



**Agenda – supplementary papers for
items 7, 11 and 12**

General Purposes Committee

**Thursday
23 June 2011
at 7.00 pm**

**The Guildhall
Westgate
Canterbury**

Membership of the General Purposes Committee

Quorum - 5 Members

Councillors

Councillor Sharp (Chairman)
Councillor H Taylor (Vice Chairman)
Councillor Baldock
Councillor Bellamy
Councillor Bright
Councillor Byford
Councillor Edwards
Councillor Flaherty
Councillor Sonnex
Councillor Staley

Also circulated to the remaining Members of the council for information.

Directors/Heads of Service

Press (5)

NOTES

- 1 Members of the public may at meetings of the General Purposes Committee speak for no more than three minutes upon any item which appears on the agenda for the meeting provided that notice has been given to Democratic Services (telephone 01227 862 009 or e-mail jemma.richards@canterbury.gov.uk) not later than 12.30pm on the working day before the meeting.
- 2 The venue for the meeting is wheelchair accessible and has an induction loop to help people who are hearing impaired.
- 3 Neither the Council nor its Executive has authorised the recording of their meetings or those of any committee, sub-committee, working group or similar body by members of the public or the media by any mechanical or electronic device or similar means. Recordings will not be permitted at any such meetings to which the press and public are admitted unless the council decides otherwise.
- 4 The information contained within this agenda is available in other formats, including Braille, large print, audio cassettes and other languages.

Contact Officer:

Jemma Richards

☎ 01227 862 009

✉ jemma.richards@canterbury.gov.uk

A G E N D A

	Page (s)
7 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LICENSING OF PLEASURE BOATS	4
<p>TO CONSIDER the report of the Head of Housing, Community Safety and Environmental Services.</p>	
11 MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE STAFF AND SAFETY JOINT CONSULTATIVE GROUP	5 - 9
<p>TO NOTE the minutes of a meeting of the Staff and Safety Joint Consultative Group held on 13 June 2011.</p>	
12 LORD MAYOR'S ROBE	10 - 13
<p>TO CONSIDER the report of the Strategic Director, Velia Coffey.</p>	

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

23 JUNE 2011

Supplementary report to Agenda item 7: proposed amendments to the licensing of pleasure boats

Since this report was written it has come to light that the requirement for CRB checks for pleasure boatmen will not be required. That condition should be deleted from the draft licences attached to the main report. (Condition 3.13 (operator's licence) and 2.12 (boatman's licence) refers. The conditions will then be renumbered.

This is because the ability to seek CRB checks is defined in the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions) Order 1975/1023. The Order refers to taxi and private hire drivers but not pleasure boatmen, so that to seek these checks would be unlawful and outside the council's powers.

If a boatman behaves in an unacceptable way at any time it is open to the Council to consider suspending or revoking his licence if it is considered necessary or desirable in the interests of the public.

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL**STAFF AND SAFETY JOINT CONSULTATIVE GROUP**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Monday, 13th June, 2011
at 2.00 pm in the Marion Attwood Room, Council Offices**

Present: Councillor Windsor (Chairman)

Councillor Baker
Councillor Bissett
Councillor A Cook
Councillor MacCaul
Councillor Sonnex
Jeff Derham
Adam Lee
David Sime

In attendance -

Officers: Jemma Richards - Democratic Services Officer
Steve Turner - Health and Safety Case Consultant

(*present for part of the meeting)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Flaherty and H Taylor, Flo Biggs, Derek Green, Steve Haddock and Andy Rush.

2 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Steve Haddock was appointed as Chairman of the Group for the year 2011/12.

3 APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Windsor was appointed as the Vice-Chairman of the Group for the Council year 2011/12.

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman agreed to take the Chair for the meeting.

4 APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

Jemma Richards was appointed Secretary of the Group for the Council year 2011/12.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Baker declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 9, the item which referred to the deck at Dead Mans Corner, Whitstable Harbour, due to his position as Chairman of the Improvement Trust at the time of the incident.

