

AMENDED AGENDA

REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 24 November 2009

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: Town Hall, High Street,
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Sherreard (Chairman), Beerling,
FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie (Vice-
Chairman), Paine, Ross, Thick and
Vizzard

Page No.

1. **The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast.**
2. **Apologies.**
3. **Notification of Substitute Members.**
4. **Notification of Visiting Members.**

Continued Over/:

Issued on 11 November 2009

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact Esther Bell on 01622 602463.**

To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk/osc

**David Petford, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ**

5. Disclosures by Members and Officers:

- a) Disclosures of interest.
- b) Disclosures of lobbying.
- c) Disclosures of whipping.

6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.

7. Minutes of the Meeting held on 27 October 2009. 1 - 13

8. Disabled Facilities Grants Review -The Role of In Touch: 14 - 18

Interview with:

- The Project Manager of In Touch, David Eaton; and
- An In Touch Caseworker, Tracy Topley.

9. Park and Ride Usage: 19 - 35

Interview with:

- The Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy, Brian Morgan; and
- The Public Transport Officer, Clive Cheeseman.

10. Contaminated Land Strategy: 36 - 38

Interview with:

- The Assistant Director of Environmental Services, Steve Goulette;
- The Pollution Team Leader, Steve Wilcock; and
- The Senior Pollution Officer, John Newington.

Amended Report Attached

11. Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions. 39 - 48

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE REGENERATION AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 27 OCTOBER 2009

PRESENT: Councillor Sherreard (Chairman)
Councillors FitzGerald, Nelson-Gracie, Paine, Ross,
Thick, Moriarty and Vizzard

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence was received from Councillors

59. The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast

Resolved: That all items on the agenda be web-cast.

60. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Beerling.

61. Notification of Substitute Members

It was noted that Councillor Moriarty was substituting for Councillor Beerling.

62. Notification of Visiting Members

There were no visiting Members.

63. Disclosures by Members and Officers

Councillor Paine declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions by virtue of his friendship with an employee of Nu-Venture Coaches Limited.

64. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.

Resolved: That all items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

65. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 29 September 2009.

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2009 be agreed as a correct record and duly signed by the Chairman.

66. Disabled Facilities Grants - The Role of Occupational Therapy

The Chairman welcomed the Head of Services for the Maidstone and Malling Locality, Ms Sue Stower, and the Senior Practitioner, Mr Peter

Buckley, from Kent County Council's Adult Social Services to the meeting and asked them to provide an introduction to the role of Occupational Therapy with regard to Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs).

Kent Adult Social Services had been restructured from 1 October 2009 to encompass the Self Directed Support, part of the Government's Personalisation Agenda, which gave people more choice and control over their lives and the support they received. The Kent Contact and Assessment Service now received all Kent Adult Social Service's referrals, giving advice and guidance and undertaking as much fast track work as possible that did not require assessments. This included arranging delivery of minor equipment and adaptations to people who were clear about what their needs were. In addition a six week period of enablement could be arranged to help someone regain their skills and confidence in activities of daily living. This helped them to live as independently as possible in their home without the intervention of long term care packages or major equipment. The enablers were able to put in minor equipment if necessary.

The Assessment and Enablement Teams consisted of Care Managers, Occupational Therapists, the Hospital Teams and Kent Home Care Teams. Occupational Therapists within this team were known as 'Case Managers (OT)'. This team was responsible for assessing clients needs, including for equipment and adaptations. Once the needs had been established and an indicative budget set, the case was passed to the Coordination Team who helped the service user create their own support plans. OT cases did however remain in the Assessment and Enablement Team because it was not considered good practice to hand over a case to a new person halfway through the DFG process given its complexities.

Occupational Therapists (OTs) completed three year Occupational Therapy degrees (or equivalent) and were required to be state registered to practice. OTs carried out home visits and used both their medical knowledge and clinical reasoning to assess the customer's physical capabilities to carry out certain actions in the home, such as a person's ability to get in and out of a chair, on and off the lavatory and up and down stairs. In response to a question, Ms Stower advised that the client's needs would not be exceeded as the assessments were formalised and OTs were trained to supply only what was absolutely necessary. She noted that some adaptations could be counter productive if not required, such as a stair lift, as the stairs were good exercise. The OT made recommendations in consultation with the client, and elected for the most modest solution, such as the utilisation of a shower stool to aid showering or a stair lift rather than an extension. The OT also considers the prognosis of the client and major adaptations may be suggested if appropriate. An OT's recommendation for a major adaptation was discussed in supervision to ensure the recommendation was justifiable. Adaptations enabled by DFGs needed to be reasonable, practical, necessary and appropriate. Members noted that the OT Service provided: assessments for DFGs to help with the cost of major adaptations; assessments for equipment and minor adaptations funded by KCC; provision of short periods of rehabilitation; and information and advice

about sources of help for disabled people and their carers. Seventy per cent of the OTs work was made up of DFG assessments.

Mr Buckley outlined the process undertaken by OTs in assessing a client for a DFG:

- The OT team received a referral from the customer, a family member, a carer, a health professional or a specialist;
- The Senior Practitioner reviewed and prioritised each case. Cases where people were most at risk, such as having problems with mobility on stairs or transfers from toilets or beds were prioritised due to the risk of falls, which could lead to fractures. The remaining cases were ranked in date order;
- The OT assessed a case to determine the client's needs and whether a DFG was required. Trained assessors worked closely with OTs to assess clients needing minor adaptations. A number of these trained assessors were previously employed by Maidstone Housing Trust when they carried out their own adaptations;
- If the assessment showed that the most modest solution available was a requirement suitable for DFG funding, a request for a preliminary test of resources was made to Maidstone Borough Council's (MBC) Grant Officer to determine whether a grant would be payable and/or how much the resident needed to contribute;
- Once the client's contribution had been assessed, the OT worked with the client to identify a key worker to draw up the specifications for the adaptations. OTs continued to provide advice to the client, including considering the most appropriate plans to meet their needs, even if they did not qualify for a grant;
- The OT prepared the recommendations to ensure that the needs of the client were incorporated into the adaptation;
- The client was able to elect to use the local home improvement agency, In-Touch, to undertake project management of the adaptation process, including drawing the plan, at a percentage fee;
- The OT, once satisfied that the plans met the customer's needs, sent a letter of support for the adaptation to the Grants Officer and confirmed that it had met the client's needs;
- The case was then closed and responsibility transferred to the key worker or Home Improvement Agency to progress. The case could be re-opened if the suitability of the adaptation was questioned, or if the customer's needs developed and required further adaptations.

Ms Stower advised Members that there were currently four OTs working in Maidstone and two Rehabilitation Coordinators. The average time to install an adaptation varied depending on what was needed, for instance extensions took longer than readily available equipment. The oldest case requiring assessment dated from August 2009 and officers were exploring methods to address increased work volumes as they arose. Agency OTs were employed on an ad-hoc basis as required. A Member queried why there had been an increase in the number of DFGs paid and was informed that there had been a 71 percent increase in the number of referrals for DFG assessments since 2001, with 1500 referrals in the last year. Ms Stower felt that the increase may be attributable to increased life

expectancy, resulting in people living longer with serious disabilities, and because more seriously disabled children were living beyond 2 years with complex needs.

The majority of DFGs funded stair lifts and/or level floor showers. Ms Stower noted that it was MBC's role to say yes or no to their recommendations for a DFG. In response to a question, Members were advised that short life expectancy was a factor in determining the suitability of a client for an adaptation, as the assessment was based on both the diagnosis and prognosis. This was understandably a difficult decision, but consideration of the upheaval caused by an adaptation was considered in relation to the client's life expectancy, in addition to cost effectiveness. KCC had a capital budget which could fund emergency major equipment and they also used recycled equipment from their stores. They did not advise clients to apply for a DFG if their life expectancy was under a year, as the DFG process took time.

