

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wed 17 Jun  
2009  
7.00 pm

Committee Room Two  
Town Hall  
Redditch



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://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](http://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](mailto:jess.bayley@redditchbc.gov.uk) / [helen.saunders@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto: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, 17 June 2009

7.00 pm

Committee Room 2 Town Hall

## Agenda

### Membership:

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>1. Apologies and named substitutes</b>            | 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.   |
| <b>2. Declarations of interest and of Party Whip</b> | To invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in items on the Agenda and any Party Whip.   |
| <b>3. Minutes</b><br>(Pages 1 - 22)                  | To confirm the minutes of the most recent meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a correct record.<br><br>(Minutes attached)<br><br><b>All Wards</b>  |
| <b>4. Actions List</b><br>(Pages 23 - 24)            | To note the contents of the Overview and Scrutiny Actions List.<br><br>(Report attached)<br><br><b>All Wards</b>   |
| <b>5. Call-in and Pre-Scrutiny</b>                   | 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.<br><br>(No separate report).<br><br><b>All Wards</b> |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 17 June 2009

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>6. Task &amp; Finish Reviews - Draft Scoping Documents</b></p>          | <p>To consider any scoping documents provided for possible Overview and Scrutiny review.</p> <p>(No reports attached)</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>   |
| <p><b>7. Task and Finish Groups - Progress Reports</b></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"><li>1. Council Flat Communal Cleaning – Chair, Councillor P Mould;</li><li>2. Dial-A-Ride – Chair, Councillor R King;</li><li>3. National Angling Museum – Chair, Councillor P Mould; and</li><li>4. Neighbourhood Groups – Chair, Councillor K Banks.</li></ol> <p>(Oral reports)</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p> |
| <p><b>8. Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol</b></p> <p>(Pages 25 - 52)</p> | <p>To receive a presentation on the subject of the Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol.</p> <p>(In view of the fact that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person the Appendix to the report is not for publication and has been circulated only to relevant Officers and Members of the Council).</p> <p>(Reports attached and presentation to follow).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>  |
| <p><b>9. Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Group</b></p>         | <p>To consider the draft final report and recommendations from the Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Group.</p> <p>(Report circulated separately).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>   |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 17 June 2009

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>10. Councillor Calls for Action (CCfAs) - Procedure</b> | <p>To consider the Councillor Call for action procedures adopted at other local authorities and to recommend suitable arrangements for CCfAs at Redditch Borough Council.</p> <p>(Reports previously circulated)</p>   |
| <b>11. Feedback from June Scrutiny Conferences</b>         | <p>To consider information from Members and Officers regarding the Centre for Public Scrutiny Conference and Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Conference.</p> <p>(Oral reports).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>  |
| <b>12. Referrals</b>                                       | <p>To consider any referrals to the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee direct, or arising from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Executive Committee or full Council</li><li>• Other sources.</li></ul> <p>(No separate report).</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p>   |
| <b>13. Work Programme</b><br>(Pages 53 - 58)               | <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"><li>• The Forward Plan / Committee agendas</li><li>• External publications</li><li>• Other sources.</li></ul> <p>(Report attached)</p> <p><b>All Wards</b></p> |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

Wednesday, 17 June 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, 27 May 2009

## MINUTES

### Present:

Councillor Phil Mould (Chair), and Councillors G Chance, R King, W Norton, J Pearce, D Taylor and D Thomas.

### Also Present:

Councillor M Braley

### Officers:

A Marklew, J Smith and E Storer

### Committee Services Officer:

J Bayley and H Saunders

### 1. APOLOGIES AND NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Banks and Smith.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND OF PARTY WHIP

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

### 3. MINUTES

#### RESOLVED that

**the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Thursday 30 April be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

### 4. ACTIONS LIST

The Committee considered the latest version of the outstanding Actions List.

.....  
Chair

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

In relation to item 3 (National Angling Museum), Officers reported that the Council's IT Services Officers had submitted an order to purchase the four versions of the National Angling Museum domain name.

**RESOLVED that**

**subject to the update in the preamble above, the Actions List be noted.**

**5. CALL-IN AND PRE-SCRUTINY**

Officers referred to Decision 10 of the Executive Committee Decision Notice of Wednesday 20 May 2009 (Housing Mutual Exchange Task and Finish Group recommendation).

Officers informed Members that this recommendation had been approved by the Executive Committee. An item would therefore be scheduled onto the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme to enable the Committee to monitor the implementation of this recommendation.

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

**6. TASK & FINISH REVIEWS - DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENTS**

Sheltered Housing Schemes - Review of Parking Arrangements

Officers advised that Councillor A Clayton, who had been due to attend the meeting to suggest a review of parking arrangements for sheltered housing schemes, had withdrawn the proposal.

Members were informed that the Council had a policy for parking at sheltered housing schemes. Officers would therefore be working with Councillor Clayton to review parking arrangements at Chiltern House. There was the possibility that this review might result in the identification of issues that would be suitable for an alternative scrutiny review.

There were no draft scoping documents for pre-scrutiny.

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

## 7. 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 Mould informed Members that the Group had recently met to agree their recommendations. The Group would present their final report and recommendations at the following meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday 17 June.

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

Councillor King informed Members that the first meeting of the Group had taken place and had been attended by relevant Officers. The Group had agreed to shadow staff who delivered the Dial-A-Ride service to observe delivery of the service in action. The Group had also been informed that a long-serving Manager of the service would be leaving the Council. The Group had therefore arranged to interview this Officer on Thursday 28 May to ensure that they could consider the important evidence that could be provided by this expert witness.

Members were informed that a questionnaire was sent to customers of the Dial-A-Ride service on an annual basis. The Group would be considering the information provided in response to these questionnaires in 2009 as part of their review.

c) National Angling Museum – Chair, Councillor P Mould

Councillor Mould informed Members that one meeting of the Group had already taken place. During this meeting Members had discussed an ongoing project to establish a National Angling Museum at a National Trust property: Mottisfont Abbey. A consultancy firm, JD Consulting, had been commissioned to review suitable arrangements for establishing a National Angling Museum in the country and had identified Mottisfont Abbey as a possible location for this site. The Chair explained that this would have implications for the review.

He informed Members that a further meeting of the Group would be taking place at the beginning of June. During this meeting relevant Officers from Leisure and Property Services

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

would be interviewed to discuss options for establishing a National Angling Museum in Redditch.

d) Neighbourhood Groups – Chair, Councillor K Banks

Officers explained that the first meeting of the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group would be taking place on Tuesday 23 June. At the request of the Chair an article would be appearing in the June edition of Redditch Matters promoting the launch of the review. The Chair had also arranged for basic information about the launch of the review to be discussed as a corporate item during the June / July round of Neighbourhood Group meetings.