6 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2010**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2010 were agreed as a true record.

7 **ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

A staff side representative enquired as to whether there had been any feedback regarding the final bullet point in minute no 3, which referred to the set up of an SSJCG for more strategic issues at the EK Services level.

The Democratic Services Officer responded that she had not received any feedback, but would follow up the issue with the Chief Executive and the EKHRP Partnership.

8 **POINTS OF ORDER**

A Staff side representative indicated that due to a misunderstanding it had been assumed that the meeting would not take place and consequently an item was to be added under AOB.

He then raised concerns that Unison had not been consulted prior to the meeting regarding some of the reports on the agenda. The Group noted the concerns.

9 **CONSTITUTION - INCLUDED FOR MEMBERS' INFORMATION**

The Group noted the Terms of Reference of the Group.

10 **QUARTERLY ACCIDENT AND INCIDENT STATISTICS**

The Group considered the report of the Director of Finance which updated members of the Staff and Safety Joint Consultative Group on the accidents and incidents that had occurred in the second quarter of the year (April 2011 to March 2012).

The Health and Safety Case Consultant indicated that item 13 should have been listed as an incident rather than an accident.

The Group commented on various issues and made points including the following:

- What was the difference between an accident and an incident?
- With regard to item 9, it was good to see that the Police were investigating the incident. Had there been any feedback from the Police on the progress of the investigation?
- There were several accidents involving children. Was it a concern that children were not being adequately supervised by parents?
- With regard to item number 5, why had this not been reported to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE)?

The Health and Safety Case Consultant responded to some of the issues raised and made points including the following:

- It was difficult to distinguish between an accident and an incident, but anything which was not an obvious accident would be added as an incident.
- No feedback had been received from the Police on item 9, and it was difficult to follow up on Police investigations.

- Accidents involving children were always discussed with the parents in a tactful way, and staff were encouraged to report every incident which occurred at Community and Children's centres.
- Item 5 had not been reported to the HSE because it involved a member of the public, rather than a member of staff.

The group noted the report.

11 GUIDANCE ON CORPORATE HEALTH AND SAFETY MAPS

The Health and Safety Case Consultant introduced his report and explained that health and safety maps had been created as part of the management system as a tool to simplify the process of managing health and safety risk. Managers could use the maps to ensure that the risks they were responsible for either operational or strategically had been appropriately addressed.

The Health and Safety Case Consultant indicated that the system had been in place in Canterbury for some time and worked well, although there had not been a guidance note previously. He stated that he would be visiting the various teams to reintroduce the process and ensure it accurately reflected the risks. The guidance would need the endorsement of Management Team.

The Group commented on various issues and made points including the following:

- When would the annual review date be?
- Would the results of the health and safety risk assessments be shared with the union and staff?
- The guidance brought together lots of separate document and acted as a single reference point for all services.
- The work place hazard checklists were currently done on an annual basis, in line with the PDA.
- What would the impact be on Sub-Contractors?
- The document 'recommended' that each review take place twice a year, but should this be tightened up to ensure that regular reviews were carried out?
- Should the document separate the different levels of risk?
- Could the results of the reviews be reported to the SSJCG annually?

The Health and Safety Case Consultant responded to some of the issues raised, and made points including the following:

- The annual review date would need to be flexible, as some risks such as the red line requirements would require reviewing more regularly, although all risks would need assessing at least annually.
- It was likely that the results of the risk assessments would be shared when there was an audit. It was perhaps an issue for MT to consider as to whether it should be shared with staff on a more regular basis.
- The Health and Safety Map would be tailored to each individual service.
- Any large contracts would pick up any issues regarding sub-contractors.
- The maps would be included in the service plan, and would therefore require sign off by Heads of Service, meaning assessments would need to be done at least annually.
- The document was a template and would vary between each individual service. Some services did not have red line requirements. This could be made more clear in the document.

- The results of the assessments could be made available to the SSJCG?
- The template could not cover every eventuality, but managers would be advised accordingly.

The group noted the document.

