

## **Cabinet 26/5/16 - Comments from O&S Panels**

### **Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel**

#### **Drug and Alcohol Services - Outcome of Review**

The Crime & Disorder Overview & Scrutiny Panel unanimously agreed to recommend to Cabinet the following:

- i. Notes the outcome of the Drug and Alcohol Services review undertaken by the Task and Finish Group and agrees the recommendations, see box 1.
- ii. Approves a tender exercise to secure drug and alcohol services for adults, effective from 1 April 2017.
- iii. Notes that Cabinet will receive a report back on the outcome of the tender in January 2017.

Councillor Carroll (Public Health), echoed by Councillor Coppinger (Lead Member for Adult Services), thanked everyone involved in the Task & Finish Group including officers who had worked to the tight timescales involved.

The Panel commented that they would like DAAT services as included in the paper to be provided and the tender process commence.

The Panel requested that the referral pathways be checked and that signposting (as part of the feasibility study) be included.

The Panel congratulated Councillor Carroll and the Head of Commissioning - Adult, Children and Health, RBWM (Hilary Hall) on the report.

### **Highways, Transport & Environment**

#### **Bus Services in the Royal Borough**

*Councillor Hunt:* I am pleased to note the relevant Ward Cllrs have been consulted regarding the busses

*Councillor Beer:* I am very concerned that a service known to conclude on 31/3/16 has only just been submitted to O&S on 19/5/16 for email comment to Cabinet on 26/5/16.

Why was this not anticipated in the Budget in February?  
Will the service have been suspended from 1/4/16 to 12/6/16?

As not all of us are familiar with the detailed geography of Maidenhead and its environs it would have been helpful to O&S as well as Cabinet to have seen relevant Route Maps to make informed decisions.

While I hasten to say that I fully support the provision of local bus services for a wide range of positive reasons and necessary financial subsidy wherever essential in RBWM, I am particularly interested in promoting public transport links between our two principal towns as that seems to be substantially under provided.

The sub notes under items 2.1 and 17.1 referring to alternative rail services between Maidenhead, Windsor and Slough are particularly misleading as (i) these do not provide an alternative local service to many communities and (ii) there is no practical rail connection between our two main towns, and (iii) I doubt if rail access via Furze Platt station is an attractive option to most Maidenheadians.

I support the recommendation.

### Flood Risk Management: Monitoring Report

*Councillor Hunt:* I am pleased to note works to the drainage/flooding issues in the report have been assessed and put forward for Cabinet.

*Councillor Beer:* Those of us who represent communities which are not protected by the Jubilee River will be extremely concerned at the tone of this Report which in a number of instances tends to downsize the scale of the horrible risks which face the rural riverside communities.

While thankfully a substantial flood reduction programme is continuing, I seek urgent support for the retention of the Six Monthly Flood Monitoring Reports to Cabinet, as the Annual Reports proposed are too far apart to monitor and take relevant action on ever changing circumstances and risks.

There is an essential need to keep up to date with what the Environment Agency is doing (or more likely not doing) with regard to the River Thames Scheme. The risks to the affected Communities are simply too high to halve the frequency of these monitoring meetings which help to safeguard their homes, financial wellbeing and safety in the face of the increasing threats of climate change. A number of Councillors have witnessed the physical and mental despair and stress the flooding and even abandonment of their homes has caused to constituents.

As far as I can recall there was no mention of this in the consideration of the Budget.

I hope that colleagues will agree to seek the essential retention of the current frequency of the Flood Monitoring Reports by deleting the proposed recommendation to alter its frequency.

Other comments, many of which contradict logic, are :

Page 1. Where is Appendix 2 which details the coming year's programme? As that is not published it cannot be agreed until a later date.

Pages 1 & 2 : (1) The proposal will NOT maintain the focus on reduced flooding and  
(2) Residents will CERTAINLY NOT benefit from from an improved response.

Recommendation (i) it is NOT possible to ensure flood and maintenance schemes are delivered on time if monitoring is reduced and  
(iv) what does reducing report intervals to current performance levels mean other than doing less in this high profile subject in high risk areas?