**RESOLVED that**

**the Task and Finish Group update reports be noted.**

**8. COMMUNICATIONS TASK AND FINISH GROUP - UPDATE**

Officers presented a written report outlining the responses of the Council's Communications Team to the Communications Task and Finish Group's final recommendations (Appendix A).

Officers explained that corporate branding related not just to the Council's logo but also to other practices which impacted on the Council's corporate identity, such as letterhead styles. Recently Officers had identified the impact of the footers, that were listed on the end of staff emails, upon corporate identity. The Council would be introducing a corporate standard for these footers which would require members of staff to list their name, job title and contact details in a specified manner. Furthermore, these footers would contain reference to the Council's priorities.

Members discussed the Council's relations with representatives of the local press. The local press had been adversely affected by the economic climate. The amount of advertisements placed in the local press by advertisers generally, had decreased which had had an adverse impact on the financial position of many newspapers. A number of local journalists had unfortunately been made redundant. However, relations between the local press and the Council remained largely positive and articles about Council business tended to feature prominently in local media reports.

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

Members discussed the different corporate branding arrangements that were utilised by some sections of the Council, such as Leisure Services. They questioned the impact that this had on the Council's corporate identity. Officers explained that some services did have slightly different branding known as co-branding. An example of this would be the branding used for the Palace Theatre. However, Members were advised that it was fairly common for co-branding arrangements to be utilised by local authorities. In all cases, Redditch Borough Council ownership should be made clear through secondary use of the Council's logo.

Members noted that one of the problems which had been identified by the Communications Task and Finish Group was that some people had poor perceptions of the town. Members suggested that to address these perceptions the Council could produce a calendar containing images of the attractions that were based within the Borough. Moreover, in order to encourage civic pride, Members suggested that the images for this calendar could be provided through a local competition. Residents could be invited to submit photographs of local attractions for this competition. Officers were asked to consider this option in further detail.

Members praised the Communications Team for the work they had undertaken to address the recommendations contained in the Task and Finish Group's report.

## **RESOLVED that**

**the report be noted.**

### **9. COUNCILLOR CALLS FOR ACTION (CCfA)**

The Chair explained that, owing to ill health, the Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services had been unable to attend the meeting. He therefore proposed that the Committee postpone consideration of details about the Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) procedures adopted at other local authorities until the following meeting of the Committee.

Officers confirmed that, as requested at the previous meeting, Officers had utilised copies of the CCfA request forms that had been produced by Worcestershire County Council and Birmingham City Council, to produce a draft form for Redditch Borough Council. This had been sent to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee for consideration. Confirmation of the contents of this form would

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

occur on the return of the Head of Legal, Democratic and Property Services.

Members noted that a large amount of paperwork had been issued containing details about the CCfA processes utilised at other local authorities.

## **RESOLVED that**

- 1) the contents of the Councillor Call for Action form for Redditch Borough Council be finalised for use as soon as possible;**
- 2) Members consider details about Councillor Call for Action processes at other local authorities at the following meeting of the Committee; and**
- 3) Members retain the paperwork relating to the Councillor Call for Action processes at other local authorities for consideration at their following meeting.**

## **10. BRAINSTORM - QUESTIONS FOR WORCESTERSHIRE PRIMARY CARE TRUST (PCT)**

As previously requested by the Committee, Officers from Worcestershire County Council had provided further information about public transport access to the Alexandra Hospital. Following consideration of this information the Committee had concluded that representatives of Worcestershire Primary Care Trust (PCT) should also be invited to provide evidence on this subject.

Members proposed a number of questions for the consideration of Worcestershire PCT (Appendix B). They agreed that these questions should be forwarded to representatives of Worcestershire PCT. Officers were asked to advise the PCT of the dates of forthcoming meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to invite representatives of the PCT to attend one of these meetings. Officers informed Members that recent legislation had created a duty to co-operate which would require Worcestershire PCT to respond to this request for information. However, this response might not entail attendance at a meeting of the Committee but, rather, receipt of written information.

Members were informed that, as requested by the Committee, Officers from Worcestershire County Council had also provided details about the potential to install a bus stop beside the Arrow

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

Valley Countryside Centre. Officers had advised that a suitable site for a bus stop had been identified on Battens Drive for the inbound route, which would operate northwards towards the Town Centre. The installation of a bus shelter on this site would need to be funded by Redditch Borough Council. However, no suitable location had been identified for a bus stop to be located on the outbound route, which would face southwards in the direction of Ipsley. A bus stop could only be installed on the outbound route at a cost to Redditch Borough Council in excess of £100,000.

Officers from Worcestershire County Council had requested further guidance from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as to whether they should pursue the option of installing a bus stop for the inbound route. Members agreed that this option would not be feasible and requested that Officers advise Worcestershire County Council accordingly.

## **RESOLVED that**

- 1) **representatives of Worcestershire Primary Care Trust be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee to answer questions regarding public transport access to the Alexandra Hospital; and**
- 2) **Worcestershire County Council be advised to take no further action regarding the installation of a bus stop close to the Arrow Valley Countryside Centre.**

## **11. REFERRALS**

There were no referrals for consideration at this meeting.

## **12. WORK PROGRAMME**

Members discussed a number of items in relation to the Committee's Work Programme.

### a) Portfolio Holder Annual Reports

Members discussed arrangements for Portfolio Holder Annual Reports for 2009/10. They agreed that Portfolio Holders should be invited to deliver answers to questions proposed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Portfolio Holders could also produce separate reports if they considered it to be

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

necessary. The Portfolio Holders would be invited to deliver their reports in a style with which they felt comfortable.

Members discussed the frequency of Portfolio Holder Annual Reports during the year. However, Members agreed that for Portfolio Holders to report more than once annually might be excessive.

b) Budget Strategy and Budget Deficit – Discussion

The Chair advised Members that the Committee was scheduled to consider the Council's Budget Strategy and Budget Deficit in further detail at a meeting of the Committee on 17 June. As requested at a previous meeting of the Committee, Officers had circulated copies of the reports relating to the budget strategy and deficit amongst Members of the Group. This arrangement had been put in place to enable Members to identify whether they would require any further information when discussing the issue at the Committee meeting. The Chair informed Members that Officers had received no responses from Members regarding this matter. He suggested, therefore, that the reports should be re-circulated and that consideration of the item be postponed until the following meeting of the Committee on 8 July.

c) Member Training – Crime and Disorder Scrutiny

Officers advised Members that a conference, focusing upon scrutiny of crime and disorder issues, was scheduled to take place in London on 15 June. Members were advised that both Officers and Councillors could attend this conference. A place had already been booked for one of the Overview and Scrutiny Support Officers.

Members were advised that the fee for attending this conference would be £265.00. Consideration would also need to be given to paying the travel expenses for any Members who attended the conference. Officers informed Members that each Councillor had a personal allowance of £300.00, which was provided for individual support needs. In addition to this sum £5,800 was held centrally for Member Development purposes.