34% of KCC's equipment was recycled in 2008, however Ms Stower was unaware of any DFG funded adaptations that had become surplus to a client's requirements. The client's prognosis was considered as part of the OT assessment and therefore it was unlikely that equipment would become redundant unless the client had undergone an operation such as a hip replacement and improved or the customer had passed away. The feasibility of removing an adaptation, such as a through floor lift, would be considered and discussed with MBC's Grants Officer. Members noted that DFG funded adaptations were owned by the customer and they or their family were ultimately responsible for disposal of that adaptation. Members were advised that KCC equipment remained under the ownership of KCC and was therefore maintained by KCC, whereas adaptations enabled by DFGs were owned and maintained by the customer.

Ms Stower informed Members that it was important to note that DFGs were paid for from the public purse and the most attractive aids were therefore not necessarily installed. She noted that owner-occupiers may sometimes be willing to make an additional contribution to ensure the equipment of their choice was installed. Customers were also able to request that the money for the minimum requirement, such as a lift, be used towards a more elaborate adaptation, such as an extension. The approval for this was determined by MBC.

In response to a question Ms Stower noted that care was usually more expensive than aids and adaptations as a carer required a year-on-year wage, whereas aids and adaptations required one off funding. She also highlighted that the majority of customers wanted to be as independent as possible. However, the OT did not insist a customer exerted all their energy to be independent and assessed customers on a case by case basis.

A Councillor asked whether the witnesses felt that enough was being done to ensure that the aging population was being planned for in respect of disabled housing. Ms Stower informed Members that properties met

Lifetime Homes Standard, but felt that more could be done. She was unsure how rigorously developments were checked to ensure that they met the standard. She also advised Members that her wish list would include: wheel chair accessible homes in terms of turning spaces, particularly in bathrooms; ramping; gradient steps; room for ground floor bedroom conversations (by having dining rooms); and wide, straight staircases suitable for stair lifts.

Ms Stower advised Members that 39% of their referrals were from MHT tenants, 47% were owner/occupier and 14% were from privately rented or other housing associations tenants, however not all referrals were necessarily regarding DFG adaptations. In response to a question Ms Stower informed Members that there was increasing tension across the country regarding the fact that Registered Social Landlords (RSL) were receiving increasingly large shares of DFGs, and that this was ultimately improving the RSL's housing stock. Questions were therefore being asked as to whether the RSL had a level of responsibility to fund these adaptations themselves. Mr Buckley advised Members that they were working closely with MHT to seek opportunities to reserve vacant adapted properties for customers with needs. MHT recorded which properties were adapted and identified customers with the OT who would benefit from a vacated adapted property. A Member queried whether information was available on the percentage of the population likely to need adaptations and considered whether housing should therefore be built to accommodate at least that percentage. Ms Stower agreed to investigate the percentage for Members.

A Member queried why Registered Social Landlords such as MHT were required to use their own technicians for the installation of minor adaptations whereas KCC provided the service free of charge to other customers. Members were informed that KCC did not have the capacity to take on MHTs minor adaptations, but that MHT residents were not charged for the MHT service. She also noted that the Housing Association had a responsibility to act on the recommendations for minor adaptations put forward by OTs.

A Member queried whether the witnesses felt there were any weaknesses with the DFG assessments and was advised that the financial assessments carried out by MBC did not incorporate outgoings, such as mortgage payments, but noted that the assessment was prescribed by Government. In cases of hardship, KCC was able to offer a 0% interest loan over a five year period to residents which assisted residents in funding their contribution to the adaptations. Ms Stower noted that legislation had changed to ensure that means tests were not applied to households where a child required the adaptation.

Mr Buckley advised Members that OTs ensured that their recommendations for DFGs were necessary and appropriate, whereas MBC's grant officer ensured they were reasonable and practicable. A Member queried whether it would be more efficient for DFGs to be orchestrated by KCC rather than MBC; Ms Stower felt that this was possible, as Medway processed its own claims, but noted they would also

require resources to do this and that it could potentially mean OTs had more sway over DFG allocations.

The Chairman thanked Ms Stower and Mr Buckley for assisting the Committee in its review and for an informative presentation.

Resolved: That

- a) Ms Stower inform Members of the projected percentage of population likely to require adaptations; and
- b) The information received be noted as part of the Committee's ongoing review of Disabled Facilities Grants.

67. Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The Chairman informed the Committee that he had met with the Contaminated Land team to discuss the Committee's forthcoming review and the work of officers. Members were advised that officers were reviewing the Council's Contaminated Land Strategy, including the definition of contaminated land, to align it with other Local Authorities. A new Environmental Health Manager would be attending the Committee's meeting on 24 November to present the draft revised strategy. Members would then be able to establish whether they felt there was any outstanding work and whether a further contaminated land review was required by Members. The Chairman highlighted that the Committee had to receive the draft strategy at its meeting in November as the Cabinet Member's decision was scheduled to be taken before 29 January 2010.

The Committee considered the Park and Ride Update attached at [Appendix A](#). Members felt it was particularly important for the Committee to continue monitoring usage and requested that further information regarding usage, financial implications and town centre footfall figures be presented to the Committee at its meeting on 24 November. The Committee also requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Officer research other Local Authorities' Park and Ride usage figures. A Councillor queried the logic of why the number of customers finding it easy to identify which bus to catch from the town had increased from 201 to 266 for the London Road Park and Ride, when bus livery had been reduced. The Committee therefore requested a copy of Jacob's survey report.

The Chairman reminded Members that the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee was holding a scrutiny structure workshop on 3 November and reiterated the importance of all Members' involvement in helping to shape the future of scrutiny.

Resolved: That

- a) The Committee monitor Park and Ride usage and receive further information on the financial implications of the drop in usage, along with town centre footfall figures to compare to Park and Ride usage;

- b) The Overview and Scrutiny Officer research other Local Authorities' Park and Ride usage figures; and
- c) Members be provided with a copy of the Jacobs Park and Ride survey report.

68. Duration of the Meeting

6.30 p.m. to 8.00 p.m

PARK AND RIDE FINANCIAL POSITION

ON BUS TRANSACTIONS

Trend between October 2008 and September 2009

	2007	2008	Difference	
October	46776	45769	-1007	-2%
November	51347	46987	-4360	-8%
December	54453	54142	-311	-1%
	2008	2009	Difference	
January	43901	41504	-2397	-5%
February	41125	36718	-4407	-11%
March	40087	40276	+189	0%
April	43474	36350	-7124	-16%
May	40978	33875	-7103	-17%
June	40186	36080	-4106	-10%
July	43119	37237	-5882	-14%
August	40037	34017	-6020	-15%
September	43125	35706	-7419	-17%
Total	528608	478661	-49947	-9%

The figures for March and April are distorted due to Easter being in March in 2008 and April in 2009.

Sales of season tickets initially remained stable. However Kent County Council reduced the number they purchase for their staff from 215 to 199 in April 2009, and then 192 from October 2009 a reduction of 11%).

Reimbursement for acceptance of the national bus pass in 2009/10 is expected to be in the region of £200,000, which is just under £1.00 per return journey, slightly above the figure for 2008/09. This includes a standard flat rate payment per journey which is made to all operators towards additional operational costs.

The trend for the thirty week period from the last week of February to the third week of September has shown an average decrease in revenue of 12%.

The figures for each site during this period are shown on the next page;-

Comparison – 30 weeks from the end of February/early March to the third week of September.

	2008	2009	Difference	
<u>Willington Street</u>				
Peak	25072	18864	-6208	-25%
Off peak	77563	75939	-1624	- 2%
Total	102640	94807	-7833	- 8%
<u>London Road</u>				
Peak	23226	17927	- 5299	-23%
Off peak	82837	64547	-18290	-22%
Total	106063	82474	-23589	-22%
<u>Sittingbourne Road</u>				
Peak	38694	31683	-7011	-18%
Off peak	37902	41131	+3229	+ 9%
Total	76605	72815	-3790	- 5%
<u>Total – all three sites</u>				
Peak	86644	68479	-18518	-21%
Off peak	197177	181617	-16685	- 8%
Total	285308	250096	-35212	-12%

PARK AND RIDE INTERVIEW SURVEYS

LONDON ROAD - APRIL and JULY 2009

SUMMARY

Two surveys were undertaken by Jacobs on behalf of Maidstone Borough Council, between 0700 and 1500 hours on the 23 April and 7 July 2009. They were specifically organised at the London Road site to gauge and compare customer's opinions following the change from dedicated Park and Ride buses in the off peak to use of ordinary service buses. The questions were designed to provide information on the purpose and frequency of people's trips, and their opinion of the buses, service frequency and length of journey.

