 ha	19.6 m ³ /sec		2 - 4,608.068 ha		<u>3,953.039</u>	85.79%
1A -	<u>1,379.018 ha</u>						
The Wharrage	205.951 ha	8.2 m ³ /sec	Dagnell Brook	1,216.660 ha	48.7 m ³ /sec	1,136.710	93.43%
Wixon Brook	158.695 ha	6.3 m ³ /sec	Church Hill Brook	366.971 ha	14.7 m ³ /sec	281.691	76.76%
	<u>364.646 ha</u>		Blacksoils Brook	<u>464.330 ha</u>	18.6 m ³ /sec	<u>239.473</u>	51.57%
1B -	<u>364.646 ha</u>			<u>2,047.961 ha</u>		<u>1,657.874</u>	80.95%
1 - 1,743.664 ha			River Arrow - RBC	<u>504.193 ha</u>			
				3 - 7,160.222 ha		5,610.913	78.36%
Plack Brook	230.604 ha	9.2 m ³ /sec					
Swans Brook	208.431 ha	8.3 m ³ /sec	River Arrow - RBC	<u>1,086.667 ha</u>		<u>157.727</u>	(SoDC)
	<u>439.035 ha</u>			4 - 8,246.889 ha		<u>5,768.640</u>	69.95%
2A -	<u>439.035 ha</u>						
1 -	<u>1,743.664 ha</u>						
2 - 2,182.699 ha							
Doe Bank Brook	226.320 ha	9.1 m ³ /sec					
Brandon Brook	708.039 ha	28.3 m ³ /sec					
3A -	<u>934.359 ha</u>						
Bow Brook	602.855 ha	24.1 m ³ /sec					
	<u>602.855 ha</u>						
3B -	<u>1,537.214 ha</u>						
2 -	<u>2,182.699 ha</u>						
3 - 3,719.913 ha							

Designated Balancing Areas

The following is a list of designated balancing areas and excludes any natural or artificial ponds which may also provide an amount of flow attenuation. They are listed alphabetically in districts and upstream to downstream.

Number RBC	CNT	Location	On / Off Line	Receiving Watercourse	District	
1	---	<i>Priest Meadow Close</i>	On	Doe Bank Brook	Astwood Bank	
2	---	<i>Off Salter's Lane - Pond B</i>	Off	Batchley Brook	Brockhill	√
3	---	<i>Off Salter's Lane - Pond C</i>	Off	Batchley Brook	Brockhill	√
4	---	<i>Off Salter's Lane - Pond D</i>	On	Batchley Brook	(Batchley)	
5	---	<i>R/o Windsor Road - Pond A</i>	Off	Red Ditch	Brockhill	√
6	10	Lower Grinsty Golf Course	On	Alders Brook	Callow Hill	
7	6	Foxholes Lane	On	Alders Brook	Callow Hill	
8	18	Rush Lane	Off	River Arrow	Church Hill North	L
9	15	Park Way	On	STW/River Arrow	Church Hill South	
10	13	Woodberrow Lane - 3	On	The Wharrage	Crabbs Cross	
11	11	Swinburne Road - 1	On	The Wharrage	Headless Cross	
12	12	Yvonne Road - 2	On	The Wharrage	Headless Cross	
13	14	Windmill Drive - 4	On	The Wharrage	Hunt End	
14	1	Feckenham Road	On	The Wharrage	Hunt End	
15	2	Stonepits Lane	On	STW/Wixon Brook	Hunt End	
16	RIP	Old Yarr, off Blaze Lane	On	Swan's Brook	Hunt End	L
17	16	Arrow Valley Park	On	STW/Blacksoils Brook	Lakeside	
18	4	Lodge Pool	On	STW/River Arrow	Lodge Park	x
19	20	Claybrook Drive/Winward Road	Off	STW/Ipsley Brook	Matchborough East	
20	17	AVP off Icknield Street Drive	Off	STW/Ipsley Brook	Matchborough East	
21	19	Winyates Way	On	Ipsley Brook	Matchborough West	
22	7	Oakenshaw Spinney	On	Wharrington Brook	Oakenshaw North	
23	8	Coldfield Drive/Alcester Highway	On	Wharrington Brook	Oakenshaw North	
24	9	Woodrow Drive	On	Woodrow Brook/STW	Oakenshaw South	
25	5	Claybrook/Icknield Street Drive	Off	River Arrow	Washford	
26	---	Shirehampton Close	Off	STW/Spring Brook	Webheath	
27	---	Reynard Close	Off	STW/Spring Brook	Webheath	
28	3	Sycamore Farm, Green Lane	On	Alders Brook	Webheath	
29	---	<i>Great Hockings Lane</i>	On	STW/Swan's Brook	Webheath	
30	---	Church Road	On	Swan's Brook	Webheath	L



Overview and Scrutiny

No Direct Ward Relevance

Committee

18 March 2009

14. 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	Chief Executive
	Consideration of the Forward Plan	Chief Executive
	Consideration of Executive Committee key decisions	Chief Executive
	Call-ins (if any)	Chief Executive
	Pre-scrutiny (if any)	Chief Executive
	Consideration of Overview and Scrutiny Actions List	Chief Executive
	Referrals from Council or Executive Committee, etc. (if any)	Chief Executive
	Task & Finish Groups - feedback	Chief Executive
	Committee Work Programme	Chief Executive
	REGULAR ITEMS	
	Quarterly Performance Report	Chief Executive
	Quarterly Budget Monitoring Report	Chief Executive
	Review of Service Plans 2009 / 12	Relevant Lead Heads of Service

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

3 March 2009

	<p>REGULAR ITEMS</p> <p>Oral updates on the progress of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Group; and 2. the Housing Mutual Exchange Task and Finish Group. 	<p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service</p>
8 April 2009	<p>REGULAR ITEMS</p> <p>Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2008/09</p>	Chief Executive
OTHER ITEMS - DATE FIXED		
18 March 2009	Capital Monitoring – Progress Report	Relevant Lead Head of Service
18 March 2009	Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group – Update on Response to Recommendations – Charging Policy	Relevant Lead Head of Service
18 March 2009	National Angling Museum – Scoping Document	
18 March 2009	Neighbourhood Groups – Scoping Document	

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

3 March 2009

18 March 2009	Overview and Scrutiny Review – Scoping Document	
18 March 2009	Review of Ditches – Discussion	Relevant Lead Head of Service
18 March 2009	Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership – Annual Report	
19 March 2009	Centre for Public Scrutiny Session – How to Win Friends and Influence Partners	
23 March	Scrutiny of Performance Training – Open to all Members	
8 April 2009	Redditch Passenger Transport Area Review – Update Report	Relevant Lead Head of Service
8 April 2009	Third Sector Task and Finish Group – Stage One Update on Responses to the Group’s Recommendations	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
17 June 2009	Uses of the Countryside and Visitors Centre – Scoping Document	Relevant Lead Head of Service
8 July 2009	District Centres Task and Finish Group – Update Report on Response to Recommendations	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service
2 September 2009	Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group – Update on Response to Recommendations – Planning Charges.	Relevant Lead Head(s) of Service

Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

3 March 2009

14 October 2009	Communications Task and Finish Group – Update on response to recommendations	Relevant Lead Head of Service
June 2011	Third Sector Task and Finish Group – Stage Two Update on responses to the Group's recommendations	Relevant Lead Head of Service
OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED		
	Community Calls for Action – Discussion	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Overview and Scrutiny Member Training on Pre-Scrutiny.	Relevant Lead Head of Service
	Update on fly tipping and the 'Worth It' Campaign	Relevant Lead Head of Service