Overview and Scrutiny Committee


Better City Life
Local government in this country has seen a major change. Councillors no longer sit in committee meetings discussing every aspect of council business.

The decision-making process has been changed in order to allow the majority of councillors more time to play a wider part in community affairs and to talk to their electorate. At the same time, most major decisions are taken by a Leader of the Council and a Cabinet, much in the style of central government.

While this makes for a more streamlined system, it also creates a vital role for other councillors whose job is to scrutinise those decisions, challenge and advise the Cabinet and listen to the views of the community.

This vital work is carried out in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea by five Overview and Scrutiny Committees. This annual report sets out what they do, what they achieved in the past year and what they are planning to do in the current year.
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It is with great pleasure that I introduce this Annual Report, the first in this new format. As each chairman has individually set out a more detailed report on their activities in the following pages, I thought it might be useful to set out here the framework for Overview and Scrutiny and to summarise what we achieved last year.

With the change in governance from the committee system to the cabinet system, the role of Overview and Scrutiny was created to provide an essential element of democratic accountability.

In the Royal Borough we have established five Overview and Scrutiny Committees covering all aspects of the Council’s activities, co-ordinated through a Scrutiny Steering Group that I chair. Since this relatively new structure may not be clearly understood by all and has developed its own modus operandi, it may be helpful for me to outline the theory behind the overview and scrutiny process.

As operated within the Royal Borough, Overview and Scrutiny (O and S) has five main responsibilities.

**Holding the executive to account**

The role of O and S is to provide robust internal challenge to the executive, to question its decisions and to provide advice. It is not its job to determine policy but to monitor its implementation.

**Policy review and development**

There is a role for pre-decision scrutiny, not just when a Key Decision is about to be made but also to make an input before policies are agreed and accepted in order to influence or perhaps initiate the direction of travel for the Council.

**Performance management review**

The responsibility of O and S is to monitor and oversee the performance of the Council’s business groups in hitting their financial and operational targets.

**External scrutiny**

OSCs are not constrained solely to activities of the Council. They have a clearly-defined statutory duty to monitor NHS Trusts and also to look at other organisations whose activities impact on the lives of our residents.

**Public participation**

OSCs should provide a forum for members of the public to have their say on matters of importance and to allow the public’s voice to be heard – in other words to help reduce the “disconnect” between the public and government.
Within the past year, OSCs have made wide-ranging contributions to the work of the Council. For example, they have:

1. Scrutinised budget proposals and key decisions, and on at least one occasion facilitated public input into a key decision before it was finalised (relating to non-residential charges).
2. Received and commented on work plans and performance information (e.g., Vital Signs, OFSTED reports, TMO performance and housing and children and young people’s work plans).
3. Helped develop policies in specific areas (e.g., work on the Parks Strategy jointly with the executive and work on the contracts for waste services and leisure centres).
4. Undertaken in-depth reviews of policy and service areas (e.g., housing allocations, libraries, disability).
5. Received briefings on services, results of audits and reviews and new developments (children’s services, adult care services, licensing of HMOs and customer service centres).
6. Scrutinised the work of external agencies and partnerships (e.g., local NHS Trusts, mental health partnership, Jobcentre Plus, PCSOs).
7. Engaged with local communities on issues of public concern (e.g., the PCT’s deficit, Holland Park School, Children and Young People’s Plan, voluntary sector grants).

It is correct to say that not all of this is reflected in the 2005 to 2006 annual programme agreed in June 2005. Whereas some of the work of the committees was planned at the start of the cycle, a considerable amount was generated by issues that were not on the horizon at the time of agreeing the programme or came from ad hoc requests or from consultations based on other people’s timetables.

At least one committee had to add an additional meeting to its schedule to deal with its workload, whereas other committees felt that a three-month gap between meetings last winter was not helpful. Another committee had to change its dates at short notice to fit in with revised Cabinet dates. The Medium Term Financial Forecast, which was of interest to all committees, had to be dealt with at only one committee meeting because of its timing. Some committees found themselves with very crowded agendas at some meetings. New Licensing Act responsibilities further added to an already heavy Councillor workload, and of course there were the local government elections.

The lesson we have learned is that while there will always be unexpected developments to which a committee needs to respond, there is scope for better anticipating and organising the work of the committee in the coming year. This is what we are doing at present; as this report goes to print a carefully-planned work programme is being finalised for 2006 to 2007, a programme that is relevant to residents and which seeks to achieve the aims of the Council, namely “responding to residents, really good services and renewing our legacy”.