Members discussed the costs involved in booking a place on the conference. They agreed that any Councillor who was interested in attending this conference should not be expected to use all of their personal development funds. Instead, they



# **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Wednesday, 27 May 2009

---

agreed that £100.00 should be contributed from individual member's budgets and the remainder should be paid for using funds from the general Overview and Scrutiny budget.

## **RESOLVED that**

- 1) Portfolio Holders be invited to indicate the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to which they would prefer to deliver their Annual Reports;**
- 2) copies of the reports relating to the Council's Budget Strategy and budget deficit be circulated for Members' consideration;**
- 3) consideration of the Council's Budget Strategy and deficit be rescheduled for a meeting of the Committee on 8 July;**
- 4) Councillors Norton and R King would attend the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Conference on 15 June;**
- 5) the Councillors' attendance at the conference be funded using £100.00 from each Councillor's personal support budget, together with funds from the general Overview and Scrutiny budget; and**
- 6) the Committee's Work Programme be noted.**

The Meeting commenced at 7.00 pm  
and closed at 8.50 pm





[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

**Overview & Scrutiny**  
Committee

27 May 2009

7.00pm

Committee Room Two, Town  
Hall

## **APPENDIX A**

# **COMMUNICATIONS TASK AND FINISH GROUP – UPDATE REPORT**



**Briefing for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting: an update following the Communications Task and Finish Group's work - Wednesday 27 May 2009**

**1. Background**

This briefing paper has been written by the Communications and Marketing Manager and accompanies his attendance at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 May, alongside the Head of HR and Communications. The briefing addresses the actions recommended by the Communications Task and Finish Group on the conclusion of its work in the summer of 2008.

The paper looked at seven areas: *Prioritising Communications, Communications Strategy, Internal Communications, Joint Working, Civic Newspaper, Corporate Branding and Media Relations.*

**2. Prioritising Communications**

The **strengthening of the Communications Team** with the appointment of a full time Communications and Marketing Manager (the previous manager worked part-time), an additional Media and Communications Officer, an Administration Assistant to support the team, and responsibility for the Print Team, was the clearest demonstration possible of this Council's commitment to communications and making it a priority.

These new members of the team joined an existing Media and Communications Officer and a Designer, and so enabled the creation of a team whose resources could now match those of other similar-sized councils and public/private sector organisations.

But good communication is not exclusive to this specialist team and must pervade across the whole council. Indeed, strengthened as the team may be, it is simply not possible for the team to carry out all the Council's communications work. Hence **Communications Champions** have been set up to cover all of the Council's services including the Children's Centres. Twelve champions will be meeting bi-monthly as a Communications Group, chaired by the Communications and Marketing Manager. Their role is to create strong two-way communications between their services and the Communications Team, and vice versa. They have a broad brief, from identifying stories and helping with internal communications, to gaining good practice and new skills in photography and marketing techniques.

**The Corporate Management Team (CMT)** now has Communications on all of its agendas. Each month the Communications and Marketing Manager presents a regularly updated Communications Planner to CMT. The Planner identifies sensitive issues for CMT's consideration and details how we will respond, as well as providing information on themed national weeks that the Council can support.

The **Controlling Group's role driving through improvements** is fundamental. The Group supported the expansion of the team and Members have worked closely with the team during the past year, especially at Leader and Portfolio Holder level.

The Task and Finish Group also considered the **position and location of Communications in the Council**. It was later agreed to locate Communications alongside HR and the Print Team as part of the HR and Communications service, led by Elaine Storer, as Head of HR and Communications. The service is part of the Environment and Planning Directorate.

It is fair to say that being part of a Planning directorate is unusual for Communications. The function is often to be found within the Chief Executive's department or corporate or policy.

But in the Redditch case it seems to work. And there are strong advantages in Communications working alongside the HR function, especially with respect to internal communications. The team makes a special effort to visit colleagues across all floors at the Town Hall and tries to break down the barriers of being located on the fourth floor at the top of the building. Being part of a service directorate also exposes Communications to the day-to-day issues and challenges councils face.

The Communications Team has made a particular effort to promote the **Council's vision and priorities** with the production of posters, press work, publicity through the Council Tax leaflet and Redditch Matters. It also led on the public and staff consultation when the new vision and priorities were proposed.

The Council's **Website**, managed through the hub arrangement with the County Council, is being re-designed and will see much improved navigation and a cleaner, modern style. The new website will be launched in September. At the same time, a new content management system (CMS) is being introduced and the Council's team of web authors are being trained to use the new system next month.

Web authors take responsibility for managing and updating content within their functional areas. The Communications Team, as one of the web authors, manages press releases on the site and has plans to create an online press office. It also oversees the Focus On features and the page for Redditch Matters where an online version of the magazine is available. It also provides content for other parts of the website depending on need, for example new photography etc.

Not mentioned by the Task and Finish Group is the whole area of **social media and networking**. Many councils are now communicating via the latest web 2.0 technology including through tools including Facebook, Twitter and Flickr. This is something we do want to embrace more, particularly as social media is an ideal method of communicating (and consulting) with those 'hard to reach groups'. A Facebook site for the Morton Stanley Fun Day is being set up, to market the event and promote the bands that will be playing during the day. Colleagues in planning have identified the usefulness of Twitter to highlight new planning applications and to consult residents.

But we are conscious that the Council's Internet policy for staff currently forbids access to social media sites during work hours and also outside core work times. This makes it difficult for staff to set up and manage legitimate social media to promote their services and needs addressing.

**Internal communications** is driven by a combination of email newsletters and updates, staff briefings, team meetings and online communication. See section 4 for more detail.

### 3. Communications Strategy

A new strategy needs to be produced and has been deliberately put on hold for the moment, to give the new Communications and Marketing Manager time to settle into the job and understand the Council's work and role within Redditch in greater detail. This will be produced later this year but will be widened into a Communications and Engagement Strategy

The strategy will reflect the vision and priorities, capture consultation activity (and ensure these are planned to ensure good response levels), link to other relevant plans, strategies and policies, and include an action plan that timetables major communications activity throughout the year – publication of the Annual Report, Corporate Plan, Council Tax leaflet, Redditch Matters, internal publications, Neighbourhood Group meetings, participation in the Community Forum etc.

The principal role of the Communications Team is to enable residents to understand how their Council works and the services it provides, and crucially to encourage engagement with the Council and those services. But many councils are now additionally looking to place shaping (or even place shielding to protect their areas against the current recession).

The Task and Finish Group did identify a need to **promote the image of Redditch** (which would fall within place shaping) and it is clear that the Council has a role to play here especially as few, if any, other local organisations are equipped or want to perform this role. However, as other councils have found, place shaping needs resourcing and has been most successful where regeneration, tourism and economic development resources are strong, not to mention the support of local people and stakeholder groups.

