



Overview Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 17 September 2020

Dear Councillor

You are advised that the attached documents form part of the main agenda papers for this meeting.

Please ensure you bring them with you to the meeting.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Walsh', written in a cursive style.

S Walsh  
Service Manager (Communities)

**List of documents attached**

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| 5. The re-starting of the Maritime Strategy Review Sub-Group | (Pages 3 - 10)  |
| 6. Overview Scrutiny Committee Training                      | (Pages 11 - 14) |

This page is intentionally left blank

**Classification: Public**

**Key Decision: No**

### **Gravesham Borough Council**

**Report to:** Overview Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** 17 September 2020

**Reporting officer:** Chris Wakeford, Committee Services Officer (Scrutiny)

**Subject:** Restarting the Review of GBC's Maritime Strategy.

#### **Purpose and summary of report:**

Members of the Committee are invited to consider resuming the review of GBC's Maritime Strategy.

#### **Recommendations:**

1. That the Committee note the work that has been undertaken so far and agree to reinstate the work of the review sub-group.
2. That the Committee consider and agree a new target date for the completion of the review.

#### **Background**

- 1.1 As per Annex 2.5 of the council's Constitution, the Overview Scrutiny Committee is required to "...establish and maintain a continuing programme of Topic Reviews".
- 1.2 In July 2019 the Committee agreed to conduct a review of GBC's Maritime Strategy
- 1.3 In September 2019 The Terms of Reference were agreed by the Committee (as detailed in Appendix 2) and the composition of the review sub-group was confirmed as follows:  
Councillor Jordan Meade, Chair of the sub-group  
Councillor Conrad Broadley  
Councillor Alan Ridgers  
Councillor Christina Rolles  
Councillor Peter Scollard
- 1.4 The Committee agreed to aim to complete the review by March 2020, this was subsequently amended by the Committee at their meeting in January 2020 to a completion date of April 2020. The pandemic resulted in the cessation of the review from March 2020 onwards.

## 2. Progress to March 2020

### 2.1 20 December 2019 – Meeting with the Port of London Authority (PLA)

- The review group met with Nadine Collins-Smith - Head of Thames Vision Delivery, Port of London Authority.
- The session raised some interesting points including:
  - Development of GBC's relationship / interaction with the PLA
  - Air quality
  - The effect of Tilbury 2 on the river.
  - Nadine Collins-Smith offered an open dialogue with the group so questions can be submitted and she can be invited back in if needed.

### 2.2 7 February 2020 - Visit to the Rochester Riverside Development

- Cllr Broadley and Cllr Meade visited the Rochester Riverside Development Scheme and met with Peter Sofoluke, the principal Architect behind the scheme.
- The following areas were discussed / noted:
  - Member engagement, use of River assets and how members from across the Council were involved in the design of the scheme.
  - Sustainability and how the buildings were being designed not only to compliment the environment but with the environment in mind.
  - It was noted that as part of the initial design consultation, local councillors were given a Polaroid camera and told to go around Rochester taking snaps of architectural features of the town that they liked and felt would make the scheme more acceptable to local people. This worked well with the final design reflecting its surroundings well.
  - It was further noted that this scheme was looking to create "communities within communities" in that local shop units had been leased prior to the occupation of residential properties being occupied.
  - It was felt that while the scheme was strong in terms of design, sustainability and community engagement; opportunities for recreational access to the River Medway had not been realised.

### 2.3 14 February 2020 - Riverside Clubs Meeting

- Cllr Meade met with the following clubs: Gravesend Sailing Club, Gravesend Rowing Club, Gravesend Regatta Society, PLA Community Outreach Manager.
- The following areas were discussed / noted:
  - There was a general consensus that there needs to be "more joined up thinking" when it comes to the recreational use of the River.
  - It was sometimes confusing which sports/recreational users of the River should contact for compliance/event support.
  - There was a general consensus that club resources were limited and outdated.
  - Clubs/Groups hoped that with the Lower Thames Crossing there might be an opportunity for funding from mitigation to improve recreational access to the Thames, but they did not know who to contact with ideas or how to feed back to the consultation.

- All agreed that it was challenging to allow young people to participate in water-based activity due to health and safety and lack of adult volunteers.
- All agreed that we could make so much more of the River and the heritage of the Thames.
- Gravesham has a lack of; changing facilities, exercise facilities and the club-based night-time economy offering that other riparian towns have.