In May 2006 12 new Councillors were elected within the Royal Borough, all of whom joined one of the five Overview and Scrutiny Committees (OSCs). A warm welcome to them; I hope that they enjoy their scrutiny work.

More specifically within the context of the Royal Borough, May saw a change in constitutional remits for OSCs that in effect aligned them more closely with the remits of business groups. This meant a variety of responsibilities being re-allocated between OSCs and also brought about the creation of an OSC dedicated to scrutinising only matters relating to health. This was the Health OSC, which I also Chair.

In addition, the Scrutiny Steering Group (SSG), originally formed as an informal body to co-ordinate the OSCs, exchange best practice and monitor overall OSC expenditure, agreed that it should operate on a more formal basis and elect a chairman, a position to which I have been elected.
Scrutiny does not sit outside the Council’s commitment to excellence, and in order to raise our standards and follow through ideas and criticisms in the IDeA Peer Review of the Royal Borough, the Cabinet and Corporate Services OSC will be conducting a review into the way we carry out our scrutiny role. This is intended to benchmark our activities, highlight those areas we already do well and tease out those areas where we might do things better, putting in place actions to address those areas.

I have reflected broadly on what OSCs have done and reflected briefly on some of the strategic issues facing scrutiny in the months ahead. Each of the following contributions reflects on last year, as well as commenting on the year ahead from the perspective of individual chairmen.

As mentioned above, the OSC structure has changed. The reports that follow have been written by the current chairmen, although the changes mean that some of the activities they cover were the responsibilities of a different OSC last year.

I would like to thank all Councillors and officers for their work on Overview and Scrutiny and particularly the small team of scrutiny staff that so ably supports us.
Last year’s OSC was chaired by Stephen Hoier, and so this report will highlight some of the work the committee did under his chairmanship. Having taken over the chair after the May elections, I will outline the programme for the year ahead, a programme that contains a number of issues that are of central importance to residents as well as to the way in which the Council holds its decision-makers to account.

Firstly though, a look at the past year.

What the OSC did in 2005/06

Scrutiny of a key Council service

The OSC established a Councillor-led working group to look at the take-up of benefits in the Royal Borough. This report will look at this review in some detail as in many ways it has all the characteristics of a good scrutiny review.

It was initiated against a background of an increasing number of welfare benefits becoming available, along with evidence suggesting that the position for many Royal Borough residents is in line with the national picture in that many are not benefiting from their due entitlement. This is especially true in respect of the many means tested benefits.

It is estimated that between £35 and £51 million worth of benefits go unclaimed each year in the Royal Borough, and the impact of this is not just on individuals but also on the local economy. As a result, a cross-cutting working group was established to make recommendations as to how benefit take-up could be improved in a cost-effective way. The sub-group comprised Councillors Stephen Hoier (Chairman), Christopher Buckmaster, Barbara Campbell, Robert Atkinson, James Husband and Jeremy Edge. It reviewed the level of benefits take-up by residents in the Royal Borough and examined the delivery and impact of measures aimed at providing direct or indirect financial assistance to residents on low incomes. It also identified the way in which these benefits contribute to the achievement of the Council’s priorities (e.g. in relation to building stronger communities and protecting the vulnerable) and it examined the relevance of these benefits to the borough’s residents.

It approached its task in a number of innovative ways, many of which show how the principles outlined in the Chairman’s Foreword can be put into practice. For example, it made use of a variety of methods to achieve its objectives, including commissioning desk research, undertaking a survey of local advice agencies, community groups and registered social landlords, receiving evidence from Royal Borough officers and taking evidence from three other local authorities (Camden, Newham and Blackpool).
It also:

• Compared the work being undertaken by the Royal Borough to promote benefits take-up with that of other organisations cited in the LGA’s Best Practice Guide to benefit take-up.
• Hosted a conference.
• Commissioned the design and development of a benefit/income maximisation project in an area of multiple deprivation for inclusion in the Royal Borough’s proposals for a Local Area Agreement.

The joint OSC review of benefit take up was presented to the Cabinet on 15 June and the Cabinet submitted a comprehensive response to the report. This is an area where scrutiny needs to be improved as there was an undue delay in the Cabinet response to the OSC report without the Chairman being kept informed. Following this, a small working group was set up to monitor the Cabinet’s response to the report. Councillors Judith Blakeman, The Lady Hanham CBE and Keith Cunningham have agreed to sit on the working group, which will continue its work through the course of 2006/07.