Redditch's reputation, certainly, county wide and regionally could clearly be improved, and is often unfair given many of the positives we could all point to. But changing perceptions will undoubtedly take time.

The Communications Team will do all it can to use opportunities to make local people feel proud to live here and influence those from outside. Opportunities that we could use now include approaching television and radio programmes to broadcast their programmes from Redditch - Gardener's Question Time, Antiques Roadshow etc. This will require effort to achieve as with all place shaping activity.

Much of our **marketing** revolves around producing quality print and advertising. Services from Shopmobility and Lifeline to the free swimming campaign and promoting the Palace Theatre all benefit from our design and marketing input. Inevitably services such as the Palace Theatre and our leisure centres are at the forefront of our marketing, having access to dedicated marketing funds and able to use more direct marketing channels to reach their customers such as mailing lists and e-marketing.

The Communications Team is conscious of the need to raise marketing standards across the Council and seeks to try and help those services with less marketing budget, in particular.

**Member Communications** are led by the Committee Services team. The Communications Team leads on the Members' Bulletin (see below) and has a role to play keeping Members informed of sudden and important news and developments. Members also receive a copy of all issued press releases.

#### 4. Internal Communications

It is clearly imperative that staff are kept informed about the democratic process and decisions made by the Council, in addition to the general day-to-day news that affects staff. To this end the following tools are used:

- **Core Brief** is produced each month and emailed to all staff, and is for corporate news and information. Core Brief Extra is issued when there is important information to convey between editions.
- **Contact** is the staff newsletter produced each quarter and is for human interest stories involving staff.
- A **Members' Bulletin**, produced monthly, is a briefing for councillors and was introduced last year.

The Chief Executive has been discussing a range of new techniques to take forward, some have already begun including back to the floor (for senior officers to spend time experiencing the frontline) and open door sessions to meet Serco as they produce the business case for shared services.

A staff suggestion scheme, a staff survey, speed dating to enable staff to meet and talk to the CMT, are among several other techniques under consideration.

#### 5. Joint Working

With the new Communications Team in place, it has been possible to work more closely with our County Council partner on joint communications activity. This includes current joint activity on the economic situation under the County Council's Economy Watch group, while the Council Tax leaflet is another example of joint working.

We also work closely with county and district councils on emergency planning, through the West Mercia LRF (Local Response Force). This has been very noticeable during the recent outbreak of swine flu.

And clearly there is considerable communications contact with Bromsgrove District Council, in line with the shared services agenda. We regularly share good practice and suppliers to achieve maximum efficiency.

The Community Forum in Redditch is a particular example of joint working as is the local strategic partnership. From a specific communications point of view, we could probably do more to share news across our partner's own publications and websites.



## 6. Civic Newspaper

**Redditch Matters** returned in March, following an 18-months absence. The spring edition was 32 pages long and included 5 pages of advertising to help offset some of the production costs. Work is currently underway completing the summer edition, due to be distributed from 1 July. A combined autumn / winter edition will be published in late November. Following competitive quotations, Newsquest was hired to distribute copies with the Redditch Advertiser and post about 850 copies to businesses. Printnote was hired to sell advertising space. The spring edition cost £4,600 to produce 40,000 copies and was within a £5,000 budget allocated for this first edition. With good advertising support it is hoped to bring the costs of Redditch Matters down further in the coming year.

The contents of each edition are agreed by an Editorial Panel comprising Councillors A Clayton (Conservative), Pearce (Conservative), Hartnett (Labour) and Thomas (Liberal Democrats). The Panel also provides feedback after each edition.

## 7. Corporate Branding

The Council's **Corporate Identity** has been revised and will be presented to the Executive Committee at their 22 July meeting for hopeful adoption by Full Council in August, and then it will be launched to staff.

The revisions include a consistent style for email footers, letterheads, presentations etc which has been missing, and new Plain English and style guides.

It goes without saying that the revised identity has a strong part to play in improving our internal communications, especially in helping all staff to communicate clearly and consistently, and so that the Redditch Council brand is well executed.

## 8. Media Relations

With two dedicated Media and Communications Officers now in place, we have been able to significantly increase the amount of pro-active press work we do. Since last November, when the new Communications Team came into being, over 80 **press releases** have been issued on a wide variety of topics (as the handout demonstrates). Every release issued has resulted in media coverage.

The Task and Finish were concerned that a **`disproportionate amount of media work is on leisure and the arts`**. A glance at the handout demonstrates that this not the case and press activity in this particular area is broadly in line with the amount of budget spent on leisure and the arts. Indeed the press office team has been careful to ensure that a wide range of services are able to benefit through media activity, in accordance with the Council's vision and priorities.

It is now policy to include **quotations from portfolio holders** in all press releases we issue with the exception of a very small number of releases where the inclusion of a quotation is not necessary.

A new **media relations policy** has been written and will be issued to staff and Members this summer, alongside the revised Corporate Identity. These are our protocols and include sections on the media we deal with; the roles of staff, Members and the Communications Team; as well as dealing with quotations and approving press releases.

**Relationships with the media** are good. There were a couple of stories concerning Dial-A-Ride and the new vision and priorities that caused some problems for the Council, although we did have the opportunity to respond. In the last few months there have been meetings with the Editor of the Redditch Standard and the Publisher of the Redditch Advertiser. This has been supplemented by regular contact with reporters from both papers as well as from the Birmingham Mail, Birmingham Post, BBC Hereford and Worcester, BBC WM, Wyvern FM, Touch FM, ITV Central and BBC Midlands Today – our principal media. We also frequently deal with the national media, especially with the Home Secretary being the MP for Redditch.

In addition, we have secured a monthly column in the Redditch Standard for the Leader of the Council to communicate her thoughts on Council activity and news at these regular intervals.

**Media briefings** are held on a regular basis. They range from one-to one briefings with the Chief Executive prior to Full Council meetings, to full briefings with several media in attendance e.g. the briefing staged before the launch of the consultation on the medium term budget strategy back in March.

We also produce **press statements** to respond to enquiries and will respond to **letters** in newspapers that require an official Council reply.

We would like to spread the excellent coverage we get locally to more coverage in the **trade press** (Municipal Journal, First – magazine of the Local Government Association, Local Government Chronicle etc), but this will only be achieved if we have a story to tell and one that is interesting on a national scale.

We have been in contact with the Editor of Worcestershire Life to encourage more articles on Redditch, and not necessarily on the Council, to be run in the county's lifestyle magazine. There may also be scope to increase feature coverage in the Birmingham Post and other regional titles, given that there is a desire to **raise the profile of Redditch** across the region and change some of the negative perceptions of the town. But again achieving this will depend on the availability of good potential feature stories and meeting the agenda of papers such as the Post.