The number of people interviewed was 335 in April and 333 in July. Whilst 153 (46%) of those interviewed in April were regular customers this had dropped to 123 (37%) in the July.

The qualitative questions asked for responses graded from 1 (easy/positive) to 5 (hard/negative). Those who found it easy to identify the Park and Ride buses rose in categories 1 and 2 from 209 (62%) to 272 (82%) in the July. Similarly, the number of customers finding it easy to identify which bus to catch from town, increased from 201 (60%) to 266 (80%).

When asked how frequently they thought Park and Ride buses operate those indicating either every 10 or 12 minutes dropped slightly from 274 (82%) to 261 (79%). This was however offset by an increase in those who "just turn up".

The opinion of how comfortable the buses were dropped in categories 1 and 2 from a total of 245 (73%) to 235 (70%) with a noticeable shift from category 1 to category 2. However the number quoting category 5, (the poorest score), dropped from 45 (13%) to 16 (5%).

When asked if the journey to and from town was reasonable the number in categories 1 or 2 rose from 264 (79%) to 300 (90%). Here also the number recording category 5, (the poorest score), also dropped from 36 (11%) to 3 (1%).

Clive Cheeseman

Transport Policy Officer

21 October 2009

DETAIL

The questions asked were;-

1. Male or Female
2. Purpose of travel today
(1) Work (2) Shopping (3) Leisure (4) Health (5) Services (6) Other
3. How often do you use Park and Ride
(1) Regularly (2) Once or twice a week (3) Occasionally
4. Do you find it easy to identify the Park and Ride buses
On a scale from 1 (easy) to 5 (hard)
5. Can you identify which bus to catch back from the town to the Park and Ride site
On a scale from 1 (easy) to 5 (hard)
6. How frequently do you think the Park and Ride buses operate
(1) Every 10 minutes (2) every 12 minutes (3) every 15 minutes (4) less than every 15 minutes
(5) I don't need to know /they are frequent (6) I just turn up
7. Are the buses comfortable
On a scale from 1 (yes) to 5 (no)
8. Is the journey time to & from town reasonable
On a scale from 1 (yes) to 5 (no)

RESULTS

	April		July	
Number of surveys	335	(100%)	333	(100%)
Male	81	(24%)	95	(29%)
Female	254	(76%)	238	(71%)

2. Purpose of travel;-

Work	166	(50%)	136	(41%)
Shopping	101	(30%)	127	(38%)
Leisure	23	(7%)	20	(6%)
Health	5	(1%)	10	(3%)
Services	15	(4%)	20	(6%)
Other	25	(7%)	18	(5%)
No response	0	(0%)	2	(1%)

	April		July	
3. How often do you use Park and Ride?				
Regularly	153	(46%)	123	(37%)
Once or twice a week	105	(31%)	135	(41%)
Occasionally	75	(22%)	72	(22%)
No response	2	(0%)	3	(1%)

4. Do you find it easy to identify the Park and Ride buses?

(1) easy to (5) hard

1	137	(41%)	157	(47%)
2	72	(21%)	115	(35%)
3	39	(12%)	25	(8%)
4	37	(11%)	19	(6%)
5	47	(14%)	9	(3%)
No response	3	(1%)	8	(2%)

5. Can you identify which bus to catch from town?

(1) easy to (5) hard

1	128	(38%)	159	(48%)
2	73	(22%)	107	(32%)
3	40	(12%)	35	(11%)
4	42	(13%)	15	(5%)
5	46	(14%)	7	(3%)
No response	6	(2%)	1	(1%)

	April		July	
6. How frequently do you think Park and Ride buses operate?				
Every 10 minutes	154	(46%)	149	(45%)
Every 12 minutes	120	(36%)	112	(34%)
Every 15 minutes	39	(12%)	32	(10%)
Less than every 15 minutes	3	(1%)	4	(1%)
Don't need to know	5	(1%)	6	(2%)
I just turn up	14	(4%)	26	(8%)
No response	0	(0%)	4	(1%)

7. Are the buses comfortable?

(1) easy to (5) hard

1	190	(57%)	127	(38%)
2	55	(16%)	108	(32%)
3	28	(8%)	56	(17%)
4	17	(5%)	19	(6%)
5	45	(13%)	16	(5%)
No response	0	(0%)	7	(2%)

8. Is the journey to and from town reasonable?

(1) easy to (5) hard

1	196	(59%)	211	(63%)
2	68	(20%)	89	(27%)
3	31	(9%)	20	(6%)
4	4	(1%)	6	(2%)
5	36	(11%)	3	(1%)

Agenda Item 8

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 24 November 2009

Disabled Facilities Grants Review –The Role of In Touch

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 30 June 2009, Members agreed to carry out a review of disabled facilities grants. The relevant extract from the minutes of the meeting is as follows:

“The Committee agreed that clearance of contaminated land would be its major review of this year. It was noted that there were a number of sensitive issues with regard to this matter, and the Legal Team had been asked for advice on this. A smaller review would also be carried out with regard to disabled facilities grants.”
- 1.2 It was agreed, in consultation with the Chairman, to delay the Committee’s in-depth review of contaminated land to November 2009 as changes to the contaminated land strategy were being made and it was agreed prudent to await the outcome of this.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 25 August 2009, the Committee interviewed the Private Sector Housing Manager, Stuart White with regard to its review of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs). The Committee agreed that the review should focus on: the distribution of DFGs to Registered Social Landlords, home owners and private sector tenants; what happened to adaptations funded by DFGs after installation; the impact of Choice Based Lettings; and whether all aids and adaptations were appropriate and necessary.
- 1.4 The Committee interviewed the Group Director of Operations, Ms Jillie Smithies, and the Property Services Manager, Ms Eileen Parrott, from Maidstone Housing Trust (MHT) and Councillor Beerling, a Council nominee on Maidstone Housing Trust’s Board of Directors, at its meeting on 29 September 2009.
- 1.5 At its meeting on 27 October 2009, Members interviewed the Head of Services for the Maidstone and Malling Locality, Ms Sue Stower, and the Senior Practitioner, Mr Peter Buckley, from Kent County Council’s Adult Social Services with regard to the role of Occupational Therapists in DFGs.
- 1.6 In the scoping document for the review of DFGs, the Committee agreed that it would be useful to interview a representative from In Touch, Mid and West Kent Home Improvement Agency. The Project Manager, David Eaton, and a Caseworker, Tracy Topley, from In Touch will therefore be in attendance at the meeting to be interviewed by the Committee.
- 1.7 The scoping document for this review is attached at [Appendix A](#).

2. In Touch

- 2.1 In Touch Mid and West Kent Home Improvement Agency is a care, support and supported housing charity and is part of the Hyde Group, the UK's largest housing association. It was initially set up to carry out, improve and grow Hyde Group's work with people who needed care or support to live independently, and operates in the Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling, Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone Borough Council areas.
- 2.2 In Touch assists elderly residents (aged 60 or over) or those residents (regardless of their age) who are considering adaptations, with Disabled Facilities Grant. The service is available to private home owners, tenants and private landlords and is usually free.
- 2.3 The Home Improvement Agency can offer:
- Practical advice and support, including liaison with external agencies if necessary;
 - Technical expertise in preparing a detailed specification and drawings if appropriate;
 - Assistance in completing grant applications and investigating and securing alternative funding; and
 - Assistance in finding reliable contractors, supervising the work and authorising payments.

