

OAKHAM TOWN TASK AND FINISH GROUP

18 October 2018, Council Chamber, Catmose

PRESENT: MEMBERS

Mr O Bird	Ward Member - Oakham South West
Mr D Bottomley	Oakham Town Council
Mr B Callaghan	Ward Member – Oakham South East
Mrs J Clough	Oakham Residents Group
Mr A Dewis	Oakham Town Partnership
Mr J Dale	Ward Member – Oakham North East
Mr P Dowse	Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Grp
Mrs J Fox	Ward Member – Exton
Mr A Mann	Ward Member – Oakham North West
Mr T Norton	OK2WAY
Mr C Wade	Independent Chairman

OFFICERS

PRESENT:	Mr S Ingram	Strategic Director for Places
	Mrs N Taylor	Governance Manager
	Mrs H Bremner	Communications Manager

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
1.	APOLOGIES	
	No apologies were received.	
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES	
	The minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2018 were approved by the group.	
3.	ACTIONS FROM LAST MEETING	
	The list of actions was as published with the agenda, the list was reviewed and updated regularly.	
	Mrs Clough confirmed that the data from the extended online survey had now been received and this would be added as an appendix to the evidence report.	
	Mr Ingram noted that the RCC Project Manager had made comments on the project template for use going forward.	
	Mr Dewis provided an update on the Business Breakfast meeting as follows:	

- Attendance had been disappointing with some RSVP's not turning up.
- A presentation was provided which included overview of evidence from the Survey Work.
- Positive feedback from those attending with some offers of help for future work.

All members thanked Mr Dewis for the work he had put into organising the Breakfast Meeting. Mr Wade noted that it was important that people had been involved along the way and that 27 was not a disappointing turn out when compared to other such events he had been involved in.

4. COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Mrs Bremner, Communications Manager, provided a verbal update highlighting that the Communications Plan had been updated to reflect recent developments and changes, the Face book page was now live and there would be communications put out about the meeting and next steps following the meeting.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. Mr Dowse asked why none of the reports were currently available on the website. Mrs Taylor confirmed that once the final report and all evidence had been collated in the report to Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel this would be published on the website.

5. UPDATES FROM SUB-GROUP

The Sub-Group had circulated the Recommendations Report to the Task and Finish Group in advance of the meeting.

Mrs Fox introduced the report and explained that when the Sub-Group had met to discuss Community, Leisure and Cultural Services they felt that all the issues could be included in the other two theme areas. They had therefore decided that there should be a central "Communication and Coordination" Group, with two other groups looking at "Pedestrian & Traffic Issues" and "Placemaking & Marketing". This reflected Section 6 of the report "Mapping issues to recommended responses".

6. OVERVIEW OF DRAFT FORWARD FRAMEWORK

Mr Wade acknowledged that there was another report in circulation. As he only received formal notification of the second report yesterday via Governance, he could not currently provide further comment on it.

Mr Wade went gave an overview of how since the last meeting he had, as agreed, prepared a draft 'forward framework' and distributed it in a timely way for comment. Comments had only been received from officers and these were reflected in second draft.

He explained how the purpose of this forward framework was to define and agree a broad consensus on issues and the process for next steps.

In drafting the Forward Framework, Mr Wade explained that it was important to adhere to principles for achieving sustained economic and community development as set-out in full in the report's summary comments.

These principles included:

- Using the baseline evidence directly to define issues and inform project development, prioritisation and measurement of success. Project development and assessment needs to be in-line with the template agreed with RCC officers.
- Defining a future structure that reflects the function across the three identified sets of issues and involves appropriate stakeholders and technical input from appropriate officers. Corresponding terms of reference and governance procedures need to be formally agreed and adopted for the new structure in-line with RCC and other partners requirements before any detailed recommendations can be legitimised.

Mr Wade felt that the recommendations report could be read as a continuation of his report. Mr Wade accepted that the group may not have got as far as they would have liked, but that some consensus had been reached which was very positive and the sub-group had collated a list of recommendations as possible solutions to address some of the identified issues.

Mr Wade had revised his report and felt that it represented a good platform on which to build future recommendations. There was a good body of evidence, he wanted to emphasise the straight line from the evidence to the issues and then on to a range of solutions.

Mr Wade recommended that the identified themes should remain at three as contained in his report, but accepted that there were different views about this, his concern was that something could get overlooked by condensing the groups.

The recommendations in his report were written for all partners to consider, not just Rutland County Council.