### 2.4 21 February 2020 - Meeting with Young People from the Youth Democracy Scheme to discuss the Maritime Strategy Review.

- Cllr. Meade met with a group of eight members of the Youth Council for a general and informal discussion on the use of the River from a young person's perspective.
- The following areas were discussed / noted:
  - The young people had a generally good awareness of the River and the Borough's riparian offering. There was a consensus that many young people in the town would not use places such as the Fort Gardens, The Prom or St Andrews' Gardens as they worried about safety and "the type of people" that congregated in these spaces. This was particularly prominent in the winter months where it was expressed that a lack of lighting around the river front makes it feel "unsafe" and not the type of place that a young person would want to go.
  - The group were unaware of assets in Northfleet such as Northfleet Harbour, the Northfleet Beach and the industrial heritage in Northfleet connected to the River.
  - The group was aware that recreational activities took place on the Thames, but they were generally unaware of how they could participate in the activity of the clubs. They felt that the clubs were not doing enough to make themselves attractive to young people.
  - The group felt that the Council should do more to promote these recreational opportunities within schools as an alternative to the traditional fun runs and sports like tennis.
  - Many in the group felt that "we were missing a trick" in not providing more recreational activities connected to the enjoyment of the River.
  - There was a consensus in the group that not enough was done locally to educate young people about the importance of the River Thames and there was equally little done to promote safety. It was suggested that the Council and Schools should develop a local curriculum around this.
  - The group did not have a clear understanding of "Thames Gateway", "The Estuary" and they additionally did not know about the "Port of London Authority".
  - On being presented with a map of the River the group found it challenging to demonstrate direction and to identify local places/landmarks.
  - The Group did not know about the Saxon Shoreway and on being told about it stated that the Council should do more to promote this as a key feature of our borough.
  - The group did not know that the PLA was based in Gravesend and further still they had no idea about the career opportunities available. It

was discussed that the Council should work with the PLA to better present these opportunities and further still it would be useful to identify future skills gaps in careers on the river, so that Gravesham students could adapt their studies to make the most of these opportunities.

- It was agreed that the historical and cultural importance of the River Thames at Gravesend is often forgotten or ignored.
- There was consensus that a Ferry to London would be seen as a uniquely 'cool' alternative to travelling on the train and that such a facility would be used by young people especially when going to concerts in Greenwich and other hard to reach by train locations.
- The young people suggested that the promenade area was outdated and lacked anything interesting.
- The young people further suggested that the club facilities along the promenade looked tired and that the area could do with an uplift.
- There was concern over the Lower Thames Crossing and it was unanimously agreed that Highways England had failed to engage with young people throughout the process thus far.

### **3. Next Steps**

3.1 Members of the Committee are invited to consider:

- Resuming the Review of GBC's Maritime Strategy.
- Setting a new target date for the completion of the review
- Which areas to explore next and the format of this exploration (bearing in mind Covid-19 restrictions)

### **4. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

4.1 Anyone wishing to inspect background papers should, in the first place, be directed to Committee Services who will make the necessary arrangements.

IMPLICATIONS	APPENDIX 1
<b>Legal</b>	None identified at this stage.
<b>Finance and Value for Money</b>	It is envisaged that the topic recommendations will be value for money for the Borough.
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	None identified at this stage
<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Screening for Equality Impacts</b>
	<b>Question</b>
	<p>a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community? If yes, please explain answer. No</p>
	<p>b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality? If yes, please explain answer. N/A</p>
	<i>In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above</i>
<b>Corporate Plan</b>	<p><b>Strategic Objective 1 - Safer Gravesham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deliver on our 'green agenda' by increasing the levels of recycling and reducing the amount of residual household waste Generate service efficiencies to maintain weekly, effective rubbish collections.</li> <li>- Deliver a quality built and green environment; keeping streets clean and maintaining a high standard of local horticulture</li> <li>- Use all available powers to pursue anyone damaging the health of the local environment (e.g. dog fouling, littering, fly-tipping etc).</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategic Objective 2 - Stronger Gravesham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote Gravesham's cultural and heritage offer, through initiatives such as helping to raise funds to bring back a museum in Gravesend</li> <li>- Deliver an improved leisure offer; activities and facilities that increase sporting participation rates and address local health inequalities.</li> </ul>
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	None identified at this stage
<b>Digital and website</b>	None identified at this stage