The agency can also offer help in carrying out minor repairs or major adaptations, and give advice concerning energy efficiency and home security.

- 2.4 Upon instruction, a caseworker and a surveyor will visit the customer's home to talk about possible repairs and adaptations and give advice on the work needed. They will also assess the customer's personal needs and risks, their home and their finances, and if necessary find an organisation to help with other problems. All advice is provided free of charge.
- 2.5 Once a customer decides to go ahead with works using In Touch, In Touch will: list any work that needs to be done and get estimates; help the customer find and apply for funding; recommend and contact builders, instruct them and arrange payment; and check the work while it is being done and after it is finished.
- 2.6 Access to the Home Improvement Agency services are entirely optional. Those considering works of repair, improvement or adaptation to their homes may also consider the appointment of an independent building surveyor or architect to assist them in preparing a suitable scheme and in supervising works.
- 2.7 The Home Improvement Agency also operates a Handyperson service and is able to carry out minor repairs and improvements such as fitting smoke detectors, easing doors and windows and minor plumbing repairs.

3. Disabled Facilities Grants

- 3.1 Disabled Facilities Grants are a mandatory entitlement administered by local housing authorities to help fund the provision of adaptations to enable disabled people to live as comfortably and independently as possible in their homes. A grant is paid when the council considers that changes are necessary to meet disabled persons' needs, and that the work is reasonable and practical.
- 3.2 A grant can be used for adaptations to give better freedom of movement into and around the home and/or to provide essential facilities within it. Acceptable types of work for disabled people include:
- Widening doors and installing ramps;
 - Providing or improving access to rooms and facilities - for example, by installing a stair lift or providing a downstairs bathroom;
 - Improving or providing a heating system;
 - Adapting heating or lighting controls to make them easier to use; and
 - Improving access to and movement around the home to enable disabled people to care for another person who lives in the property, such as a child.

An occupational therapist looks at the claimant's circumstances and will recommend the type of adaptation(s) needed.

- 3.3 The work must be considered "reasonable and practicable" bearing in mind the layout and condition of the property, and is assessed by an officer of Maidstone Borough Council. Maidstone Borough Council must also be satisfied that the works required are "necessary and appropriate" to meet the needs of the disabled occupant and to establish this will consult with the Social Services Department of Kent County Council through their Occupational Therapy Bureau.
- 3.4 The amount of grant paid is usually based on a financial assessment - a 'means test' - of the applicant's average weekly income in relation to their outgoings. However, there is no means testing for families with disabled children under 19. Depending on the outcome of this assessment the amount of financial assistance offered can vary from 0 to 100 per cent of the cost.
- 3.5 The maximum amount of grant that an English council is required to pay is £30,000 per application less any assessed contribution from the claimant. If the cost of the eligible works is more, the council can use discretionary powers to increase the amount.
- 3.6 The following Disabled Facilities Grant Allocations have been received by Maidstone Borough Council from Communities and Local Government since 2006:

2006/07	£210,000
2007/08	£237,000
2008/09	£270,000
2009/10	£405,000

3.7 Kent County Council also has separate funding to help vulnerable people to have 'a better quality of life by providing housing related support services'. This is provided through Kent County Council's Supporting People programme. The programme helps pay for the services that allow people to live independently in the community.

4. Recommendation

4.1 David Eaton, the Project Manager, and, Tracy Topley, a Caseworker from In Touch, will be in attendance at the Committee's meeting on the 24 November 2009 to discuss: their views on DFGs; In-Touch's role and involvement with DFGs; their customer base; whether all adaptations are necessary; and what could be done to improve the process.

4.2 Members are recommended to consider the statements of Mr Eaton and Ms Topley and ask questions with regard to the Disabled Facilities Grants Review as they feel appropriate. Areas of questioning could include, but are not limited to:

- Best Practice;
- The role of Home Improvement Agencies in the provision of Disabled Facility Grants;
- Waiting times to receive assistance for Disabled Facilities Grants;
- Who the service is for;
- The relationship between In Touch, Maidstone Borough Council and Landlords in providing Disabled Facilities Grants;
- Other assistance offered to residents by In Touch;
- What improvements could be made to the Disabled Facilities Grants process to assist residents; and
- How residents find out about the provision of Disabled Facilities Grants.

Disabled Facilities Grants
<p>What are the objectives and desired outcomes of the review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine whether the distribution of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) to home owners, private sector landlords and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) is appropriate; • Establish whether aids and adaptations to RSL properties are necessary, and make recommendations as required; • Determine what happens to the adaptations enabled by DFGs in RSL properties once those properties are vacated or the adaptations are no longer required by the disabled resident, and make recommendations as required; • Establish the impact of Choice Based Lettings on the use of adapted RSL properties; and • Investigate the plausibility of a RSL managing only disabled housing.
<p>Which witnesses are required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled housing tenants • Private Sector Housing Manager • Registered Social Landlords, including Maidstone Housing Trust • Kent County Council – Operational Manager of the Occupational Therapy Bureau • Mid and West Kent In Touch Home Improvement representative • Communities and Local Government
<p>Other ways to seek evidence? E.g. site visits, involving members of the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible site visit. • Photographic evidence. • Best Practice at other Local Authorities.
<p>What information/training is needed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on DFGs for RSL tenants at other Local Authorities; and • Communities and Local Government guidance.
<p>Suggested time for review and report completion date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – 4 months
<p>How does the review link to council priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place with efficient and effective public services.
<p>How does this item deliver CfPS effective scrutiny principles?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides 'critical friend' challenge to executive policy makers and decision makers • Drives improvement in public services.
<p>Any co-optees or expert witnesses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations, The National Body for Home Improvement Agencies Representative

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 24 November 2009

Park and Ride Usage

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 October 2009, Members considered an update on Park and Ride and agreed to receive a further update at its meeting in November. The relevant extract from the draft minutes of the meeting is as follows:

"The Committee considered the Park and Ride Update... Members felt it was particularly important for the Committee to continue monitoring usage and requested that further information regarding usage, financial implications and town centre footfall figures be presented to the Committee at its meeting on 24 November. The Committee also requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Officer research other Local Authorities' Park and Ride usage figures."

- 1.2 The Committee requested comparative data from other Local Authorities' Park and Ride Services. Ten authorities were contacted and six replied. The following appendices provide the requested comparative data:

- [Appendix A](#) – Canterbury
- [Appendix B](#) – Guildford
- [Appendix C](#) – Medway
- [Appendix D](#) – Norwich
- [Appendix E](#) – Salisbury (Wiltshire)
- [Appendix F](#) – Winchester
- [Appendix G](#) – Maidstone

- 1.3 Data for Maidstone Borough Council's car park and town centre footfall figures are attached at [Appendices H and I](#) to assist Members in considering the context of Maidstone's Park and Ride usage data.

- 1.4 The report of the Public Transport Officer is attached at [Appendix J](#) and provides the requested update on Maidstone's Park and Ride usage data and its financial implications.

- 1.5 The Assistant Director of Development and Community Strategy, Brian Morgan and the Public Transport Officer, Clive Cheeseman, will be in attendance at the Committee's meeting to provide clarification on the update.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Members are recommended to consider the comments of the witnesses, discuss the update and information provided and make recommendations as they see fit.
- 2.2 Members are reminded that "Quality Recommendations" are those that adhere to the following categories:
 - Recommendations that affect and make a difference to local people;
 - Recommendations that result in a change in policy that improves services;
 - Recommendations that identify savings and maintain/improve service quality; or
 - Recommendations that objectively identify a solution.

Canterbury (charged per car)

"Canterbury City Council's Park & Ride staffing levels are being reduced in January 2010 from 8 Full Time Employees to 6 full time posts to cover our three Park & Ride sites, our Multi-Storey car park and the new Canterbury Coach Park. Whilst this will not be sufficient to cover the whole of our operational timetable it will allow us the flexibility to cover the sites at peak times.

From January we will also stop the Sunday Park & Ride service which is currently operational from our New Dover Road site only.