Adrian Marklew  
Communications and Marketing Manager  
Redditch Borough Council

May 2009



[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

**Overview & Scrutiny**  
Committee

27 May 2009

7.00pm

Committee Room Two, Town  
Hall

## **APPENDIX B**

# **PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESS TO THE ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL – QUESTIONS FOR WORCESTERSHIRE PCT**



**Public Transport Access to the Alexandra Hospital – Questions from the Redditch Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the Consideration of Worcestershire Primary Care Trust (PCT)**

- 1) What practical steps is Worcestershire PCT taking to encourage sustainable transport access to the Alexandra Hospital?
- 2) What measures has Worcestershire PCT taken to encourage car sharing by staff working at the Alexandra Hospital?
- 3) What other green travel plan arrangements does Worcestershire PCT encourage staff from the Alexandra hospital to use?
- 4) Worcestershire County Council has suggested that a bus interchange could be introduced at the Alexandra Hospital. Does Worcestershire PCT regard this to be a feasible suggestion? If not why not?
- 5) Worcestershire County Council has reported that there are problems with nuisance parking practices at the Alexandra Hospital. Does the Worcestershire PCT concur that there is a problem with nuisance parking practices at the Alexandra Hospital? If so, what action does Worcestershire PCT plan to take to address this problem?
- 6) Redditch Borough Council currently provides a Dial-A-Ride service to local residents and businesses. This service is frequently used by people who need to visit the Alexandra Hospital to attend medical appointments. Does Worcestershire PCT provide grants which could be used to fund this service? If not why not?



**Actions requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

| <b>Date Action Requested</b> | <b>Action to be Taken</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| 14/01/09<br><br><b>1</b>     | 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. |
| 04/02/09<br><br><b>2</b>     | 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.  | Relevant Officers to report before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as part of the shared services process where appropriate. (TO BE DONE) – ONGOING.  |
| 30/04/09<br><br><b>3</b>     | Members requested that Officers purchase all four versions of the website domain name for the National Angling Museum.   | Officers have confirmed that all four versions of the National Angling Museum domain names have been purchased on behalf of the Council. (DONE).  |
| 30/04/09<br><br><b>4</b>     | Members requested further information about the procedural arrangements adopted at external local authorities for the councillor Calls for Action (CCfA) Process. This would inform Members' recommendations about an appropriate CCfA process for Redditch Borough Council. | Details about CCfA processes at other local authorities have been appended to this agenda pack for the consideration of Members accordingly. (DONE).  |

|                                 |   |  |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>30/04/09</p> <p><b>5</b></p> | <p>Members requested further details regarding the number of occupied units in the Greenlands Business Centre; the Hemming Road Business Centre; and the Rubicon Centre. Members also requested a copy of a report on this subject that was considered at a recent meeting of the Economic Advisory Panel.</p>  | <p>The requested information was circulated amongst Members of the Committee on Tuesday 12 May. (DONE).</p>                |
| <p>30/04/09</p> <p><b>6</b></p> | <p>Members requested that details about the proposed actions that would be undertaken to address real and perceived career opportunities for young people be circulated for the consideration of Members.</p>   | <p>The requested information was circulated for Members consideration on Tuesday 5 May. (DONE).</p>                        |
| <p>30/04/09</p> <p><b>7</b></p> | <p>Members agreed that an item should be scheduled on the Committee's Work Programme for 17 June regarding a report on the subject of the Worcestershire Land Drainage Partnership.</p>   | <p>The Committee's Work Programme has been amended accordingly. (DONE).</p>  |
| <p>30/04/09</p> <p><b>8</b></p> | <p>Members requested that copies of the reports relating to the Council's Budget Strategy and Deficit, which were considered at a meeting of full Council on 6 April, be circulated for the consideration of members of the Committee. Members agreed they would request any further details considered necessary for 17 June meeting when this item is due for further consideration, based on their assessment of this information.</p> | <p>Copies of these reports were circulated for the consideration of members of the Committee on Tuesday 5 May. (DONE).</p> |

### Glossary

|      |   |                                       |
|------|---|---------------------------------------|
| CCfA | - | Councillor Calls for Action           |
| OSSO | - | Overview and Scrutiny Support Officer |



**Notes: O & S Committee, Wednesday, 17 June 2009****Introduction:**

Officers thank the O & S Committee for the opportunity to expand and update upon the earlier presentation on 18 March 2009. In addition officers are supported this evening, by BWB consulting who have been working with a number of our Worcestershire partners, as well as others. They will provide an overview of our changing and additional responsibilities, as a result of the Draft "Flood & Water Management Bill".

**Progress to Date:**

The Worcestershire Land Drainage Partnership has prepared a Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol – attached for Member approval.

A new National Indicator, NI 189, requires extensive training (planned) as it has a comprehensive series of base indices to arrive at the correct final score. The EA are taking a lead in the training role. An earlier event also explored possible new grant funding routes. However, as the principal factors relate to the numbers of properties flooded, divided by 145,000, 37,000 and 9,000 respectively, it's most unlikely that as with former DEFRA (or MAFF) grants, any Redditch schemes will not score sufficiently highly and thus unlikely to succeed in securing extra government funding.

**Timetable of Critical Events (updated):**

Note dates are provisional and in some cases actions have been or may hopefully be sooner rather than later): -

- 01 April 2009 Flood Forecasting Centre brought into operation including "Extreme Rainfall Alert Service"
- 21 April 2009 Draft "Flood & Water Management Bill" published; consultation by 24/07/09
- 25 June 2009 Officers to attend "Flood Management 09" conference
- Summer 2009 New building regulations "for flood resilient buildings"
- December 2009 EA to provide LRF's with inundation maps for each Reservoir – we currently have no advance information
- June 2010 National Flood Emergency Framework
- June 2010 new standards for sewers, and
- December 2011 National emergency exercise

**Conclusions:**

The various appendices have been prepared using existing legislative references only. Officers ask Members to agree that it will not be necessary to re-approve these documents provided that any references are simply typographic changes to correspond to the new ones. Where there are substantive, new, amended or deleted obligations, these will of course be brought to Members attention for subsequent approval.

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 and thus outside the remit of our immediate control or influence.

O & S is asked to consider, and where they feel appropriate, to recommend that the attached documents be taken forward to the Executive Committee of the 12 August 2009. This will allow certain key objectives to be achieved in accordance with relevant criteria set out in the NI 189 validation process, by September 2009.

**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. "Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol" – May 2009, WDLP/LDTG
2. Ditches and Other Minor Watercourses – RBC (03/06/09)
3. Landscape & Land Drainage Maintenance Policy – RBC (18/02/09)
4. Dredging (Land Drainage) Maintenance Policy – RBC (05/06/09)
5. Flood Resilience Analysis – RBC (05/03/09)

CAW/P2022

08 June 2009



**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 one 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. The latter definition also applies in the case of roadside ditches, as normally ownership extends up to the centre of the highway from adjacent land(s).