Scrutiny of areas of importance to residents

The committee set up two review sub-groups:

(i) **Tourism and visitor management** – Comprising Councillor Ernest Tomlin (Chairman), Councillor Lady Hanham and Councillor Stuart Shapro. Following changes in the remits of OSCs, this piece of work was taken over by the Public Realm OSC.

(ii) **Efficiency, economy and effectiveness** – Comprising Councillor John Cox (Chairman), Councillor Andrew Dalton and Councillor Stephen Hoier. This sub-group reviewed key themes in the Council’s agenda to maximise value for money, such as the use of freedoms and flexibilities, and the Council’s plans to strengthen efficiency. It examined in detail the comments of external scrutineers – the External Auditor’s Use of Resources assessment and the IDEA Peer Review – and followed that up by commissioning detailed reports on three areas identified as not fully demonstrating value for money: Libraries, environmental health and housing management.

Relevant findings emerging from scrutiny in these areas are that the Council has generally sound processes in place to test value for money but needs to be alive to the risks of slowly rising staffing numbers. Housing management and libraries have recognised weaknesses in value for money and have already embarked on a programme of improvements. The Council’s Environmental Health Department offers a ‘Rolls Royce’ service that may have prioritised effectiveness over economy, and it is appropriate that this is to be subject to a Royal Borough Review in 2006/07.

**What will the OSC be doing in 2006/07?**

The OSC agreed its work programme for 2006/07 on 11 September 2006. It includes:

• Keeping an eye on value added by new customer service arrangements.
• Monitoring the implementation of the recommendations flowing from the benefits take-up project.
• Establishing a Councillor-led working group to review the Council’s approach to economic regeneration.
• Getting to grips with the Local Government White Paper expected in November and considering any possible work flowing from it.
• Taking an initial look at the corporate grants sector and if necessary conducting an in-depth review.
• Establishing a Councillor-led working group to review the question of what the Royal Borough is getting in return for its investment into PCSOs, coupled with the broader question of unpacking what “Safer Neighbourhoods” means in practice and looking at the impact of Safer Neighbourhood teams.

Evaluating these against the criteria used to determine what should be included in our programme of work (importance to residents, value added to the work of the Council and timeliness of the issue) shows that all of them score very highly indeed. Finally, as the Chairman of the Scrutiny Steering Group pointed out in his introduction, Scrutiny Chairmen are committed to ensuring that the work of the OSCs remains cutting edge. To ensure this, this OSC will be leading an independent, cross-cutting review and benchmarking exercise to ensure that we are fully aware of our strengths and weaknesses when it comes to our scrutiny work and that we are building on our strengths and addressing any areas where there might be a need to do so.
The Family and Children’s Services OSC has had one opportunity to meet since the elections in May 2006, which is when I was appointed as the new chairman of this committee. Councillor James Husband, who was chairman for most of 2005/06, moved on to take a Cabinet position as Cabinet Member for Education and Libraries. It is worth mentioning that this review cannot cover all the things the committee did during the course of the past year – there simply isn’t enough space for that. It does, though, highlight a few of the more important aspects of the committee’s work last year.

What the OSC did in 2005/06

Scrutiny of a key Council plan

One of the Council’s key plans is the Children and Young People’s Plan (CYPP). It is of central importance to the Council as it is a single plan that covers all services affecting children and young people in the Royal Borough. The OSC spent a considerable amount of time engaging with this key policy area, starting with a discussion of the draft plan in January.

Following this discussion, the OSC thought it sensible to hear from the people affected directly by the plan, which it did at its meeting on 14 March. The result of this consultation with young people was debated at a subsequent Full Council meeting where at least ten Councillors expressed their views. As a result of the OSC’s activities, the plan was substantially re-written to take into account the comments made by Councillors, Council officers, partner agencies and, of course, young people themselves.

Scrutiny of a major capital project

The re-development of Holland Park School, a project involving the expenditure of a considerable amount of money, was kept under scrutiny by the committee. During November 2005 the committee decided to hold a public meeting to allow all interested parties to question the Cabinet Member, architects and project managers as well as the Head of the School and the Vice-Chairman of the School Governing body. The meeting was held in the Small Hall and there was a good turnout, including about 120 members of the public.