<b>implications</b>	
<b>Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults</b>	None identified at this stage





## Appendix 2

### Overview Scrutiny Committee – Topic Review Terms of Reference

#### – Review of Gravesham Borough Council’s Maritime Strategy

#### – September 2019

#### 1. Membership of the review sub-group

1.1 The political representation on the sub-group will be as follows:

- |       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| 1.1.1 | Councillor Jordan Meade, Chair of the sub-group | (C) |
| 1.1.2 | Councillor Conrad Broadley                      | (C) |
| 1.1.3 | Councillor Alan Ridgers                         | (C) |
| 1.1.4 | Councillor Christina Rolles                     | (L) |
| 1.1.5 | Councillor Peter Scollard                       | (L) |

1.2 Co-opted Representatives (at the discretion of the Chairman).

1.3 Whilst the Portfolio Holders and any other Member of the Executive cannot legally be a member of the sub-committee, they may be invited to the meetings when appropriate by the Chairman.

1.4 The Chairman may, from time to time, invite individuals, companies and organisations to contribute towards the work of the Committee.

1.5 The sub-group will be supported in their activities by the Committee Services Team.

1.6 Additional support will be provided, specific to the review, as required from officers across the council.

#### 2 Work plan of the sub-group

2.1 The sub-group will look at the following areas

- 2.1.1 To undertake a review of how the Council promotes Gravesham as a riparian borough.
- 2.1.2 To further explore how the borough can capitalise on the River Thames as a driver for economic development.
- 2.1.3 To evaluate the effectiveness and review the delivery of the Council’s existing Thames-based partnerships and scope out the potential for the creation of additional partnerships.
- 2.1.4 In the context of planning, explore how access to the River Thames can be improved for both recreational and commercial purposes.



- 2.1.5** To appraise existing infrastructure and how new developments can support riverside regeneration.
- 2.1.6** To find greater opportunities for young people and the wider community to utilise Gravesham's river assets.
- 2.1.7** To enable the Portfolio Holder and Senior Officers to brief and consult on any proposed policy and procedural changes that might affect the Council's Tourism and Planning Strategies in relation to The River Thames.

**2.2** As per the Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Annex 2.5 of the Constitution), the Committee will be informed of the response to any recommendations to cabinet, at the next available meeting following the Cabinet discussion.

### **3 Timeframe for activities**

- 3.1** An initial timeframe for completion of the topic review of six months has been agreed (March 2020) although Members have agreed that ensuring the review is thorough and robust is critical and therefore, should the review need to go past this deadline, this will be acceptable.
- 3.2** Six months after the topic review is considered, an agenda item will be listed for the next available Overview Scrutiny Committee to receive a report on actions completed, their outcomes and the status of actions in progress.

**Classification:** Public

**Key Decision:** No

### **Gravesham Borough Council**

**Report to:** Overview Scrutiny Committee  
**Date:** 17 September 2020  
**Reporting officer:** Chris Wakeford, Committee Services Officer (Scrutiny)  
**Subject:** Scrutiny Training for Members

#### **Purpose and summary of report:**

To provide Members of the Overview Scrutiny Committee with a summary of the Scrutiny training that is currently available.

#### **Recommendations:**

1. The Committee are requested to consider the training options available and agree a proposed way forward.

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The Chair of the Committee requested that a report be presented to the Committee that outlines the current training options for Members on the topic of Scrutiny. This report outlines those options in section two and three of the report.

#### **2. Local Government Association (LGA)**

- 2.1 The Local Government Association (LGA) website contains a number of free workbooks that cover a wide range of subjects including Scrutiny and Scrutiny Finance, the links are set out below:

<https://www.local.gov.uk/councillors-workbook-scrutiny>

<https://www.local.gov.uk/councillor-workbook-scrutiny-finance>

- 2.2 The LGA also offer e-learning modules for Councillors, including one on Scrutiny. You usually have to register to access but, in response to Covid-19, the LGA have removed the need to register and have given open access but this does mean that anyone doing the training needs to take a screenshot of the completion certificate to prove they did it. Here is the link to the modules (the Scrutiny module is eleventh in the list)

<https://lga.melearning.university/course/view/1?gc=WMA7LFIA1FZCUC1QCVSK>

- 2.3 The LGA have been contacted about the possibility of remote Scrutiny training and we are awaiting further detail about this option.

