

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 2015

REVIEW OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN PARKS - DRAFT SCOPE

VERSION HISTORY:

- Version 1 27 July 2015 (NM)
- Version 2 17 August (NM/DC)
- Version 3 1 September (Cllrs)

1	SUBJECT	Community involvement in parks
2	COMMITTEE	Overview & Scrutiny Committee
3	REVIEW GROUP	Councillors: Councillor Richard Almond (C) Councillor Jeff Anderson (L) Councillor Kam Chana (C) Councillor Susan Hall (C) Councillor Ameet Jogia (C) Councillor Jean Lammiman (C) Councillor Norman Stevenson (C) Councillor Christine Robson (L) Additional councillors tbc Co-optees: • Tbc
4	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES/ OUTCOMES	 To examine the current levels of community involvement in Harrow's parks and benchmark against parks in neighbouring boroughs. To develop an understanding of what residents want from their local parks. To explore innovative practices in the delivery of park services by other councils and other initiatives demonstrating community involvement and volunteering in parks. To identify ways in which Harrow Council can best deliver 21st century parks for residents. To inform the development of Harrow's parks and open spaces strategy 2016-19. To develop the park users' forum so it is inclusive and representative of all park users across Harrow. To inform the progress of Project Phoenix and the

		commercialisation strategy for parks.
5	MEASURES OF SUCCESS OF REVIEW	 Increasing community involvement in Harrow's parks. Informing the future development of Harrow's parks so that they best meets the needs of residents. Increasing the revenue generated in Harrow parks, to ensure their longer term commercial/financial sustainability and robust business models.
6	SCOPE	This review will consider current levels of community involvement in Harrow's parks and the schemes in operation to encourage more residents to be actively involved or volunteer in their local parks.
		Community usage of parks will be examined in terms of sports groups, access to grant funding, community lettings and events. The wider impact of parks in relation to community cohesion, public health and social benefits will be considered.
		In inputting into the development of the next open spaces and parks strategy for 2016 onwards, this review will in particular look at the plans contained within Project Phoenix and the commercialisation strategy for parks.
7	SERVICE PRIORITIES (Corporate/Dept)	This review relates in particular to the Corporate Priorities 2015/16 of: • Making a difference for communities
8	REVIEW SPONSOR	Venetia Reid-Baptiste, Divisional Director Commissioning Services
9	ACCOUNTABLE MANAGER	Rachel Gapp, Head of Policy
10	SUPPORT OFFICER	Mohammed Ilyas, Policy Officer Nahreen Matlib, Senior Policy Officer
11	ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	Business Support Service / Policy Team
12	EXTERNAL INPUT	The input of the following may be useful for the review:
		Stakeholders: Relevant corporate/divisional director(s)/service managers Relevant portfolio holder(s) Residents
		Partner agencies: Tbc
		Experts/advisers: Representative interest groups Park users forum

13	METHODOLOGY	 This review will involve three phases: Desktop research – including gathering evidence from local and national studies around community involvement in parks, the results of any recent consultation on Harrow parks, performance data, other written/oral evidence from senior managers, ward councillors, residents and experts. This will inform the structure and lines of questioning for the next phase of the review. a) Challenge sessions – to take evidence from key
		managers, relevant portfolio holders, parks user group/forum, residents. b) Visits to key Harrow parks that can demonstrate effective community involvement projects or have opportunities to develop them. 3. Writing up of final report and recommendations - for the approval of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 19 th April 2016 for onward transmission to Cabinet on either the 21 st April or 24 th May 2016.
14	EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS	The review will consider during the course of its work, how equality implications have been taken into account in current policy and practice and consider the possible implications of any changes it recommends. In carrying out the review, the review group will also need to consider its own practices and how it can facilitate all relevant stakeholders in the borough to have their voices heard.
15	ASSUMPTIONS/ CONSTRAINTS	The success of the review will depend upon the ability and willingness of officers, partners and stakeholders to participate and contribute fully in this work.
16	TIMESCALE	Timescales for the review to be decided.
17	RESOURCE COMMITMENTS	To be met from existing Policy Team budget. No significant additional expenditure is anticipated.
18	REPORT AUTHOR	Mohammed Ilyas and Nahreen Matlib, as advised by the Review Group.
19	REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS	 Outline of formal reporting process: The relevant Divisional Director (Venetia Reid-Baptiste) and portfolio holder (Councillor Graham Henson, Environment, Crime & Community Safety Portfolio Holder) will be invited to the review group meetings as appropriate. They will be consulted in the drafting of the final report and recommendations. Report to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 19th April 2016. Report to Cabinet on either the 21st April or 24th May 2016
20	FOLLOW UP ARRANGEMENTS	Implementation of recommendations to be monitored by exception on a 6-monthly basis by the Performance and Finance

(proposals)	Scrutiny Sub-Committee.