A model of the scheme was on display and members of the committee and the public were given the opportunity to speak and ask questions about the proposals. A lively and informative debate ensued. This was an opportunity for the OSC to ensure public engagement and clearly demonstrated that when an OSC discussed a matter of public interest, the public turned up. It also not only allowed members of the committee to hold the executive and senior officers to account, but gave residents and members of the public an opportunity to do this too.
Contribution of member working groups

Two Councillor working groups finalised their work during the year. One was constituted to look at the Council's Library Strategy and the other to investigate the provision of Adult Learning services. In relation to the Library Strategy, the working group looked at how the borough's library buildings and book purchasing needs could best be met and, in particular, emphasised the need to re-model the central library buildings extensively to bring them up-to-date and provide better facilities for residents. In this way it played its part in the development of the overall strategy. The final report of the Adult Learning Working Group made recommendations that helped to improve Council service delivery in this area and identified central government spending constraints that militated against the best interests of residents by prioritising expenditure to employment training initiatives.

What will the OSC be doing in 2006/07?

This OSC, like the others, is in the process of agreeing its work plan for next year, something it does every September. There are some interesting things on the agenda and they are listed below. Generally speaking, though, we will be looking at areas of importance to residents of the Royal Borough that will help further improve their quality of life.

We also hope that they are interesting enough for residents to want to engage with us in discussing them.

Some of the things we will be keeping an eye on:

- The money being spent on the two new schools. We will be looking to ensure value for money and in particular at the projected length of life of the new school buildings and at the full life costs as well as alternatives such as refurbishment.
- Admission arrangements in light of the Children Act.
- Adoption and looked-after children.
- Children's Centres and plans to re-develop services for children with disabilities.
- Arrangements and mechanisms on the scrutiny side of the Council's governance structure for ensuring that the voices of children and young people are heard.
Health Scrutiny is an important but still emerging area of activity for local government. Within the Royal Borough, the scope of health scrutiny potentially includes three general acute Health Trusts (Chelsea and Westminster, Hammersmith Hospitals and St Mary’s), the Kensington and Chelsea PCT, the Central and North West London Mental Health Trust, two specialist hospitals (the Royal Marsden and the Royal Brompton) and, even further afield, the London Strategic Health Authority and the London Ambulance Service. Health Scrutiny includes not just health services for people who are ill but also the health improvement of the general population and plans by Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) to reduce health inequalities.

Given this scope, it was a problem for previous OSCs which combined health with other major service areas to do equal justice to all the areas within their remit. For this reason, in May 2006 the Council decided to create a ‘stand-alone’ Health OSC.

Since those two areas were a substantial part of the remit of my predecessor committee, of which I was also Chairman, I have also included health work undertaken by that committee in this report in order to provide a complete picture of health scrutiny activities undertaken in the borough.

What the OSC did in 2005/06

The committee completed annual health checks on seven NHS Trusts.

The committee has considered and commented on applications for NHS Foundation status by two Trusts within the borough: Chelsea and Westminster NHS Trust and The Royal Brompton and Harefield NHS Trust.

The committee was consulted by the PCT on the proposed closure of the Princess Louise Kensington Hospital. The committee was concerned about the closure and sought and received clear reassurance from the PCT that appropriate alternative provision would be put in place to maintain the quality of care for the patients and residents.

Actions so far during 2006/07

Scrutiny of the PCT’s Turnaround Plan

The Kensington and Chelsea PCT published its three-year Turnaround Plan, aimed at eliminating a gross budget deficit of £10.1m, in June 2006. The committee held a public meeting on 21 June to question the PCT on the impact of their proposals. More than 100 people attended the meeting and had the opportunity to make representations. The committee was concerned that the rationale for, and the impact of, the proposed savings were not clear.
It also took the view that adequate investment was needed in community-based services to cope with expected demand and that any additional cost pressures put on partners as a result of the Turnaround Plan should be picked up by the PCT once it returned to surplus.

Reviews

Two reviews that had been commissioned in the previous year presented their final report to committee – the Review of Benefit Take-up, initiated by the Cabinet and Corporate Services OSC, and the Review of Hospital Acquired Infections.

Joan Bartlett Nursing Home

The PCT’s proposal to close the Joan Bartlett Nursing Home was discussed and reviewed and received approval from the OSC only after adequate assurances were given on alternative care provision.

What else will the OSC be doing in 2006/07?

Over the course of the coming year the committee will be scrutinising the implementation of the PCT’s Turnaround Plan, getting to grips with the implications of practice-based commissioning on local health provision, following up on the closure of the Joan Bartlett Nursing Home to ensure that residents’ needs are being appropriately met, commenting on the application by the Central and North West Mental Health Trust for foundation status and scrutinising proposals from the PCT on the future of St Charles’ Hospital.