### **3. Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS)**

- 3.1 CfPS have published a 'Good Scrutiny Guide' for Councillors that can be viewed here: <https://www.cfps.org.uk/?publication=the-good-scrutiny-guide>  
The guide is written to complement the Government's Statutory Scrutiny Guidance which can be viewed here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overview-and-scrutiny-statutory-guidance-for-councils-and-combined-authorities>
- 3.2 CfPS are currently running free online webinar sessions, You can view two recorded webinars one on 'Online Scrutiny Meetings for Councillors' and one on 'Finance Scrutiny' below:  
<https://www.cfps.org.uk/watch-our-recorded-webinars/>  
<https://www.cfps.org.uk/watch-our-recorded-webinar-finance-scrutiny/>
- 3.3 CfPS have also published a free guide to Scrutiny during the Covid-19 crisis. It covers the key arguments in favour of continued, robust member-led scrutiny in this time of crisis, and sets out an approach to provide that scrutiny in a way that is proportionate and fits within the constrained resources that councils will have at their disposal.  
The guide can be viewed here:  
<https://www.cfps.org.uk/?publication=covid-19-guide-2-scrutiny>
- 3.4 CfPS do offer Scrutiny Training for Councillors through a single, short evening training session, through multiple workshops, or through coaching and mentoring. CfPS have been contacted about the possibility of providing GBC Councillors with training and we are awaiting the options.

### **4. South East Employers (SEE)**

- 4.1 SEE can provide all types of scrutiny training and usually develop a programme following a discussion of the key issues/areas of content with the Chair of Scrutiny or an appropriate officer.
- 4.2 The programme length is usually around 2 hours and a mixture of group discussion and facilitator input.
- 4.3 The fee is £750 plus VAT. A virtual session using Teams or Zoom is an option.

### **5. Background Papers**

- 5.1 Anyone wishing to inspect background papers should, in the first place, be directed to Committee & Electoral Services who will make the necessary arrangements.

<p><b>Legal</b></p>	<p>There are no legal implications resulting from this report. The Constitution sets out the roles and responsibilities of the Overview Scrutiny Committee and the activities set out within this report are in line with this.</p>
<p><b>Finance and Value for Money</b></p>	<p>A Member Training budget is in place which has a budget of £5,150 each year which remains constant over the life of the Medium-term Financial Plan. All training provided for Members which incurs a cost will be delivered within this budget.</p>
<p><b>Risk Assessment</b></p>	<p>There is a risk to the council should Members not attend the training that is being provided. The training being provided will assist Members in their roles as councillors and in some cases, specifically in relation to their roles on Committees. As such, there is a risk that if Members do not attend the training they may not be properly trained in an area and therefore this may affect their ability to make sound decisions.</p>
<p><b>Data Protection Impact Assessment</b></p>	<p><i>A data protection impact assessment (DPIA) should be carried out at the start of any major project involving the use of personal data or if you are making a significant change to an existing process.</i></p> <p>a. Does the project/change being recommended through this paper involve the processing of <a href="#">personal data</a> or <a href="#">special category data</a> or <a href="#">criminal offence data</a>? No</p> <p>A definition of each type of data can be found on the Information Commissioner’s Office website via the above links.</p> <p>b. If yes to question a, have you completed and attached a DPIA including Data Protection Officer advice? N/A</p> <p>c. If no to question b, please seek advice from your nominated DPIA assessor or the Information Governance Team at <a href="mailto:gdpr@medway.gov.uk">gdpr@medway.gov.uk</a>.</p>
<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment</b></p>	<p>a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community? If yes, please explain answer. No</p> <p>b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality? If yes, please explain answer. No</p> <p><i>In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above</i></p>
<p><b>Corporate Plan</b></p>	<p>The work of the Overview Scrutiny Committee is cross-cutting and therefore is likely to contribute towards all elements of the council’s Corporate Plan.</p>

<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	There are no Crime and Disorder implications with this report.
<b>Digital and website implications</b>	There are no digital and website implications with this report.
<b>Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults</b>	There are no specific safeguarding children and vulnerable adults implications with this report.