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 our management regime of these 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. Assets budget excluding WCC contributions for 2009/10 is £110k.

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 need to be carefully re-considered. The Draft “Flood and Water Management Bill” was published for consultation on 21 April 2009 (to be responded to by 24 July 2009).

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 their woodland and parkland management regimes. However, there are substantial rural areas within the southern and western areas of the Borough, which are not within RBC’s immediate operational control.

There are also considerable contributory areas, chiefly to the north and west of the RBC boundary, which drain into our watercourse network (from Bromsgrove District Council's administrative area). 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 changing, primary legislation, 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. Clearly one of the areas of focus highlighted by the Pitt Review, was the need for stronger links and controls to be established as part of the Planning Process.

**REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL – June 2009**

**DRAFT DREDGING (LAND DRAINAGE) 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, the Draft "Flood and Water Bill" was published on 21 April 2009. This attempts to unify various pieces of drainage legislation and therefore any references below, refers to documents currently in force.

In this regard, a 'river' could either be a named river (e.g. River Severn, River Avon, River Arrow, etc) or any other named or un-named watercourse, ditch, roadside ditch and the like. The basic criteria to be considered is: - Does it convey flow for more than 50% of the year, irrespective of rainfall? Some channels are designated 'main rivers' (by the Environment Agency (EA)) and this confers additional powers upon the EA to act, in combination with the Local Drainage Authorities on associated matters.

Clearly, there were mixed codes of practice adopted by the various drainage authorities pre-2007, whereby Blanket Policies: -

- Which dictate that all channels "should be dredged", and also
- Which dictate that all channels "should not be dredged"

have now been found to be unacceptable. A range of criteria should be considered and if the 'test' suggests that actions are required, this should be enforced and if necessary rigorously, by means of formal actions by the appropriate LDA(s) in accordance with the Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol (as adopted by Redditch Borough Council (RBC)).

One common misconception has in the past been, that if in clearing one section of channel it may cause flooding downstream, it should not be done. This may be due to inadequate capacity downstream in which case the argument is valid. If however, it is due to one or several downstream landowners also requiring taking appropriate actions it is not. Obviously, it is better to commence downstream improvements first, but if this is not possible, other actions should not be unreasonably delayed as a consequence – two wrongs do not make a right.

The commonest cause of obstruction is due to natural processes such as migration and deposition of silt and/or former minor vegetation reaching maturity, has been allowed to encroach into the bed and/or channel of the river or watercourse. Also, where 'old' structures have been in place for many years, they may now be acting as throttles due to inappropriate developments in the vicinity and/or climatic effects.

This policy is not to be confused with any requirements for navigation purposes which may in those instances, override the usual Land Drainage Criteria. However, there are no navigable river waters within the RBC area, which fall within the remit of the Land Drainage Acts 1991 and 1994.

Intervention Matrix (between fixed structures or other reference points)

| Effect(s)  |     | Test - 1                         |     | Test - 2                             |     | Test - 3                             |
|--|-----|----------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|
|  | Y/N | Action                           | Y/N | Action                               | Y/N | Action                               |
| During high rainfall, is silt or standing water present at high-level? | Yes | Throughout an entire reach?      | Yes | Does this extend to next reach?      | Yes | Clear culvert or other obstructions. |
|  | No  | No action.                       | No  | Remove localised obstructions.       | No  | Review only.                         |
| During high rainfall, are there any significant steps in water level?  | Yes | Fixed Assets, culverts, bridges? | Yes | Seek EA approval to alter structure. | Yes | Remove or re-build structure.        |
|  | No  | No action.                       | No  | Remove localised obstructions.       | No  | N/a                                  |
| During low rainfall, is silt or standing water present at high-level?  | Yes | Throughout an entire reach?      | Yes | Dredge reach completely.             | Yes | Clear culvert or other obstructions. |
|  | No  | No action.                       | No  | Remove localised obstructions.       | No  | Review only.                         |

Hierarchy – Channels

- C1 Main River – River Arrow  
The Wharrage, Wixon, Swan's and Bow Brooks
- 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).



## 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. (This item will be jointly developed by Landscape and Asset Maintenance officers).

Where such an area adjoins a highway (Foxlydiat Wood/Bromsgrove Road), situations can arise whereby trees can become unsafe and ultimately may fail, and partially obstruct the highway as well as any open channels. 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 present or 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 any 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.

## 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. 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 are to be doubled.

Thus the nominal distances are: -

- Main Rivers 15m (30m)
- Ordinary Watercourses 10m (20m)
- 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 is to be as follows: -

- Minor vegetation Shredded and deposited on suitable adjacent flat areas.
- Logging Secured (within critical zones) by means of pegs and wires (regularly checked by persons placing them).
- 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.

A common problem associated with 'river' maintenance is the presence of self-set trees and shrubs. Over time, they can mature and the root and trunk systems can eventually obstruct the normal flow of the channel. This is technically an obstruction and acts in the same way as if it were artificial hard material or structure.

The need for taking action is when there is clear evidence of afflux. This is where the water levels in the channel either side of the tree or other obstruction are markedly different. This may in low flows be only a few centimetres, but during storm conditions, this can be greatly magnified. If there are several such obstructions present, it is possible for considerable false depths of flow to accumulate over relatively short distances which can have a serious, deleterious impact upstream.

This can have a marked detrimental impact upon flood management. Firstly, there is less below ground storage (volumes) within the channel itself and thus flooding situations can occur quite quickly. Secondly, the performance of any on-line channel

structures (culverts and the like) will also suffer leading to a significantly reduced capacity for flows. The final and major consequence is that with normally low velocities, siltation of the channel will take place at an ever increasing rate, thereby greatly exacerbating both reductions of storage and flow capacities.

Happily the need for taking significant actions is relatively infrequent, and when such works are required, provided a sensible, minimal annual maintenance regime is put in place, the benefits will last for between 10 and 20 years in most instances.

**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.



**WORCESTERSHIRE LAND DRAINAGE ENFORCEMENT PROTOCOL**  
**(REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL – MAY 2009)**

**Introduction**

Current legislation puts District Councils in the lead role in overseeing land drainage matters along “ordinary watercourses”, while “main rivers” are overseen by the Environment Agency. Councils have powers rather than duties to act. Decisions in any case will be down to individual authorities and will depend on the circumstances of each case. The purpose of this protocol is to promote a common approach to the exercise of these powers.