Since October 2008 Kent Top Travel have supplied the Park & Ride fleet under contract and this is proving successful"

Canterbury Vehicles Parked

	Oct 06 to Sep 07	Oct 07 to Sep 08	Change from 06/07	Oct 08 to Sep 09	Change from 07/08	Oct- 09	Change from 08/09
Oct		58133		51153	-12.01%	50919	-0.46%
Nov		58344		51395	-11.91%		
Dec		61600		59268	-3.79%		
Jan	50550	47738	-5.56%	43104	-9.71%		
Feb	45342	46558	2.68%	37863	-18.68%		
Mar	53440	44825	-16.12%	44236	-1.31%		
Apr	45689	43736	-4.27%	39263	-10.23%		
May	50113	42434	-15.32%	38974	-8.15%		
Jun	47983	39606	-17.46%	38584	-2.58%		
Jul	46901	39951	-14.82%	39314	-1.59%		
Aug	44905	39007	-13.13%	36006	-7.69%		
Sep	49181	44741	-9.03%	44799	0.13%		
Total Oct to Sep		566673		523959	-7.54%		
Total Jan to Sep	434104	388596	-10.48%	362143	-6.81%		

As can be seen above, there has been a 7.54% reduction in the number of vehicles compared to the same period in 2007/08. The nine month period up to and including September 2009 shows a reduction of 6.81%, and a 10.48% for the same period in 2008. Therefore there continues to be a reduction in the number of vehicles parking in the display and pay car parks for Park and Ride use in Canterbury, but the reduction is at a lower rate than in the previous year.

Canterbury Passengers

	Oct 06 to Sep 07	Oct 07 to Sep 08	Change from 06/07	Oct 08 to Sep 09	Change from 07/08
Oct		97855		87428	-10.66%
Nov		97850		90648	-7.36%
Dec		117550		119688	1.82%
Jan	80842	78107	-3.38%	75748	-3.02%
Feb	76219	79242	3.97%	78312	-1.17%
Mar	87414	76355	-12.65%	72574	-4.95%
Apr	82141	75756	-7.77%	80628	6.43%
May	82887	74417	-10.22%	69535	-6.56%
Jun	79050	66464	-15.92%	68035	2.36%
Jul	85977	65041	-24.35%	72154	10.94%
Aug	89632	78912	-11.96%		
Sep	83958	76639	-8.72%		
Total Oct to Jul		828637		814750	-1.68%
Total Jan to Jul	574530	515382	-10.30%	516986	0.31%

As can be seen above, there has been a 1.68% reduction in the number of passengers from October to July compared to the previous year. The seven month period up to and including July 2009 shows a 0.31% increase in passengers compared to the previous year, but with a 10.3% reduction for the same period in 2008. Therefore the number of passengers has remained largely consistent since 2008, but there was an overall decrease since 2007.

Guildford (charged by passenger)

"We have two sites with guards...So far we have had nil crime at those sites."

For the Merrow site which opened in September 2008, the passenger figures are as follows:

January 09	12267
February 09	8772
March 09	14904
April 09	14149
May 09	12413
June 09	15813
July 09	18535"

Please note that the data for 2008/09 and 2009/10 was not available at the time of publishing the agenda.

Guildford Passengers

	Oct 2005 to 2006	Oct 2006 to 2007	Change from 05/06	Oct 2007 to 2008	Change from 06/07
Oct		92784		92058	-0.78%
Nov		97221		97137	-0.09%
Dec		139144		137864	-0.92%
Jan		80680		82172	1.85%
Feb		89202		92288	3.46%
Mar		111269		106591	-4.20%
Apr	87521	84867	-3.03%		
May	85078	79407	-6.67%		
Jun	105061	107007	1.85%		
Jul	88016	92497	5.09%		
Aug	86867	87742	1.01%		
Sep	106633	106724	0.09%		
Total Oct to Mar		610300		608110	-0.36%

Medway

Operated on a Saturday only. The service is free, both for parking and bus use.

Passengers

	Oct 2006 to 07	Oct 2007 to 08	Change from Oct 06 to 07	Oct 2008 to 09	Change from Oct 07 to 08	Oct 2009 to 10	Change from Oct 08 to 09
Oct	2949	3089	4.75%	2857	-7.51%	1836	-35.74%
Nov	2967	2637	-11.12%	1803	-31.63%		
Dec	3844	4075	6.01%	745	-81.72%		
Jan	2812	3046	8.32%	1537	-49.54%		
Feb	2316	2398	3.54%	1513	-36.91%		
Mar	3285	2425	-26.18%	2613	7.75%		
Apr	2410	1990	-17.43%	1857	-6.68%		
May	3168	2205	-30.40%	1344	-39.05%		
Jun	2432	2171	-10.73%	1793	-17.41%		
Jul	3009	2527	-16.02%	1885	-25.41%		
Aug	1909	1583	-17.08%	1586	0.19%		
Sep	2285	1844	-19.30%	1806	-2.06%		
Total	33386	29990	-10.17%	21339	-28.85%		

As can be seen above, there has been a 28.85% reduction in the number of passengers compared to the same period in 2007/08. However, there was a slight increase and a smaller reduction in August and September 2009.

Norwich (moved from charging per car to per person in 2009)

“There has been a decline in park and ride usage in the last two years

Factors affecting are:-

- Increased parking provision in the city centre with a new multi story car park opening.
- Different parking pricing policy in the city centre with retailers encouraging short term afternoon parking with very cheap prices. £1.50 after 3.30pm.
- The City Council owning about 1/3 of the car parks and needing to encourage usage to protect their revenue stream. NATS and strategy to tariff on medium / long stay car parks to support P&R. Some undermining of policy as not unitary authority status in Norwich. County responsible for on street and P&R only.
- A large number of development sites being used for cheap all day parking before development starts.
- The recession, it would appear patronage across all city centre car parks has declined this year at a similar level to our experience. 5-6 % and turnover per space down up to 20% on some private short stay sites.
- City centre employers relocating to out of town business parks.
- In June 2009 we changed to pay per person on 5 sites and the last one changed on 31/08/09. Loss of patronage from car sharers has been experienced though we have seen some increase in single occupancy usage.”

Norwich Passengers

	Oct 2006 to Sep 08	Oct 2007 to Sep 08	Change from Oct 06/08	Oct 2008 to Sep 09	Change from Oct 07/08
Total up to Sep		3226673		2916567	-9.61%
Total Jan to Sep	2431211	2268565	-6.69%	2023084	-10.82%

The nine month period up to and including September 2009 showed a reduction of 10.82% in the number of passengers, compared to the same period in 2008. There was a 9.61% reduction in the number of passengers in October 2008 to Sep 2009 compared to the previous year. Therefore the number of passengers has fallen in both years.

Norwich		Vehicles			
	Oct 2006 to Sep 07	Oct 2007 to Sep 08	Change from Oct 06/07	Oct 2008 to Sep 09	Change from Oct 07/08
Total up to Sep		871102		840914	-3.47%
Total Jan to Sep	632873	610412	-3.55%	589758	-3.38%

The nine month period up to and including September 2009 showed a reduction of 3.38% in the number of vehicles compared to the same period in 2008, and a 3.55% reduction in the previous year. There was a 3.47% reduction in the number of vehicles in the year from October 2008 compared to October 2007. Therefore there continues to be a consistent rate in the reduction in the number of vehicles parking for Park and Ride in Norwich.

Salisbury (charged by vehicles)

"As you will see, we had strong growth up to the start of the recession. From March 2008 to May 2009 the numbers were showing a decline. Since May, passenger figures seem to have stabilised (no further decline) but they have not recovered to the pre-recession levels. This is in spite of the rise in concessionary fare usage."