The three chairmen of the Health Scrutiny Committees of the neighbouring boroughs of Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham and Westminster are keen to optimise opportunities for joint working between the three boroughs in order to maximise the impact of their work and to use resources in the most efficient way. The boroughs have agreed to pool information and intelligence on local provision, seek to build joint approaches on cross-borough issues where appropriate and work jointly to lobby strategic bodies such as the Strategic Health Authority. We hope that this new united approach to health will bring not just a more effective approach to scrutiny but also real benefits to our residents.

Following extensive consultation, the committee has decided that health inequalities and the PCT’s commissioning priorities will be the areas for in-depth investigation by the committee in the coming year. In addition, a short, detailed working group will look into the development of the St. Charles’ Hospital site and the consultation that takes place on that development with the public and with interested parties.

The committee will be interested in seeing how the new arrangements for user and public involvement – requiring the setting up of a Local Involvement Network (LINk) to replace the previous Public and Patients’ Involvement Forums – proceed in the borough. In the coming year, the committee will also be monitoring the performance of the new London-wide Strategic Health Authority and contributing to the development of a public health strategy for the borough that is now being drafted jointly by the PCT and the Royal Borough. We hope that the Department of Health gives the new organisations time to settle down. Concentrating on process and more structural change rather than on outcomes is rarely the solution to problems within the National Health Service.
In May 2006 the Council revised the original remit of this committee. It added responsibility for scrutinising adult care and environmental health, while responsibility for leisure, arts and regeneration were transferred to other committees. I am pleased to report that the committee has scrutinised significant issues in a number of areas, particularly housing, adult care and regeneration as set out below.

What the OSC did in 2005/06

A major focus of my committee’s work over the past year has been housing. This area of Council activity has not had as high a profile in the past as might be expected, given its importance to the Council and residents. An assessment of the Royal Borough’s housing needs was presented to the committee, setting out the great disparity between supply and demand for affordable housing and the challenges facing the Royal Borough in this area. The committee also scrutinised the condition of the Royal Borough’s housing stock, the plans to commission a study to look at options for managing the Royal Borough’s housing stock over the next 30 years and the Council’s new scheme for allocating housing to people in need.

A special meeting was held in December 2005 to discuss the Council’s future strategy on regeneration. In February 2006, the committee was briefed on the Council’s new statutory responsibilities in the area of licensing of houses in multiple occupation. The committee also had the opportunity to question the manager of the new Jobcentre Plus in the north of the borough on services she was planning to deliver to local residents, the methods of delivery, accessibility of the services and her plans to engage hard-to-reach groups.

An important meeting on proposed changes in homecare charges – an example of pre-decision scrutiny – was held at short notice and attended by 20 members of the public, many of whom contributed to the debate. As a result of this meeting changes were made to the original proposals.

Actions so far during 2006/07

Meeting on the proposed closure of the Edenham Residential Home

In July 2006, following the changes in the committee’s remit, a pre-decision scrutiny meeting was organised to give the public an opportunity to question the relevant Cabinet Member on proposals to close the Edenham Residential Home. Officers from the Council and the local Primary Care Trust gave a presentation on the existing conditions at Edenham and on future plans for the residents. In a lively meeting at the Isaac Newton Centre attended by more than 30 people, residents’ families and friends, voluntary organisations and local Councillors had the opportunity to question senior officers and the responsible Cabinet Member.
Although the committee reluctantly accepted the need to close the home, it asked the Council to monitor the situation of the residents and to provide regular reports to the committee on where the residents are placed and whether or not they are satisfied with what they are offered.

Reviews

Considerable work was done last year on three reviews. These reviews were into the interface between mental health and drugs misuse services, access to services for people with disabilities and housing allocations. These three reviews will be completed very shortly.

What else will the OSC be doing in 2006/07?

Over the course of the coming year the committee will be keeping a watchful eye on the Council’s services to its most vulnerable residents; disabled people, people with mental health problems, those with HIV and those who are abusing substances. Following the public meeting on Edenham mentioned earlier, the committee is also keen to be kept updated on developments in Edenham as well as on the other residential care facilities in the Royal Borough.