**Riparian rights and responsibilities**

In most cases the owner of the land next to a watercourse is the “riparian owner”. The legal responsibility for maintaining watercourses rests with the riparian owner. Where a watercourse passes over someone’s land, the riparian owner has to keep it clear to allow water to flow freely though it. Further, it is usually the landowner’s responsibility to maintain a watercourse that forms a boundary with a highway.

**Dealing with reports about “ordinary watercourses” that need attention.**

When a problem is reported to the district council a site inspection will be arranged, usually within 10 working days to assess the problem, and a decision made upon the course of action to be taken.

If the problem appears to be urgent, attendance will be arranged as soon as possible and in any event within 24 hours

**Assessment**

Consideration should be given to all of the facts of the matter, before proceeding with the request for action that may later lead to enforcement and possible prosecution.

Examples of factors that may influence action:

- Are any properties at risk of flooding
- Serious risk of harm
- All other attempts to remedy the situation have failed
- Deliberate and obvious action by landowner to obstruct watercourse
- The obstruction or problem has occurred fairly recently
- Support of parish council, community etc
- Unchecked natural growth has as a result of general lack of maintenance resulted in unacceptable restrictions to flow.
- Change in circumstances makes problem worse

Examples of factors that may influence against action:

- Obstruction has been in place for a number of years
- Action has no community support
- Other options are available
- Minimal risk of harm
- Change in circumstances makes problem better

### **Initial action**

- ▶ Upon inspection, if it is considered that the matter complained of is not the cause of the drainage problem or the proper flow of water is not impeded, and no action is to be taken or required, the complainant will be advised accordingly. In any event, a written communication will be sent to the complainant explaining the reason why no action is to be taken.

*Examples of matters not requiring action, may include – minimal silting of watercourse, slight vegetation overgrowth, small quantity of debris etc*

- ▶ Where it is considered that action needs to be taken by the relevant landowner, person and/or Agency responsible, the following steps will be taken:-

Enquiries will be made to identify the landowner involved. This may mean conducting a land search to determine the owner of the land and where the land is not registered, making enquiries with appropriate parties, such as the relevant, local parish council, or serving an official land ownership request under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

Contact will be made with the landowner. The authority will write to the landowner, explaining the problem and setting out the work required to remedy the problem. This will be done by reference to a map supplied with the letter. The deadline for completing the work will normally be 28 days from the date of the letter, although a different period may be specified if the problem requires earlier resolution or if the circumstances justify a longer time period.

Advice regarding what work is needed will be given at any time and take account of local issues that may legitimately cause delays.

If a positive response to the initial letter has not been received within four weeks (or time allowed to complete work), and on inspection no work has been satisfactorily undertaken as required

the matter should be discussed with Legal Services to obtain their agreement for enforcement action to be taken, if necessary.

A formal reminder will then be sent to the landowner giving him 14 days to respond positively before enforcement action is commenced.

### **Section 25 Notice**

If a positive response to the letter of reminder has not been received within 14 days, and on inspection the watercourse's condition has not been remedied and the proper flow of water remains impeded, the authority will proceed to issue a Section 25 Notice.

Before serving a Section 25 Notice notify (in writing) the Environment Agency or other Internal Drainage Board of the proposed action. (Section 26 "Competing Jurisdictions under Section 25".)

- ▶ The relevant papers will be passed to Legal Services and a Notice under Section 25 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 will be prepared.
- ▶ The Notice will include the nature of the works to be carried out and the period within which they are to be carried out, and the right of appeal to a magistrates' court within 21 days of service of the notice.
- ▶ A letter will accompany the Notice and inform the responsible person that in the event of his failure to satisfactorily undertake the work, the local authority may carry out the work themselves and recover from the person responsible the expenses reasonably incurred in doing so? It shall also be stated that without prejudice to their right to exercise that power, that person shall be guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding level 4 on the standard scale.
- ▶ Proper service of the Notice will be made.

### **Enforcement of Notice**

Following service of the Notice.

- ▶ The responsible person may appeal the Notice. If the notice is upheld or varied, compliance will be pursued as appropriate.
- ▶ The responsible person may carry out the work to the satisfaction of the authority, or may carry out alternative work which remedies the condition
- ▶ The responsible person will fail to carry out the work to the satisfaction of the authority and the authority may arrange for the work to be completed in default and the reasonable costs incurred recovered.
- ▶ The relevant authority prosecute the responsible person under Section 25(6)b
- ▶ The authority will normally pursue enforcement by way of prosecution rather than by way of works in default. However, the circumstances of the case will always be considered and in exceptional circumstances works in default may be carried out. An example would be where prosecution is not in the public interest as the person responsible is elderly or seriously ill.

*If it is considered appropriate to commence prosecution action in the Magistrates Court due regard must be given to the Rules of Evidence and the Crown Prosecution Service Guidelines.*

### **Completion of Proceedings**

If the responsible person complies with the Notice and completes the work to the satisfaction of the authority, the authority shall write to him confirming the closure of the case and the end of the action.

### **Illegal Structures**

Where structures, such as pipes or revetments, have been constructed or altered in a watercourse without the consent of the Environment Agency, then the landowner or person responsible may face enforcement action by the Environment Agency in accordance with Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.

### **Riparian Rights and Responsibility under Common Law**

Riparian landowners have certain rights and responsibilities in relation to a watercourse flowing through or adjacent to their property. These “rights” are based on common law. The “rights” of riparian owners include:

- Presumption of the ownership of the land up to the centre of the watercourse. (For artificial watercourses the presumption is that both banks belong to the land on which the original hedgerow is sited)?
- To receive the flow of water in its natural state without undue hindrance in quality or quantity.
- To discharge uncontaminated run-off from your land.
- The right to protect property from flooding and land from erosion.

The responsibilities of riparian owners include:

- To pass on the flow of water without obstruction, pollution or diversion affecting the rights of others
- Accepting the flood flows through the land maintaining the bed and banks of the watercourses including the removal of debris even if it originated elsewhere. There is no common law duty to improve a watercourse.
- Keeping the bed and banks clear of material that could cause obstructions either on the riparian owners land or by being washed downstream during high flows.
- Keeping clear structures owned by the riparian landowner such as culverts, trash screens, weirs and mill gates.

### **Changes in Legislation**

The Draft Flood and Water Management Bill was published on 21 April 2009) and has been circulated for consultation, with comments to be made by 24 July 2009. To avoid confusion, the existing legislation references have been used in this document and it is presumed that once the Bill becomes Statute, any corresponding references will be amended without the need to consult Members.

However, where new or amended powers or responsibilities are confirmed, it will be necessary for Members to formally approve such changes in this Protocol.

## REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL – FLOOD RISK SUPPORT SYNOPSIS

On review of the Draft Flood and Water Management Bill it is evident that the emerging legislation will fundamentally influence the roles, responsibilities and duties of the various stakeholders including local authorities.