2.1. A 50% reduction in monitoring is REDUCING a key priority

2.3. More frequent reports in times of flooding is no substitute for an essential monitoring programme to REDUCE such events

2.4. Performance Headlines - has there been any periodic training of many relevant parties?

2.5. I get fed up with failure of all and sundry to take note of the fact that Old Windsor is not mentioned in the list of communities at risk despite promises to raise this within RBWM circles and the EA River Thames Scheme Board.

A further point which is overlooked is that our upstream rural communities (Cookham and Bisham) would hugely benefit from significantly increased downstream flood water discharge rates.

Bullet 3 refers to offering property related flood protection products, but does not detail the take up numbers. These are disappointingly low and need to be tackled, maybe with more and better publicity.

Bullet 6 - no evidence of RTS working with communities (other than re previous item several years ago)

A Member /Officer Group was referred to on 26/11/15 but NOTHING has been heard of it since. Does the secrecy imply that nothing has been done or that Parish and other people who have first hand experience of flooding have been excluded ? Does any such liaison exist?

2.7. Another reference to Annual Monitoring Reports - once again item (iv) would NOT support the manifesto pledge mentioned in item (i).

2.8. Last option refers to withdrawing from RTS which would be an amazingly huge departure from established RBWM policy and ongoing manifesto commitments from as far as I am aware every Councillor in riverside Wards as well as many others. Why is this outrageous clause included in a public report ?

4.1. Are any partial cost fees charged for SUDS advice to developers?

5.1. Legal Obligations - fails to mention that RBWM has the statutory role of the Lead Local Flood Authority under the 2010 Act. It is hard to accept that its coordinating responsibilities should only be monitored on an annual basis.

8.1. Risk Management Para 3 assesses the risk rating as medium but the consequences of any event as high and then concludes that the appetite for this (?) is low. That conclusion is TOTALLY WRONG and indefensible given that the circumstances which created such catastrophic flooding in Parishes downstream of Windsor in recent years have NOT altered as nothing has been done yet to reduce them. I do not understand the reference to 'appetite' but the communities concerned certainly want to get their teeth into keeping these high risks and related matters at the highest priority level.

An associated high profile risk related to flooding has been completely omitted from this Monitoring Report and the risks and strategies. Urgent provision must be included to address foul sewage contamination of flood waters and the overall overloading of Thames Water and possibly other companies' sewage treatment works (STWs). These are immensely important issues which our representatives should be very actively pressing TW to address as matters of urgency both in regard to present day health risks and an escalation of the problems if RBWM is to meet its Local Plan commitment to accommodate many thousands more dwellings in the very near future. Sealed foul drainage systems and future proofed additional STW capacity to reduce pollution of the Thames and other watercourses should be

included as high profile requirements of RBWM in its role as the Lead Local Flood Authority.

14. Report factually incorrect and likely to cause confusion in the future as the OSP on 18/5/16 referred to was cancelled and the Report was not circulated to OSP Members until 19/5/16 requesting email comments. Will they be recorded on the RBWM website in the context of openness and transparency?

17.1. There are references to

- (i) gully cleaning - but no facts about if there is a programmed frequency or other arrangements for carrying out such operations to restrict local flooding, and
- (ii) engagement with Parish Councils and also the RTS Member/Officer Project Group - but no information on whether the first referred only to the Parishes Flood Liaison Forum and if the second actually met and if so who was invited to participate and what did they do?

I hope that these comments will help colleagues to appreciate the complexities and high profile concerns related to flooding.

## **Adult Services & Health**

### **Drug and Alcohol Services - Outcome of Review**

The Adult Services and Health O&S Panel considered the report and fully endorsed the recommendations. The Chairman thanked those on the Task and Finish Group and supporting officers for their excellent work on the report.

### **Finance Update**

The Adult Services and Health O&S Panel considered the report and fully endorsed the recommendations.

## **Children's Services**

### **Ofsted Action Plan**

The Children's Services O&S Panel received a presentation on the action plan at their April meeting and the Cabinet report was circulated for comment. No comments were received.

### **Drug and Alcohol Services - Outcome of Review**

None received

## **Culture & Communities**

### **IPMR Q4**

None received

**Corporate Services**

IPMR Q4

None received

Shared Legal Services

None received

Residents Survey

None received

Finance Update

None received

