Scrutiny Topic Registration

Name of person proposing topic:	Date: 29 th June 2006
Clls Webster/ Flynn/ Franklin	
Contact:	
Suggested title of topic:	
St. Paul's Regeneration	
What is the issue that scrutiny needs to address?	
What do we mean by regeneration; How does this scheme relate to the regeneration needs of the to What are the strategic objectives of this scheme What physical/ environmental improvements should be achieve What social initiatives are there Which partners/ stakeholders are involved How do we work with members of the local community	
What do you feel could be achieved by a scrutiny review	ew?
Clarity of strategy and objectives; Better understanding of Council Partnership coo=ordination; Community buy-in.	

Priority and urgency

Is the topic urgent?	yes
----------------------	-----

If so, please consider which of the following might apply:

Is there a strict time constraint?	yes
Is there currently high media coverage?	yes
Is there high public pressure to respond?	yes
Does it involve a high risk to the council?	yes
Any other reasons:	

There is a danger of momentum being lost unless the Council continues with this work.

Issues

Please consider whether the following might apply:

Is the topic important to the people of Cheltenham?	yes
Does the topic involve a poorly performing service or high public	no
dissatisfaction with a service?	
Is it related to the Council's corporate objectives?	yes
Is it directly related to an item on the council workplan?	yes
Has there been media interest in the topic?	yes
Can scrutiny help in the development of council policy?	yes
Any other issues or details:	

It will be an opportunity to review where the Council is on this; to renew momentum and to involve the community in St Paul's.

Officer Implications (for office use)

Please give your comments on this proposed topic, for example is there any other similar review planned or in progress, are there any potential resource constraints etc

The St Paul's Regeneration Project has been the subject of three substantive reports to Cabinet since July 2005 and two update reports since the change in administration in May 2006, the second in the form of an Information Paper (25th July, 2006). The area has also been the subject of two independent surveys – one to ascertain the views of residents in the area and the other to undertake a physical survey of the properties. These achieved very significant response rates, with 81% of households completing social survey questionnaires and 94% of properties being inspected.

The Information paper and associated officer briefing set out a revised and extended timescale for reporting back to cabinet with a preferred option (target date: 7th November 2006) and advised of proposals for extensive consultation with local residents, stakeholders and the wider community in accordance with best practice recommended in guidance produced by ODPM in relation to Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment.

The Information Paper also set out the high level objectives for the project and a 'Vision' for the St Paul's regeneration area as agreed by the residents' group and a wide range of Council officers. The Cabinet did not suggest any amendment to these objectives.

There is an opportunity for members to get involved and to express their views during ongoing consultation and the work engaging residents and other stakeholders in the option selection and appraisal processes. This will inform the report to Cabinet on the recommended option.

Given the above factors and the limited staffing resources available to progress the project, officers consider that scrutiny of the project at this stage could be counterproductive.

It is suggested that Overview and Scrutiny may wish to review the decision regarding a preferred option for the St Paul's area should there be reasonable grounds to do so, once this decision has been taken by Cabinet

Links to Business Plan and
Corporate Objectives or
Risk Register

Item 2 under 'Strategic Risks' – Corporate Risk Register Organisation capacity given new initiatives and increasing
workload, and the risk of stress related absence.

Current risk rating: 20 (escalating risk as at October 2005)

Completed by Mike Redman, Assistant Director Neighbourhood Regeneration

Date 28th July 2006