7. FORMAT AND CONTENT OF FINAL REPORT TO GROWTH INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY PANEL

Mrs Fox read a statement on behalf of a number of the Task and Finish Group Members which requested that the Chairs Report was not the substantive report presented to Scrutiny and that the "Recommendations" report would best demonstrate the aspiration of the group.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. Mr Wade was willing to take on board feedback and incorporate it into his report;
- ii. Mr Wade felt that the Recommendations Report and his own report complemented each other and could be taken to the Scrutiny Panel together;
- iii. Mr Dowse explained that the model put forward by Mr Wade had been used in the Recommendations Report, but it had also been adapted to fit with the vision that the sub group had, with some focus on early delivery of quick wins, and amending the theme groups to reflect the findings of the evidence;
- iv. Mr Wade urged the Group to retain focus on both short term and longer term goals;
- v. Mr Dowse commented that some of the longer terms aims and objectives could form part of the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan;
- vi. Mr Mann highlighted the need to see some short term solutions as part of the recommendations, but also accepted that the long term solutions would also be important;
- vii. Mr Bird suggested that Communication could be used to reassure people that things were happening and objectives had been put in place, so that people could be kept informed of where the project was in the process. This would reassure people that progress was being made;
- viii. Mr Ingram highlighted that presenting a positive approach was important and saw the benefit of the two complimentary reports with a cover report which would highlight the way the groups have worked together to create a positive piece of work. The cover report would include detail on how the Council could respond to the report and what could be done to achieve some early successes and support the work of a Partnership Group going forward;
- ix. Mr Callaghan raised the importance of the final report clearly defining the following key aspects in regard to the project and group. He felt that the two reports currently covered most of these areas and that this list was a summary of what had already been discussed at meetings:
 - Leadership/independent chairmanship
 - Group structure, membership, roles and human resource
 - Meeting programme
 - Time frames
 - A strategy for engagement with all possible sectors of the wider community throughout the county
 - A strategy for funding sources
 - A communication strategy
 - The creation of a properly constituted partnership body
 - The resources that other partners will contribute to the process
- x. Mr Dale felt that having two reports gave the impression that there was conflict, it would be better presented as one report which covered all the issues;
- xi. Mr Norton highlighted that the group should retain the focus of why the group had been formed. It was in order to solve a problem and the group wanted to produce a report which is theirs;
- xii. Mrs Taylor confirmed the importance of putting something before

Scrutiny that they were able to respond to positively and that in turn could be put before Council for consideration. This had been discussed at the previous meeting. As long as all relevant details were included, the two reports could be combined into one;

- xiii. Mrs Fox suggested that the two reports be combined with the detail regarding future resourcing, action planning and project development being added to the Recommendations Report; and
- xiv. Mr Ingram felt the report should reflect the expertise that had been provided by the Independent Chairman in the drafting of his report and if this could be incorporated as one report that would be a good outcome. There needed to be positive recommendation to Scrutiny on a realistic way forward with deliverable objectives based on funding available from a variety of resources.

The Task and Finish Group agreed the two reports would be blended to ensure that all aspects were incorporated and circulate electronically for approval of the members.

Mr Wade would review the 'blended' report in due course and consider the appropriateness of writing a forward or otherwise endorsing it based on his experience and professional knowledge. Another option would be for him to provide a commentary on the revised report which can be read alongside his existing independent chair's forward framework.

8. FEEDBACK FROM GROUP PARTNERS

Mr Wade asked all members to provide some detail on how their own organisations may be able to support and be involved in the work of any future partnership group:

Mr Bottomley (Oakham Town Council) confirmed that Oakham Town Council wanted to act in the best interests of the town and were willing partners in any future work/delivery. Once expectations were clarified by the Council (if they became the lead group) then they would be considered through the decision making process of the Council.

(Mr Callaghan clarified that it was likely that RCC would be a participant rather than having overarching responsibility in the future)

Mr Dewis (Oakham Town Partnership) confirmed that the partnership were willing to receive the report and were not constrained by restrictions on meetings. They would look to support the business community through newsletters and meetings. The Partnership was limited in terms of funding but wanted to be highly involved and would be looking at external funding options.

Mr Dowse (Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) confirmed that the Group was a sub group of the Town Council so would be subject to the same funding and decision making processes. The longer term recommendations could be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan. The group could look at the report at its next meeting in November.

(Mr Ingram highlighted that any Community Infrastructure Levy received in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan could provide some funding for

future developments to support growth and sustainability of the town)

Mrs Clough (Oakham Residents Group) did not have access to any funding but had many volunteers who were willing to put in the hours required to research funding options, carry out further survey work etc...

Mr Norton (OK2WAY) highlighted that he had been co-opted due to his involvement in the group working to stop the One Way proposals, he would step down following the final report of the Task and Finish Group.

Mr Dale (RCC Councillor) confirmed that it would be up to the members to respond to the recommendations and refer the report for Council to consider. He felt that all large businesses/organisations in the town should be approached to provide financial support.

Mr Bird (RCC Councillor) highlighted the importance of communicating with the wider public. There had been a huge amount of work done and it was important to inform people about this and what the next steps would be.

(Mrs Bremner confirmed that there would be communications and press releases regarding the outcome of the Task and Finish group and that keeping the public informed would be a priority)

9. AGREED ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

During discussion the following points were noted:

ACTION	OWNER	NOTES/TARGET DATE/COMPLETED
Sub Group to meet to look at blending the two reports and then circulate the revised report through Governance for approval by members	All	Sub Group Meeting Tuesday 23 October 2018 Report with Governance by 29 October 2018
Independent Chairs review of combined report and comments	CW	ASAP
Confirm timescales for each partner organisation to consider and respond to the report	All	ASAP
Cover report drafted for GIR Scrutiny Panel	NT/SI	29/30 October 2018
Reports circulated for RCC Internal Approvals	NT	30 October 2018
Report Published for GIR Scrutiny Panel	Governance	7 November 2018
Press Release following publication of the final recommendations report	HB	Following 7 November publication

The Independent Chairman, Mr Wade, concluded by thanking all the members for their hard work. The group were all clearly passionate

about the local community and had a real desire to do what was best. There was commitment from the members of the group to carry this work forward using the work done as part of the Task and Finish Group as a platform for future partnership and project work to deliver improvements.

---o0o---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 19.56pm

---o0o---