Salisbury Passengers

	Oct 2006 to 07	Oct 2007 to 08	Change from Oct 06 to 07	Oct 2008 to 09	Change from Oct 07 to 08
Oct	69946	79414	13.54%	75767	-4.59%
Nov	73454	78097	6.32%	73352	-6.08%
Dec	90366	93864	3.87%	87979	-6.27%
Jan	64589	68491	6.04%	65619	-4.19%
Feb	60699	68016	12.05%	54281	-20.19%
Mar	69139	65572	-5.16%	65777	0.31%
Apr	71469	71997	0.74%	66159	-8.11%
May	66273	67759	2.24%	64177	-5.29%
Jun	70378	66007	-6.21%	66018	0.02%
Jul	77787	75629	-2.77%	74693	-1.24%
Aug	83579	79424	-4.97%	79030	-0.50%
Sep	73448	69980	-4.72%	69370	-0.87%
Total	871127	884250	1.51%	842222	-4.75%

As can be seen above, there has been a 4.75% reduction in the number of passengers compared to the same period in 2007/08. There was a slight increase in passenger numbers in 2007/08 compared to the same period in 2006/07. There was a smaller reduction in passenger numbers from June 2009 compared to the preceding months.

Winchester (charged by car)

Winchester City Council operates two Park & Ride car parks - Barfield and St Catherine's in partnership with the County Council.

	Oct 2007 to Sep 08	Oct 2008 to Sep 09	Change from Oct 07/08	Oct 2009 to Sep 10	Change from Oct 08/09
Oct	15,667	15,356	-1.99%	16,576	7.94%
Nov	15,618	14,853	-4.90%		
Dec	14,787	14,967	1.22%		
Jan	14,615	13,512	-7.55%		
Feb	13,730	11,945	-13.00%		
Mar	12,341	14,596	18.27%		
Apr	14,201	14,020	-1.27%		
May	13,541	14,442	6.65%		
Jun	12,674	14,598	15.18%		
Jul	15,050	15,574	3.48%		
Aug	12,565	13,827	10.04%		
Sep	14,454	15,832	9.53%		
Total	153,576	158,166	2.99%		

As can be seen above, there has been a 2.99% reduction in the number of vehicles compared to the same period in 2007/08. There was a notable increase in usage between May and September 2009 compared to 2007.

Maidstone (charged per passenger)**Maidstone Passengers**

	Oct 2007 to Sep 08	Oct 2008 to Sep 09	Change from Oct 07/08
Oct	46776	45769	-2.15%
Nov	51347	46987	-8.49%
Dec	54453	54142	-0.57%
Jan	43901	41504	-5.46%
Feb	41125	36718	-10.72%
Mar	40087	40276	0.47%
Apr	43474	36350	-16.39%
May	40978	33875	-17.33%
Jun	40186	36080	-10.22%
Jul	43119	37237	-13.64%
Aug	40037	34017	-15.04%
Sep	43125	35706	-17.20%
Total	528608	478661	-9.45%

As can be seen above, there has been a 9.45% reduction in the number of passengers compared to the same period in 2007/08.

For further information on Maidstone's Park and Ride please see the report produced for the Committee by the Public Transport Officer.

Maidstone's Car Parks Number of Tickets Issued

Town Centre Car Parks Tickets Issued (inc Lockmeadow)			
	2008/09	2009/10	Change
April	83387	80857	-3%
May	84367	82286	-2%
Jun	78289	83106	6%
Jul	88114	90604	3%
Aug	84145	82790	-2%
Sep	80586	82918	3%
Oct	87114	91950	6%
Total	586002	594511	1%

Town Centre Car Parks Tickets Issued (exc Lockmeadow)			
	2008/09	2009/10	Change
April	67266	64374	-4%
May	67720	65696	-3%
Jun	63697	68346	7%
Jul	70680	73329	4%
Aug	66115	67029	1%
Sep	65285	68379	5%
Oct	69982	74236	6%
Total	470745	481389	2%

Footfall

The following information was provided from Town Centre Management and shows the footfall trends for the Mall and Fremlins Walk.

2008/09	Footfall % change from previous year
October	0.79
November	-4.05
December	1.27
January	-2.44
February	-11.69
March	-2.45
April	2.78
May	-3.86

	2008	2009
Week (first week in January)	% Difference to previous year's week	% Difference to previous year's week
1		13.45
2		-7.65
3		-6.3
4		-9.25
5		-10.25
6		-18.35
7		-12.2
8		-5.45
9		-10.75
10		-5.5
11		-4.35
12		4.95
13		-4.9
14		3
15		4.6
16		-1.55
17	9.2	5.05
18	14.3	1.25
19	-12.1	4.15
20		-1.45

21	15.3	-8.35
22	17.3	-9.8
23	13.8	4.8
24	2.6	1.65
25	3.15	4.4
26	4.9	-3.5
27	8.8	-3.5
28	4.55	0.6
29	2.25	-3.35
30	0.3	-5.75
31	6.8	-5.7
32	8.1	2.35
33	9.86	4.65
34	8.6	-6.4
35	2.25	8.7
36	3	-2.15
37	5.85	-2.25
38	3.65	0.13
39	0.15	-6.2
40	3.45	-1.2
41	4.7	1
42	4.3	
43	-9.3	
44	11.05	
45	-2.55	
46	-9.05	
47	-9.1	
48	-10.6	
49	3.2	
50	-5.85	
51	-14	
52	9.55	

The table below shows the percentage change in the number of pedestrians from 2006 and 2008 in surveys undertaken by Jacobs for Maidstone Borough Council in July.

Survey Point	Tuesday % change	Wednesday % change	Friday % change	Saturday % change	Sunday % change	Totals % change
2	-44.8%	6.3%	6.7%	51.4%	-4.6%	0.2%
3	15.3%	9.6%	19.6%	-15.5%	-15.2%	1.8%
4	-5.2%	9.4%	3.9%	-11.2%	-11.2%	-3.6%
5	6.2%	10.0%	22.9%	-0.8%	-16.9%	5.5%
6	5.8%	14.7%	22.9%	60.7%	15.4%	24.8%
7	-23.2%	22.7%	66.1%	30.6%	-17.0%	17.3%
8	8.4%	11.7%	13.2%	2.6%	-4.6%	6.3%
9 & 13	19.6%	29.6%	35.3%	9.2%	-11.5%	18.4%
12	3.0%	-9.4%	-42.1%	-31.1%	-20.6%	-24.3%
14	12.7%	28.9%	24.3%	5.4%	-18.4%	11.4%
15 & 17	-12.2%	14.6%	-14.2%	-5.6%	-5.1%	-5.9%
16	40.4%	85.0%	107.9%	24.3%	-6.1%	52.6%
20	-19.4%	-12.4%	1.8%	-26.7%	4.5%	-14.1%
21	7.5%	-0.5%	7.7%	-6.6%	29.6%	4.7%
22	6.8%	2.5%	-6.2%	13.2%	0.2%	4.2%
23	15.6%	13.8%	1.3%	-1.9%	10.6%	5.9%
24	22.0%	41.3%	16.5%	5.8%	3.5%	16.1%
25	12.5%	20.9%	14.1%	3.6%	0.5%	10.3%
26	-24.0%	4.9%	110.9%	-10.1%	-35.3%	5.7%
27	1.8%	14.3%	17.1%	145.0%	3.3%	32.4%
28	64.8%	25.6%	37.8%	-0.4%	0.8%	26.8%
29	-36.4%	-40.8%	-44.2%	-10.2%	123.0%	-23.7%
30	7.8%	19.7%	1.0%	0.6%	10.5%	6.2%
31	-36.9%	18.7%	-0.5%	14.1%	18.8%	-2.6%
32	-23.9%	25.6%	13.7%	104.1%	-18.7%	18.0%
33	-70.2%	-67.8%	-76.1%	-74.7%	-66.7%	-71.9%
34	30.2%	25.4%	5.9%	5.2%	-23.9%	6.9%
Totals	1.8%	14.8%	9.1%	3.7%	-3.0%	5.6%

PARK AND RIDE FINANCIAL POSITION

Report of: The Public Transport Officer

The following is an update to the information reported to the Overview and Scrutiny meeting on the 27 October. It includes patronage figures for October and an estimate of the budget situation taking into account the service changes introduced from the 2 November.

