

Nominations to an Outside Body – Rochester Bridge Trust

Final Decision-Maker	Democracy Committee
Lead Head of Service/Lead Director	Angela Woodhouse, Head of Policy, Communications and Governance
Lead Officer and Report Author	Caroline Matthews, Democratic Services Officer
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All

Executive Summary

The Committee are requested to consider the nominations for the position on the Rochester Bridge Trust which expires on 31st May 2019.

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That the Committee considers the nominations received and makes an appointment to the Rochester Bridge Trust as the Council's representative with effect from 1st June 2019.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Policy & Resources Committee	24 April 2019

Nominations to an Outside Body – Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council's current representative's term of office is due to expire on 31st May 2019 for the position of Assistant Warden on the Rochester Bridge Trust.
 - 1.2 Since 1999 the Trust's Charity Commission Scheme has provided for twelve wardens and assistants, three nominated by Medway Council, two by Kent County Council and one by Maidstone Borough Council and six assistants appointed by the Trust. However, the nominee does not need to be a member of the appointing body, i.e. the local authority.
 - 1.3 The Trust owns and maintains the two road bridges and the service bridge at Rochester and has contributed toward the cost of many other road crossings of the River Medway, including Maidstone Bridge. In addition, the Trust provides civil engineering education services and provides grants for engineering education, research, restoration of historic buildings and projects related to the river.
 - 1.4 If appointed, Maidstone Borough Council's nominee would serve a term of four years on the Trust.
-

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 2.1 To appoint one nominee to the Trust who need not be a member of the appointing body.
 - 2.2 The Committee could decide not to appoint but this would mean that the Council would not have any input to the work or funding carried out by the Trust and may present reputational damage to the Authority.
-

3. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The preferred option would be to appoint a nominee to the Rochester Bridge Trust. Appointing a representative ensures that the Council is properly represented and continues to have input to the vital services that the Trust provide.
-

4. RISK

- 4.1 There is a risk that should the Council not be represented on the Rochester Bridge Trust then they would not have an input into future funding opportunities for Maidstone and present reputational damage to the Authority.

5. CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

- 5.1 An email was circulated to all Members seeking nominations by 23rd April 2019. To date only one nomination has been received which is from Mr Derek Butler who is the Authority's current representative.
- 5.2 An update on the nominations received will be provided at the meeting on 24th April 2019.
-

6. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 6.1 The current representative's term of office expires on 31st May 2019 and in an effort to provide continuity to the Council's involvement in this outside body, the nomination is sought now rather than waiting until the June Committee.
- 6.2 The Trust would be notified of the appointment and the successful nominee would be required to report to Policy and Resources Committee on an annual basis to provide feedback on the work of the Trust during that year.
-

7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	We do not expect the recommendations would by themselves materially affect the achievements of the corporate priorities.	Democratic Services Officer
Risk Management	There is a risk that should the Council not be represented on the Rochester Bridge Trust then they would not have an input into future funding opportunities and its reputational damage. However this risk is well within the Council's risk appetite and does not need to be added to the Council's risk register.	Democratic Services Officer

Financial	There are no current financial implications.	Democratic Services Officer
Staffing	There are no staffing implications.	Democratic Services Officer
Legal	There are no legal implications	Democratic Services Officer
Privacy and Data Protection	There are none.	Democratic Services Officer
Equalities	There are none.	Democratic Services Officer
Crime and Disorder	There are none.	Democratic Services Officer
Procurement	There are none.	Democratic Services Officer

8. REPORT APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Nomination Form from Mr Derek Butler

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None