12 GUIDANCE ON RISK ASSESSMENT

The Health and Safety Case Consultant introduced the risk assessment process which enabled the organisation, through its managers, to focus on the significant risks ie those that could potentially cause harm. This would ensure that the organisation complied with all legal requirements in a concise easy to understand form.

The Health and Safety Case Consultant stated that briefing sessions would be held for anyone who was required to carry out risk assessments.

The Group noted the report.

13 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held at 2pm on Monday 12 September 2011 in the Marion Attwood Room.

14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A staff side representative raised an item regarding the East Kent Human Resources Partnership. He indicated that there were concerns regarding the quality of service given by the Partnership.

The staff side representative indicated that Shared Services had been embarked upon to save money but the same quality of service as received with Canterbury's Personnel Section was expected.

He indicated that the council should not look back at the issues raised but should look to improving the future service. However, the following questions needed to be considered:

- Were the Council making savings ?
- What were the savings ?
- Was Canterbury City Council getting the quality service it needed?
- Were Canterbury getting the service expected?
- Should Managers be asked to record HR failings and report them to an independent group?

The group discussed the various issues and made points including the following:

- It was concerning that maternity leave had been overpaid.
- Could a HR rep be invited to attend a meeting of the SSJCG?
- Should managers be monitoring the situation with HR?
- Was the Partnership achieving Value for Money?
- It seemed sensible to monitor the partnership from this point forward, as any changeover difficulties should now be ironed out.

The Health and Safety Case Consultant then indicated that there was an HR Strategic Board, which included a member of staff from each authority. The representative for Canterbury was the Director of Finance. Issues surrounding performance should be dealt with at this level. The Partnership had also recently introduced 'Customer Issues' which was a transparent system of investigation which was then communicated back to the manager. He suggested that a representative from the Partnership could attend a meeting of the SSJCG meeting to explain this process.

The Group noted the concerns raised and it was agreed to refer the matter to the appropriate Officers.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 3.00 pm

Subject:	Lord Mayor's Robe
Director/Head of Service:	Velia Coffey
Decision Issues:	These matters are within the authority of the Council
Decision type:	Non-key
Classification:	This report is open to the public.
	REASON:
CCC Ward(s):	All
Summary:	<i>To agree what action should be taken in respect of the Lord Mayor's robe which is now in urgent need of repair or full replacement.</i>
To Consider:	Which option the council wishes to take. Whether to: A) Clean and repair the current robe. B) Purchase a lesser quality robe and attach existing regalia. C) Purchase a new full spec robe.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. Introduction and detail

The Lord Mayor wears a black and gold robe for certain events during his civic year. The current robe has been in service for 23 years. It was commissioned when the civic status was raised from Mayor to Lord Mayor in 1988 which required an upgraded robe. The robe is worn an around 30 occasions each year, both at our civic but at other important city events hosted by others. Events would include Mayor Making, Freedom ceremonies, graduations for various universities and colleges in Canterbury, civic services in the cathedral as well as various open air events such as Blessing of the Sea ceremonies, parades and other occasions where appropriate. The robe is also taken to schools and other venues when the Lord Mayor gives talks on their civic role.

2. Detail

The impact of the regular use is now very evident: there is a large hole on the left side of the robe in the chest to underarm area and a worn patch on the left hand side at hip level. The material is wearing in a number of places and the hem has become brittle and badly creased. The gold ribbon and ornaments are becoming very faded, loose and frayed.

The robe is currently with Ede and Ravenscroft (original suppliers of the robe) who were asked to clean and repair it. They have advised us that it could be a false economy to repair the robe due to its current age and condition. Ede and Ravenscroft are waiting for our decision and have loaned us a robe of lesser quality than the original, free of charge. Ede and Ravenscroft were surprised to see the robe still in use as normally a robe of this kind would be expected to survive for no more than 20 years.

We need to agree what the best course of action would be.