ON BUS TRANSACTIONS

Passenger Numbers (Includes Concessionary Travel)

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
April	43474	36350	-7124	-16
May	40978	33875	-7103	-17
June	40186	36080	-4106	-10
July	43119	37237	-5882	-14
August	40037	34017	-6020	-15
September	43125	35706	-7419	-17
October	45769	39964	-5805	-13
Total	296688	253229	-43459	-15

Revenue (Excludes Concessionary Travel)

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
	£	£	£	
April	46243	36172	-10071	-21
May	43198	34810	-8388	-19
June	42766	37353	-5413	-13
July	43943	36977	-6966	-16
August	39695	33477	-6218	-16
September	45072	35967	-9105	-20
October	44847	39056	-5791	-13
Total	305762	253812	-51950	-17

Reimbursement for acceptance of the national bus pass in 2009/10 is expected to be in the region of £200,000, which is just under £1.00 per return journey, slightly above the figure for 2008/09. This includes a standard flat rate payment per journey which is made to all operators towards additional operational costs.

Sales of season tickets initially remained stable. However Kent County Council reduced the number they purchase for their staff from 215 to 199 in April 2009, and then to 192 from October 2009 a reduction of 11%).

The trend for the thirty one week period from the 28 /29th March to the last week of October has shown an average decrease of passenger numbers of 14%.

Passenger Numbers by SiteWillington Street

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
Peak	25894	19465	-6429	-25
Off Peak	81773	78573	-3200	-4
Total	107667	98038	-9629	-9

London Road

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
Peak	24550	18092	-6458	-26
Off Peak	87098	64838	-22260	-26
Total	111648	82930	-28718	-26

Sittingbourne Road

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
Peak	40502	32603	-7899	-20
Off Peak	40365	43407	+3042	+8
Total	80867	76010	-4857	-6

Total

	2008/09	2009/10	Difference	+/- %
Peak	90946	70160	20786	-23
Off Peak	209236	186818	22418	-11
Total	300182	256978	-43204	-14

The table below shows the estimated year end out turn against budget

	Original Estimate 09/10	Estimated year end out turn	Variance
Total Employee Costs	69940	71420	-1480
Running Costs (Other)	38920	38920	0
Bus Contract	846459	821742	24717
Rent	152100	152100	0
Rates	49990	49950	40
Total Running Costs	1087469	1062712	24757
Season tickets	-134670	-113200	-21470
Willington St.	-190179	-139987	-50192
London Rd.	-195058	-135953	-59105
Sittingbourne Rd.	-258032	-176640	-81392
Concessionary	-199050	-192177	-6873
Other/Section106	-41060	-41060	0
Total Income	-1018049	-799017	-219032
Total Recharge. Costs	116060	116060	0
Total Cost	255420	451175	-195755

Agenda Item 10

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 24 November 2009

Contaminated Land Strategy

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 30 June 2009, Members agreed to carry out a review of contaminated land. The relevant extract from the minutes of the meeting is as follows:

"The Committee agreed that clearance of contaminated land would be its major review of this year. It was noted that there were a number of sensitive issues with regard to this matter, and the Legal Team had been asked for advice on this."

- 1.2 It was agreed, in consultation with the Chairman, to delay the Committee's in-depth review of contaminated land to November 2009 as changes to the contaminated land software were being made and it was expected that this would have a big impact on the service.
- 1.3 Furthermore, the Environmental Health Manager informed Members that the Contaminated Land Strategy was being revised and it was agreed that it would be considered by the Committee in due course.
- 1.4 At its meeting on 27 October 2009, the Committee agreed to consider the contaminated land strategy at its meeting in November. It was also agreed that this would assist Members in determining whether they felt there was any outstanding work and whether its review was still appropriate. The relevant extract from the draft minutes of the meeting is as follows:

"The Chairman informed the Committee that he had met with the Contaminated Land team to discuss the Committee's forthcoming review and the work of officers. Members were advised that officers were reviewing the Council's Contaminated Land Strategy, including the definition of contaminated land, to align it with other Local Authorities. A new Environmental Health Manager would be attending the Committee's meeting on 24 November to present the draft revised strategy. Members would then be able to establish whether they felt there was any outstanding work and whether a further contaminated land review was required by Members. The Chairman highlighted that the Committee had to receive the draft strategy at its meeting in November as the Cabinet Member's decision was scheduled to be taken before 29 January 2010."

- 1.5 The revised Contaminated Land Strategy has been delayed and the draft revised Contaminated Land Strategy will be presented to the Committee at its meeting on 26 January 2010.

2. Land Contamination

- 2.1 The United Kingdom has the world's longest history of industrial activity dating back to the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century, and as such has left a legacy of land contamination to address.
- 2.2 Maidstone, as a historic town, has its share of former industrial land, including land that was used for quarrying operations, often subsequently used for landfill.
- 2.3 Maidstone Borough Council has a statutory duty to identify land which is contaminated within the Borough and to secure, where appropriate, remediation of that land¹.
- 2.4 Remediation of land in Maidstone is being carried out largely by use of the planning process, whereby developers are responsible for determining whether land is suitable for a particular development or can be made so by remedial action, though a proactive approach to sites of potential contamination is carried out whenever possible.
- 2.5 The Environmental Enforcement Team has prioritised a list of over 600 sites of possible contamination and has started to remedy them as appropriate.
- 2.6 The Council's Land Contamination Strategy was adopted in July 2001 and was partly revised in May 2006. The latest draft can be found at [http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/pdf/Draft%20Strategy\(31.05.06\)%20final.pdf](http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/pdf/Draft%20Strategy(31.05.06)%20final.pdf). Copies can also be obtained by contacting Esther Bell, Overview and Scrutiny Officer, on 01622 602463 or at osc@maidstone.gov.uk.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Assistant Director of Environmental Services, Steve Goulette, the Pollution Team Leader, Steve Wilcock and the Senior Pollution Officer, John Newington will be in attendance at the Committee's meeting on the 24 November 2009 to discuss the revisions being made to the Contaminated Land Strategy.
- 3.2 Members are recommended to consider the comments of the witnesses and make recommendations as they see fit.
- 3.3 Furthermore, Members are recommended to consider the scope and contents of the strategy to determine whether a further review of contaminated land is required by the Committee.

¹ Removal of environmental pollutants or contaminants for the general protection of the environment, this is accomplished by various chemical, biological, and bulk movement methods, in conjunction with environmental monitoring

2.1 Members are reminded that “Quality Recommendations” are those that adhere to the following categories:

- Recommendations that affect and make a difference to local people;
- Recommendations that result in a change in policy that improves services;
- Recommendations that identify savings and maintain/improve service quality; or
- Recommendations that objectively identify a solution.

Maidstone Borough Council

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 24 November 2009

Future Work Programme and Forward Plan of Key Decisions

Report of: Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Future Work Programme

- 1.1 The Future Work Programme for the Committee is attached at [Appendix A](#); Members are requested to consider this to ensure that it is appropriate and covers all issues Members currently wish to consider within the Committee's remit.

2. Forward Plan

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 3 February 2009, Members considered the Forward Plan of Key Decisions and agreed that "this should be a standing item on the agenda to ensure important issues were dealt with in a proactive, rather than reactive, manner." The Forward Plan will therefore now be included on each Committee agenda under the "Future Work Programme" item.
- 2.2 The Forward Plan for November 2009 – February 2010 contains the following decisions relevant to the Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
- Consideration of Growth Point Revenue Expenditure;
 - Affordable Housing Capital Expenditure;
 - Adoption of Revised Model Standards for Caravan Site Licenses;
 - Review of Contaminated Land Strategy; and
 - South East Maidstone Strategic Link Road.

Reports with further details on these are attached at [Appendix B](#).

- 2.3 Members are recommended to consider the sections of the Forward Plan relevant to the Committee and discuss whether these are items requiring further investigation or monitoring by the Committee.