On housing, the committee will be monitoring how well the Council’s Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) is performing and has asked to be kept informed of the progress of the housing stock options appraisal mentioned earlier. The progress of the Royal Borough Review of Leaseholder Services will be of interest to the committee and there will be opportunities for the committee to scrutinise the Sheltered Housing Strategy.

The Council’s Environmental Health and Trading Standards services are undergoing a fundamental review aimed at modernising the ways in which they carry out their work. Given the important role of these services in safeguarding and improving health, safety and welfare in both the domestic and work environments, the committee will be looking forward to seeing the outcomes of this review.

Following consultation with Councillors, the Council’s partners and members of the public, the committee has identified two priority areas for in-depth investigation in the coming year. These are service provision across the Council for older people and provision for mental health patients once discharged from care.
Looking back at last year, there have been a number of changes that have impacted on the work of the OSC. Primarily, implementation of the new Licensing Act and the May elections meant that many members of the committee had far more responsibilities and commitments than would otherwise have been the case, leading to heavy workloads and impacting on the work of the OSC. OSC remits also changed during the course of the year, which meant that the OSC gained some new responsibilities and lost others. Nonetheless, we did achieve some significant outcomes during the course of the year and I will highlight these briefly below. We are currently in the process of finalising our work programme for next year, a programme that is filled with work which is important to the residents of the Royal Borough and to the achievement of the Council’s overall aims. I have listed some of these items in the conclusion below.

What the OSC did in 2005/06

Scrutiny of key Council strategies

Two Council strategies were scrutinised during the course of the year – the Waste Management Strategy and the Parks Strategy. A Councillor-led working group was formed to consider the Waste Management Strategy and looked at the Council’s overall performance against the national government target. It noted that there was a need to re-examine current arrangements as costs increased, and considered the need for an element of compulsion or of positive incentives to recycle. It also noted that the Council found it impossible to generate enough green waste to meet government targets because of a predominance of flats in the Royal Borough.

Following the numerous visits that were made by members of this OSC to parks during the previous year, the Parks Strategy was kept under scrutiny. Despite briefly being removed from the constitutional responsibilities of this OSC and then returned (due to changes in OSC remits), the OSC was able to make a contribution to the final Parks Strategy that was published in the summer.

Scrutiny of matters of importance to residents

Public conveniences remain on the work programme of the OSC into 2006/07. Review of this matter commenced with the Public Realm OSC meeting on 31 October 2005, when Councillors scrutinised the findings of the Resident Reviewers’ mystery shopping exercise that examined the Council’s public conveniences. Following in-depth scrutiny, the OSC asked for a report in the autumn on progress in implementing the action plan that flowed from the mystery shopping exercise. The OSC raised a number of concerns relating to the provision of public conveniences that were listened to by members of the executive present at the meetings.
The OSC also scrutinised the question of whether or not there really was a demand for more public conveniences. In the past the Visitor Management Strategy had suggested that more public conveniences were needed and the OSC concluded that choices of this nature needed to be made in the light of the overall priorities of the Council.

What will the OSC be doing in 2006/07?

We have an ambitious programme for next year, some of which is carried over from last year. For example, we will continue to look at the question of the provision of public conveniences in the Royal Borough. We intend to look at progress with gambling licensing policy and will be visiting some of the parks in the Royal Borough to make sure that the Parks Strategy is being implemented. With the change in OSC remits we were tasked with scrutinising the arts, and we will be holding a special meeting at Leighton House to scrutinise the Council’s Arts Strategy. The Council’s Waste Management Strategy remains on our radar, as does the question of waste and recycling. We intend to keep a close eye on the tendering process for the Grounds Maintenance Contract. We will be engaging with residents of the Royal Borough when we put the 328/28/31 bus routes under scrutiny later in the year. Likewise, we hope to engage with residents when we consider the regeneration of Golborne Road/Portobello Road. Finally, the OSC will be looking at the Environment Strategy.
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Contacts

If you want to find out more or suggest an area for scrutiny or have any other questions, contact one of the people listed below. Members of the public are invited to contact us.

Ahmed Farooqui
Scrutiny Development Manager
(Health and Housing, Environmental Health and Adult Social Care OSCs)
Tel: 020 7361 2987
Email: ahmed.farooqui@rbkc.gov.uk

Clive Mentzel
Scrutiny Development Manager
(Cabinet and Corporate Services, Family and Children's Services and Public Realm OSCs)
Tel: 020 7361 3494
Email: clive.mentzel@rbkc.gov.uk

Address for correspondence
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Policy and Partnerships Unit
Room 248
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX