

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield,

on Wednesday, 17th October, 2018 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillor Lee Anderson in the Chair;

Councillors Amanda Brown, Jackie James, John Knight, Rachel Madden (as substitute for Christine Quinn-Wilcox), Lachlan Morrison and Sam Wilson (as substitute for Glenys Maxwell).

Apologies for Absence: Councillors Glenys Maxwell and Christine Quinn-Wilcox.

Officers Present: Lynn Cain, Carol Cooper-Smith, Ruth Dennis, Theresa Hodgkinson and Mike Joy.

In Attendance: Councillors Don Davis, Cathy Mason, Helen-Ann Smith and Mike Smith.

OS.09 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Personal Interests and Non Disclosable Pecuniary/Other Interests

No declarations of interest were made.

OS.10 Call-In of the Decision Taken by Cabinet: Play Strategy for the Rural Area/Green Space Projects

The Chairman informed the Committee that the decision taken by Cabinet on 1st October, 2018, relating to the Play Strategy for the Rural Area/Green Space Projects, was called-in and accepted in accordance with the provisions of Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny Rule No. 13.

The proposer of the call-in, Councillor Cheryl Butler was asked to address the Committee and outline the reasons for initiating the call-in process.

Councillor Butler proceeded to outline her reasons for the call-in of the decision as follows:-

Inadequate and Inaccurate Information

Friezeland Recreation Ground – Gym Equipment

The report does not give evidence that the 106 available in The Rurals can be used in Jacksdale or whether it has to be allocated to a different area as part of the agreement with the developer who made the contribution.

A revised MTFS has not been provided showing how this will impact on the MTFS, especially in light of other recent costly initiatives and decisions including the Skips and the new Local Plan.

Friezeland Recreation Ground – Scooter Park

The report does not give evidence that the S106 available in the Rurals can be used in Jacksdale or whether it has to be allocated to a different area as part of the agreement with the developer who made the contribution.

There is no evidence of Demand and Usage surveys for the entire District that shows that this park has the greatest need or that it should be a priority, nor is there any given evidence of need.

A revised MTFS has not been provided showing how this will impact on the MTFS, especially in light of other recent costly initiatives and decisions including the Skips and the new Local Plan.

Multi Use Games area Main Road Recreation Ground, Jacksdale

There is no evidence of Demand and Usage surveys for the entire District that shows that this park has the greatest need or that it should be a priority, nor is there any given evidence of need.

A revised MTFS has not been provided showing how this will impact on the MTFS, especially in light of other recent costly initiatives and decisions including the Skips and the new Local Plan.

Pye Hill Recreation Ground

Have costings for the removal and reinstatement of ground been considered and what impact does this have on the MTFS.

Jacksdale Car Park Expansion

No evidence has been provided that shows an increased demand, nor is there any provided evidence of the usage of this car park, to show this has the greatest need for expansion in them District.

A revised MTFS has not been provided showing how this will impact on the MTFS, especially in light of other recent costly initiatives and decisions including the Skips and the new Local Plan.

Wharf Road, Stanton Hill

No evidence of a condition Survey has been provided to show there is an urgent need for the repair work.

Evidence has not been provided for the entire District that shows that this is in the top 2 of priorities for repair work.

Brand Lane

Is there a demand survey for the Entire District showing that this road is urgent and the greatest need for parking provision? If so it has not been provided, where is the justification?

No evidence of a business case showing how we recoup the costs of providing parking for private houses.

No evidence to show that tenanted properties in our district do not have a greater need of off-road parking where the road is narrow.

No evidence to say who owns the land where the parking is to be provided. At the Cabinet meeting held on 14th June 2018, Agenda Item 6 (General Fund, HRA and Capital Outturn 2017/18) Cabinet were asked to note: 'Transfer of £50k of the General Fund underspend to the Asset Repair and Renewal Reserve to help to meet costs arising from the stock condition survey and other urgent works as identified.'

Has Wharf Road and Brand Lane been identified as having the most urgent need in our entire District. How does the spending of this affect other urgent or potentially more urgent priorities on our reserves?

On conclusion of the presentation, Councillor Helen-Ann Smith, as Deputy Leader of the Council (Outward Focus) and Portfolio Holder responsible for parks and open spaces, took the opportunity to respond to the concerns raised by Councillor Cheryl Butler.

Committee Members were firstly reminded that the projects for the Rural areas, as outlined in the report, were originally submitted to Selston Parish Council in February 2017 by the Labour run Administration as part of a list of their proposals for key future investment. The current Administration were continuing with these agreed schemes and endeavouring to allocated funding to the initiatives over a priority based 4-year programme.

In relation to the Wharf Road scheme, the project had been earmarked for improvements for many years (as included in the former Locality Plan) but the previous Labour Administration had withdrawn the allocated funding for the project and redirected it to an alternative scheme of their choosing. The site had now become dangerous due to disrepair and for health and safety reasons the repairs were now a priority to ensure the area was made safe.

Following the response from the Deputy Leader of the Council (Outward Focus), Members discussed the call-in as follows:-

	Question/Comment:	Response from Officers/ Deputy Leader:
1.	Is the 4-year investment in the Play Strategy divided equally over the four area on a per capita basis?	No. All the earmarked projects contained in the Play Parks Strategy are continuing (subject to funding) with some projects being prioritised (i.e. bowling greens) due to need and health and safety requirements

2.	Has the car parking provision in the Rurals been prioritised over other town centres?	No. A Car Parking Strategy is currently being developed and should be finalised by the end of March 2019 which will inform future investment in car parking facilities.
3.	How were the schemes in the Play Strategy prioritised and was any influence brought to bear by the current Administration?	The findings from the Open Space Strategy informed/mapped out the play schemes included in the Play Strategy and schemes were mostly prioritised based on access to funding and match funding opportunities
4.	Why was the report submitted to Cabinet lacking in detail and the Open Space Strategy not referenced?	The Open Space Strategy and Play Strategy have already published on the Council website (being previously endorsed by the Council) and did not require inclusion within the report
5.	Who will be policing the double yellow lines on Brand Lane?	The Council manages highways enforcement as part of the Notts. Parking Partnership with the County Council
6.	What risk assessments have been undertaken in relation to the Wharf Road scheme?	To be advised after the meeting
7.	Are Officers ever unduly influenced by the current Administration when prioritising projects for investment?	No
8.	Investing in the Rurals is good. The Wharf Road project has been ignored for many years and is in urgent need of repair. A resident recently slipped and fell on the site. Repair works are urgently required	Urgent health and safety repair works are required to ensure the site is safe

9.	The Districts bowling greens have been neglected for many years and are in urgent need of improvement.	Agree. The poor state of the bowling greens is resulting in outside clubs refusing to use the facilities thus reducing potential income (and prestige) for the Council
10.	Why have the Rural projects been brought forward with all other projects being bumped back?	This is not the case. All projects within the Play Strategy are continuing (subject to adequate funding); the Rural projects have been prioritised due to the recent success in obtaining Local Improvement Scheme (LIS) and match funding with associated deadlines for spend and completion
11.	Concerns as to why the Rurals are being prioritised in the Play Strategy. Would it not make more sense to prioritise schemes on an individual basis based on merit not area?	All individual projects are evaluated on their merits but some are prioritised due to opportunities for funding coming forward with associated deadlines for spend and completion
12.	The Rurals have been neglected for many years by the former Administration. Selston Parish Council have put money aside to facilitate the match funding required for the earmarked play schemes. The Cabinet decision is to be welcomed.	Any ruling Group (Administration) has the right to inform the Council as to its direction and priorities in accordance with the Council's Corporate Plan
13.	What are the problems being experienced on Brand Lane?	The issues are associated with the width of Brand Lane and cars being able to pass properly
14.	Why are they replacing the fence at Wharf road with a brick wall?	Expert advice has been sought and a retaining brick wall has been recommended to counteract any future deterioration which would be expected from a wooden fence over time

On conclusion of the debate, a motion was proposed by Councillor Lachlan Morrison to request a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Council to enable Members to further consider the content of the Play Strategy and the emerging Car Parking Strategy as referred to in the original Cabinet report.

Having been informed that the option to make a recommendation to Council was restricted to a called-in decision being wholly or partly outside the Budget and Policy Framework only (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 13.4), it was further suggested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider the Strategies instead.

RESOLVED

- a) that in accordance with the provisions of Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 13.2, the content of the Play Strategy and the emerging Car Parking Strategy, as referred to in the original Cabinet report, be further considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with suitable recommendations being made to the Executive as deemed appropriate;
- b) the Committee report back to the Executive in a timely manner to ensure that the time limited additional funding is utilised appropriately.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm

Chairman.