Regeneration and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Work Programme 2009-10

Date	Items To Be Considered
27 May 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elect Chairman and Vice- Chairman
30 Jun 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member for Regeneration Vision • Cabinet Member for Environment Vision • Work Programme
16 Jul 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCFA – S106 Agreement: Oakwood Hospital
28 Jul 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Regeneration Statement
25 Aug 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled Facilities Grants
29 Sep 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled Facilities Grants
27 Oct 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled Facilities Grants
24 Nov 09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled Facilities Grants • Park and Ride (rec. 27 Oct) • Contaminated Land (rec. 25 Aug and 27 Oct)
26 Jan 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Road Safety Update (rec. 30 June) • Contaminated Land ? • Draft Disabled Facilities Grants Report
23 Feb 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminated Land? • Economic Development Update (rec. 30 June)
23 Mar 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminated Land?
27 Apr 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Members Progress

Watching Briefs

- Gypsy and Traveller Sites
- Housing Survey

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**FORWARD PLAN OF
KEY DECISIONS**

1 November 2009 –
28 February 2010

Councillor Christopher Garland
Leader of the Council



FORWARD PLAN November 2009 – February 2010

INTRODUCTION

This is the Forward Plan which the Leader of the Council is required to prepare. Its purpose is to give advance notice of all the "key decisions" which the Executive is likely to take over the next 4 month period. The Plan will be updated monthly.

Each "key decision" is the subject of a separate entry in the Plan. The entries are arranged in date order – i.e. the "key decisions" likely to be taken during the first month of the 4 month period covered by the Plan appear first.

Each entry identifies, for that "key decision" –

- the subject matter of the decision
- a brief explanation of why it will be a "key decision"
- the date on which the decision is due to be taken
- who will be consulted before the decision is taken and the method of the consultation
- how and to whom representations (about the decision) can be made
- what reports/papers are, or will be, available for public inspection
- the wards to be affected by this decision

DEFINITION OF A KEY DECISION

A key decision is an executive decision which is likely to:

- Result in the Maidstone Borough Council incurring expenditure or making savings which is equal to the value of £250,000 or more; or
- Have significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in Maidstone.

WHO MAKES DECISIONS?

The Cabinet collectively makes some of the decisions at a public meeting and individual portfolio holders make decisions following consultation with every member of the Council. In addition, Officers can make key decisions and an entry for each of these will be included in the Forward Plan.

WHO ARE THE CABINET?



Councillor Christopher Garland
Leader of the Council
chrisgarland@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 602683

**FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010**



Councillor Marion Ring
Cabinet Member for Community Services
marionring@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 686492



Councillor Richard Ash
Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
richardash@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 730151



Councillor Mark Wooding
Cabinet Member for Environment
markwooding@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 07932 830888



Councillor Brian Moss
Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture
brianmoss@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01622 761998



Councillor Malcolm Greer
Cabinet Member for Regeneration
malcolmgreer@maidstone.gov.uk
Tel: 01634 862876

HOW CAN I CONTRIBUTE TO THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

The Council encourages and welcomes anyone wishing to express his or her views about decisions the Cabinet plans to make. This can be done by writing directly to the appropriate Officer or Cabinet Member (the details of which are shown for each decision to be made).

Alternatively, the Cabinet are contactable via our [website](#) where you can submit a question to the Leader of the Council or any Cabinet Member on-line. There is also the opportunity to invite the Leader of the Council to speak at a function you may be organising.

Cabinet Roadshows are held 3 times a year in different wards. This is an opportunity for you to meet the Cabinet Members direct and discuss any issues that may concern you.

FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010

Title:	Consideration of Growth Point Revenue Expenditure
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will result in the local authority incurring expenditure over the value of £250,000. • Have significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more Wards in Maidstone.
Purpose:	To seek approval for growth point revenue expenditure
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
New Proposed Date of Decision:	11 November 2009
Original Proposed Date of Decision:	14 October 2009
Reason for Delay:	The capital programme and associated funding streams are under review as a consequence of changes to Growth Point capital grant and asset disposals. The capital programme will impact upon revenue expenditure and consequently both need to be considered together.
Consultation and Method:	
Representations should be made to:	John Foster, Economic Development Manager johnfoster@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	30 October 2009
Relevant documents:	None.
Wards affected:	All
Other Information:	None
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Prosperity and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	John Foster

FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010

Title:	Affordable Housing Capital Expenditure
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	Recommended expenditure is in excess of £250,000
Purpose:	To update the Housing Capital Programme and recommend capital expenditure of £400k towards the delivery of affordable housing at the Former Shepway Junior School, Oxford Road, Maidstone.
Decision Maker:	Cabinet
Proposed Date of Decision:	11 November 2009
Consultation and Method:	Meeting and discussion with Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Chief Accountant, Director for Prosperity and Regeneration
Representations should be made to:	John Littlemore, Housing Manager johnlittlemore@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	6th November 2009
Relevant documents:	None.
Wards affected:	Shepway North Ward;
Other Information:	
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Prosperity and Regeneration
Head of Service:	John Littlemore
Report Author:	Andrew Connors

FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010

Title:	Adoption of Revised Model Standards for Caravan Site Licences (Residential Sites)
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Environment
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	The changes to the model standards used to determine all site licence conditions for caravan sites has the potential to affect any new and existing sites within the borough which may affect all Wards.
Purpose:	To implement the revised standards recommended to Local authorities by Communities and Local Government.
Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Environment
New Proposed Date of Decision:	Before 31 December 2009
Original proposed Date of Decision:	30 October 2009
Reason for Delay:	To update and include information from the latest consultation from CLG which indicates significant proposed changes to the licensing regime and to allow sufficient time for consultation
Consultation and Method:	Through contact with Parish Councils and Web.
Representations should be made to:	Ron Wallis
Representations should be made by:	End of November 2009
Relevant documents:	New Model Standards issued by CLG
Wards affected:	All Wards;
Other Information:	Changes to legislation under the Regulatory Reform Order also require changes to be made.
Director:	David Edwards, Director of Change and Environmental Services
Head of Service:	Steve Goulette
Report Author:	Ron Wallis

FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010

Title:	Review of Contaminated Land Strategy
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Environment
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	It relates to areas and sites across the Borough
Purpose:	To update and amend the current Contaminated Land Strategy
Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Environment
New Proposed Date of Decision:	Before 29 January 2010
Original proposed Date of Decision:	30 October 2009
Reason for Delay:	The consultant appointed to update the raw data will not be available until October 2009. This is later than anticipated and delays preparation of the core data for the strategy and associated report.
Consultation and Method:	Direct consultation with identified statutory consultees.
Representations should be made to:	John Newington, Steve Wilcock johnnewington@maidstone.gov.uk, stevewilcock@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	31 December 2009
Relevant documents:	Contaminated land Strategy 2001 Environment Act 1995 Environmental Protection Act 1990 Part IIA
Wards affected:	All Wards;
Other Information:	
Director:	David Edwards, Director of Change and Environmental Services
Head of Service:	Steve Goulette
Report Author:	John Newington

FORWARD PLAN
November 2009 – February 2010

Title:	South East Maidstone Strategic Link Road (SEMSL)
Portfolio:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
This will be a "Key Decision" because:	It will have significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in Maidstone.
Purpose:	To seek approval for expenditure to begin the design, alignment and cost estimation work for the SEMSL in the context
Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration
New Proposed Date of Decision:	Before 30 November 2009
Original proposed Date of Decision:	31 December 2008
Reason for Delay:	Delays in transport modelling work and production in a brief for the planned works
Consultation and Method:	Will feed into the Core Strategy consultation process. LDDAG advice.
Representations should be made to:	Michael Thornton, Spatial Planning and Design Manager michaelthornton@maidstone.gov.uk
Representations should be made by:	End of October 2009
Relevant documents:	Cabinet report 10 th September 2008 and June 2009
Wards affected:	All Wards;
Other Information:	
Director:	Alison Broom, Director of Prosperity and Regeneration
Head of Service:	Brian Morgan
Report Author:	Peter Rosevear and Michael Thornton