3. **Relevant Council Policy/Strategies/Budgetary Documents**

None

4. **Consultation planned or undertaken**

None

5. **Options available with reasons for suitability**

a) **Clean and repair the current robe - approximately £3,575.00 +VAT**

The robe has already been cleaned so that Ede and Ravenscroft could thoroughly investigate the garment's condition. The hole and badly worn areas would be patched. The worst worn areas of gold ribbon would be patched or replaced.

Benefits: This is the cheapest option.

Risks: Although the robe will look fresher, it will continue to deteriorate and will still look worn in places as only the most damaged areas will have been addressed. The ornaments will still look tarnished as they will not have been replaced. As the material is becoming thin in some areas a major repair could be needed at any time so this option is only a temporary fix. Because of its age, the robe could require repairs on a regular basis. At some point the robe would have to be totally replaced.

b) **Thoroughly clean and repair the ornaments and shoulder wings of the existing robe and place them on a new robe body - £11,795.00 + VAT.**

A new robe body of a lesser quality material (the same material that the loan robe is constructed of) with the existing ornaments cleaned and re-gilded and resited. Some of the original ribbon would be re-used and only the pieces too worn to be repaired would be replaced. The quote for this work could increase dependant on the amount of ribbon and ornaments that would need to be replaced due to them being beyond repair.

Benefits: Although the robe body would be new and lighter to wear. Ede and Ravenscroft suggested this robe would be expected to survive for around 10 years.

Risks: The current Lord Mayor, Councillor Thomas and the past Lord Mayor, Councillor Todd have reported problems when wearing the loaned robe. The material is not strong nor heavy enough to bear the weight of the chain of office. This causes the robe to look uneven and is uncomfortable for the Lord Mayor to wear, especially for long periods of time, such as graduations and cathedral services which also involve processions, sitting and standing. The loan robe is already creasing at the hem as the material is not heavy enough to hold its shape.

c) Purchase a totally new robe - £16,995.00 +VAT

Commission a complete new robe in the same heavy duty material as the current robe so that it is fit for purpose.

Benefits: Ede and Ravenscroft have suggested that the heavy duty material in the current robe is more suited to the meet our requirements and that the robe would be able to withstand better the demands made of it. As everything would be new, the robe would have a suggested life of 20 years plus. The current robe which has now been cleaned, would still be owned by Canterbury City Council so could be used for display purposes in Tower House. It could also be taken to venues when the Lord Mayor speaks to schools and community groups and be worn at some external events when the weather is inclement or unsettled. This would prolong the life of the new robe which could be properly stored away when not in use.

Risks: Expenditure of this amount in the current climate could be perceived as an extravagance in the current climate when jobs are being lost. However the Lord Mayor is valued across the district for the important role that they play in civic life, both in representing the district and attending community events and we know that attendance at events in civic robes is much appreciated.

6. Reasons for supporting option recommended, with risk assessment

Option C is recommended because in all probability it will be the most cost effective route to take over the whole life cost of the garment and the other options could be a false economy. It would cost around £850 per year as opposed to £1,200 for the lesser quality robe. We could find repairs would become more frequent if we kept using the current robe and with an expected life of around 10 years, the lighter garment is a more expensive option were we to have to purchase two in the next 20 years or so.

7. Implications

(a) Financial Implications - The costs of repairs/replacement have not been budgeted for within the civic budget this year however it is possible that it could be financed from the underspend. A regular sum could be set aside in the renewals programme for future replacements.

(b) Legal Implications - None

Other implications

- (c) Staffing/resource - None
- (d) Property Portfolio - None
- (e) Environmental/Sustainability - None
- (f) Planning/Building Regulations - None
- (g) Human Rights issues - None
- (h) Crime and Disorder - None
- (i) Biodiversity - None
- (j) Safeguarding Children - None
- (k) Energy efficiency - None

8. Conclusions

The presence of the Lord Mayor in the gown at local events is much appreciated by the community and gives a strong sense of occasion to civic participation at events. For total life cost of the garment, option C makes the most economic sense.

Contact Officers:

Celia Glynn-Williams

Marsha Whiteway

Telephone: 862065

Telephone: 862560