Recognising the limitations of the current fragmented water management structure in England and Wales and in line with the recommendations of Sir Michael Pitt's review 'Learning the Lessons from the 2007 Floods' (June 08), the Bill endeavours to address some of the deficiencies in current legislation most notably new responsibilities associated with surface water management.

The Bill places accountability and leadership of local flood risk management on county and unitary local authorities. However, in acknowledging the expertise and capacity which exists within the districts there is likely to be an obligation on the district authorities to contribute to local flood risk management and through 'arrangement' clauses elements of planning or subsequent work could be delegated to a district level.

BWB Consulting has been supporting district authorities throughout Worcestershire and Gloucestershire to help deliver their current responsibilities for land drainage and ordinary watercourses. As further support to the local authorities, BWB is presenting their understanding of the likely impact of the Bill and the future role of the local authorities in managing flooding issues and contributing to Surface Water Management Plans. BWB will also provide further case studies of work undertaken elsewhere which in part delivers the objectives of the Bill and maximises the effectiveness of the limited funding available.

The presentation will last approximately 15 minutes and BWB Consulting representatives (Mr Iqbal Rassool & Mr Stuart Nelmes) would be happy to answer any questions at the end of the presentation.





By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted





# Overview and Scrutiny

No Direct Ward Relevance

## Committee

17 June 2009

### 12. WORK PROGRAMME

(Report of the Chief Executive)

| Date of Meeting     | Subject Matter   | Officer(s) Responsible for report  |
|---------------------|--|--|
| <b>ALL MEETINGS</b> | <b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>   | <b>(CHIEF EXECUTIVE)</b>   |
|                     | Minutes of previous meeting<br>Consideration of the Forward Plan<br>Consideration of Executive Committee key decisions<br>Call-ins (if any)<br>Pre-scrutiny (if any)<br>Consideration of Overview and Scrutiny Actions List<br>Referrals from Council or Executive Committee, etc. (if any)<br>Task & Finish Groups - feedback<br>Committee Work Programme | Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive |
|                     | <b>REGULAR ITEMS</b><br>Quarterly Performance Report<br>Quarterly Budget Monitoring Report<br>Review of Service Plans 2010 / 13  | Chief Executive<br>Chief Executive<br>Relevant Lead Heads of Service   |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

17 June 2009

|                                     |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                     | <p><b>REGULAR ITEMS</b></p> <p>Oral updates on the progress of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Group;</li> <li>2. the Dial-A-Ride Task and Finish Group;</li> <li>3. the National Angling Museum Task and Finish Group; and</li> <li>4. the Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group.</li> </ol> | <p>Relevant Lead<br/>Head of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead<br/>Head of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead<br/>Head of Service</p> <p>Relevant Lead<br/>Head of Service</p> |
| <b>OTHER ITEMS<br/>- DATE FIXED</b> |  |   |
| <b>17 June 2009</b>                 | Councillor Calls for Action (CCfAs) – discussion of external local authorities' procedures   | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service  |
| <b>17 June 2009</b>                 | Council Flat Communal Cleaning – Final Report  | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service   |
| <b>17 June 2009</b>                 | Update on Scrutiny Training - Discussion   | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service  |
| <b>17 June 2009</b>                 | Worcestershire Land Drainage Protocol - discussion   | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service   |
| <b>8 July 2009</b>                  | Budget Strategy and budget deficit - discussion  | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service   |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

17 June 2009

|                          |   |                                     |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>8 July 2009</b>       | District Centres Task and Finish Group – Update Report on Response to Recommendations                                   | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |
| <b>8 July 2009</b>       | Uses of the Countryside and Visitors Centre – Scoping Document  | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |
| <b>29 July 2009</b>      | Quarterly monitoring – Performance Outturn Report   | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service    |
| <b>19 August 2009</b>    | Interview with representatives of the Worcestershire PCT - public transport to the Alexandra Hospital (suggested date). | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |
| <b>19 August 2009</b>    | Role of the Mayor Task and Finish Group – Monitoring the Implementation of Recommendations                              | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |
| <b>19 August 2009</b>    | Quarterly Budget Report – first quarter 2009/10.  | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service    |
| <b>19 August 2009</b>    | Quarterly Performance Report – first quarter 2009/10.   | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service    |
| <b>2 September 2009</b>  | Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group – Update on Response to Recommendations – Planning Charges.                      | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |
| <b>2 September 2009</b>  | Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Development and Transport – Annual Report                                       |                                     |
| <b>23 September 2009</b> | National Angling Museum Task and Finish Group – Part One report   | Relevant Lead<br>Head(s) of Service |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

17 June 2009

|                          |   |                               |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>23 September 2009</b> | Portfolio Holder for Housing, Local Environment and Health – Annual Report                                  |                               |
| <b>14 October 2009</b>   | Housing Mutual Exchange Task and Finish Group – Monitoring the Implementation of the Group’s Recommendation | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>14 October 2009</b>   | Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management – Annual Report   |                               |
| <b>4 November 2009</b>   | Dial-A-Ride Task and Finish Group – Final Report  | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>4 November 2009</b>   | Quarterly Budget Report – second quarter 2009/10.   | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>4 November 2009</b>   | Quarterly Performance Report – second quarter 2009/10.  | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>25 November 2009</b>  | Neighbourhood Groups Task and Finish Group – Final Report   | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>3 February 2010</b>   | Update on fly tipping and the progress of the ‘Worth It’ campaign.  | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>3 February 2010</b>   | Quarterly Budget Report – third quarter 2009/10.  | Relevant Lead Head of Service |
| <b>3 February 2010</b>   | Quarterly Performance Report – third quarter 2009/10.   | Relevant Lead Head of Service |

# Overview and Scrutiny

Committee

17 June 2009

|                                     |   |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>24 February 2010</b>             | Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism – Annual Report  |                                  |
| <b>17 March 2010</b>                | Review of Ditches - update report   | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |
| <b>17 March 2010</b>                | Fees and Charges Task and Finish Group – update on implementation of the Charging Policy                          | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |
| <b>17 March 2010</b>                | Portfolio Holder for Community Safety – Annual Report   |                                  |
| <b>7 April 2010</b>                 | Council Flat Communal Cleaning Task and Finish Group – update on implementation of recommendations (if approved). | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |
| <b>7 April 2010</b>                 | Portfolio Holder for Community Leadership and Partnership – Annual Report   |                                  |
| <b>23 June 2010</b>                 | Performance Outturn Report  | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |
| <b>June 2011</b>                    | Third Sector Task and Finish Group – Stage Two Update on responses to the Group's recommendations                 | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |
| <b>OTHER ITEMS – DATE NOT FIXED</b> |   |                                  |
|                                     | Overview and Scrutiny Member Training on Pre-Scrutiny.  | Relevant Lead<br>Head of Service |

# Overview & Scrutiny

Committee

19th March 2008

---